



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Adoption of the agenda : report of the General Committee (A/1950) (<i>continued</i>)	243

President : Mr. Luis PADILLA NERVO (Mexico).

Adoption of the agenda : report of the General Committee (A/1950) (*continued*)

[Agenda item 7]

1. Sir Mohammad ZAFRULLA KHAN (Pakistan) : The recommendation of the General Committee which is under discussion is of a most unusual character. The language of rule 40 of our rules of procedure which is the relevant rule, as was so clearly demonstrated by the representative of Egypt when this matter came up for discussion on 13 November [342nd meeting], contemplates one of three courses being adopted by the General Committee in making recommendations to the Assembly in respect of matters relating to the agenda of the Assembly. The General Committee may recommend the inclusion of an item in the agenda, or the rejection of a request for inclusion, or the inclusion of an item in the provisional agenda of a future session. In the case of an item, the inclusion of which has been recommended, it may further recommend what priority should be accorded to it.

2. In the case under consideration the General Committee has not done any of these things. It has not recommended the inclusion of the item in the agenda, nor has it recommended the rejection of the request for inclusion, nor the inclusion of the item in the provisional agenda of a future session. It has adopted a course which is not contemplated by rule 40, and which, therefore, it was not competent to adopt. Further, with all respect, the recommendation not only lacks competence ; it is also meaningless. We fail to appreciate what it amounts to. The General Committee recommends that the consideration of the question whether this item should or should not be included in the agenda should be postponed by the Assembly for the time being.

3. If the General Committee found some difficulty in coming to a decision with regard to the inclusion or exclusion of the item for lack of adequate relevant information or data, it could have itself postponed consideration of the item to a later date and on such later date recommended inclusion or exclusion, or inclusion in the provisional agenda of a future session. But it has recommended to the Assembly the postponement of consideration of the very question with the consideration of which it was itself charged. What purpose was the recommendation, even if it had been competent which it is not, designed to serve, except to intimate to the Assembly that those who subscribed to the recommendation were troubled by an uneasy cons-

cience and were not willing to discharge the duty which they had been elected to discharge?

4. The General Committee is set up to assist the Assembly and its President, among other matters, with regard to the settlement of the agenda. What assistance has the General Committee rendered to the Assembly in respect of this item? The Assembly had a right to require of the General Committee that, after due consideration, it should record a recommendation as to whether, in its opinion, the item should or should not be included in the agenda of the Assembly. Any postponement of consideration that the Committee may have felt was needed could have been secured by the Committee by its own decision.

5. What does the Committee desire the Assembly to do in the matter? Assume for a moment that the recommendations of the Committee were adopted, what would be gained? Discussion of the item could be revived tomorrow in the General Committee. The question ; having been postponed for the time being, could now be revived. With all respect, we are constrained to observe that in respect of this item the General Committee has, in effect, abdicated its function and has refused to discharge its duty.

6. We are unaware of the considerations which impelled it to adopt this course, and are therefore at a loss to understand why it chose so to stultify itself. One thing is clear : the General Committee was not of the view that it could legitimately recommend the rejection of the request for inclusion of the item in the agenda. Had it been of that view, it would have recommended rejection. But those Members who made themselves responsible for the recommendation of the Committee could not so far suppress their consciences ; they could not say that this was not an item that could be included in the agenda of the Assembly. The powers of the Assembly in respect of the discussion of matters are of the widest description. Article 10 says : " The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter ". Here is a question obviously within the scope of the Charter. Whatever view may be taken of it on its merits after discussion, it cannot be argued—and we still wait to hear anybody argue—that a question like this, even phrased as it is, is not within the scope of the Charter.

7. Assuming, however, it were contended that, although within the scope of the Charter in its general aspects, this is a question that is somehow or other excluded by some

special provision from the scope of the discussion in the Assembly, the immediately following words of the Article would take care of that: "or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter". So even if a question were raised relating to the functions of the Assembly in this respect, the matter would have to come to the Assembly. The Assembly might then decide that though it is a matter of general interest falling within the scope of the Charter, yet after hearing a debate on the question, it is of the view that the consideration of this question is excluded by some special provision. It cannot be kept off the agenda merely because somebody says, "Oh, but some special provision might come into operation."

8. That being so, it must follow that the General Committee was of the view that the item was fit to be included in the agenda but, for reasons best known to those members who subscribed to the recommendation actually made, instead of making a recommendation in accordance with its view, the Committee chose to beseech the Assembly to cover up its retreat from the performance of its duty. This the Assembly must refuse to do. The General Committee having thus intimated that, though in its view the item was one fit for inclusion in the agenda, it was not willing in respect of this item to perform its plain duty, the Assembly must come to a decision on the matter without the benefit of the assistance of the General Committee.

9. The Assembly owes a duty to mankind and it must perform that duty with courage, if it is to retrieve and retain any portion of the dignity and prestige of the United Nations that has been and is being so sadly squandered and frittered away. The eyes of Asia and Africa are at this moment fixed upon the Assembly. Will the Assembly live up to the Charter in this respect? On this issue the United Nations is on trial and will be judged by the people of Asia and Africa by the stand it takes on it. Here is an item obviously within the scope of the Charter. All that is asked is that it should be included in the agenda. If the Assembly turns down this request, the whole world, and certainly Asia and Africa, must draw their own conclusions.

10. When the recommendation of the General Committee came up for consideration on 13 November, the Foreign Minister of France [342nd meeting] made a statement which, coming from so eminent a statesman occupying the responsible position that Mr. Schuman occupies, deserves the most careful consideration of the Assembly. It was for the purpose of securing time for such consideration that the Foreign Minister of Egypt requested the postponement of the consideration of this item by the Assembly. We have had just one month in which to consider the statement. We, for our part, have given it our most careful and sympathetic consideration, as indeed it deserved. Speaking for ourselves alone, we have found one aspect of that statement somewhat embarrassing.

11. Mr. Schuman began by reminding us that we were the guests of France and that any attempt on our part to have this item included in the agenda would amount to an unmerited affront to our hosts. In other words, we were asked not to behave ungraciously as guests. As I have said, we feel embarrassed by this approach but, the approach having been made, we shall give due weight to it. Mr. Schuman averred that the specific charge set out in the item, that is to say, violation by France in Morocco of the provision of the Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights, "offends our honour because we are particularly sensitive to that charge." I am quoting from the English

interpretation of Mr. Schuman's remarks¹. We feel that the item is perhaps not happily worded, and that French sensitiveness on that score should be met by appropriate amendment. To this I shall revert later.

12. Mr. Schuman went on to explain that France had undertaken a trust in 1912 in respect of Morocco "to bring that country to a brilliant future."¹ He repudiated any suggestion that France had been guilty of any breach of that trust. He reminded us that France had been the champion of democracy and freedom for centuries and felt a just resentment at being accused of betraying this tradition. He proceeded to explain the policy of France in respect of Morocco and the manner in which France was seeking to carry it out. He called it "a sacred pledge, a sacred mission".¹ He claimed that in respect of the culture of the people of Morocco there had nowhere been greater respect for national traditions and national beliefs—in other words, that the way of life of the Moroccan people had been fully safeguarded. He stated that France had given a pledge to promote economic and other development, social and educational advancement, just treatment, protection against abuses and the development of self-government. For that last purpose, France had promised to promote the free institutions of self-government. He reminded us that: "That is the political programme, the very wise political programme, which we have implemented there."¹

13. He explained that under the Constitution of 1946 France had undertaken: "to bring the peoples whose fate rests in her hands to freedom, rejecting every system of colonization based on constraint or coercion."¹ He went on to say:

"The task that has been carried out [by France] already within the Maghrib is an evidence of the sincerity of the intentions of the French Government. It testifies to the truth of the statements which its qualified representatives have made and should be sufficient evidence of the good faith which we display in our plans for the future."

"This task was started practically forty years ago and has continued ceaselessly notwithstanding two world wars. The past and the present vouch for the future".¹

He continued to state further that:

"In the country—in the Arab areas and in the Berber areas—there have been constant efforts at collaboration, constant co-operation designed to pursue together a task which France has continuously considered to be a common one".¹

Mr. Schuman concluded with the explanation that France was pursuing its task, was discharging its trust, was redeeming its pledge, by training and preparing the younger generation to carry out its future responsibilities and by seeking its co-operation and collaboration.

14. This, I trust, is a fair analysis and summary of the statements that Mr. Schuman made from the rostrum of the Assembly. Five days after Mr. Schuman addressed the Assembly, His Sherifian Majesty, the Sultan of Morocco, delivered a speech from the Throne, the occasion being the twenty-fourth anniversary of his accession to the Throne of Morocco. It is a lofty and dignified pronouncement wholly worthy of the exalted position occupied by His Majesty the Sultan, and I shall read out to the Assembly the portion of it which is relevant to the question we are now discussing. His Majesty said:

¹This quotation is taken from the provisional verbatim record of the 342nd plenary meeting.

"We are fully aware of the very grave responsibilities which have been conferred upon us in the fulfilment of our duty to God and to our people, in the accomplishment of the mission we have been called upon to fulfil, and in the conduct of those affairs which have been placed in our trust. Since God has called us to this great task we have striven to keep our solemn promise to strive without respite or discouragement until such time as we shall have restored to our country its position in keeping with its glorious past and historical importance and with its strategically important position resulting from its special geographical situation. Our aim being thus, we strive in the national interest for the full satisfaction of the legitimate aspirations of our people by all means in our power.

"On many previous occasions we have already declared that the finest régime under which a people can live, a people enjoying their full sovereignty, is the democratic system, for that system is in accord with our liberal and generous religion. It guarantees to individuals as a community a stable and peaceful existence. We shall not waver in our determination to uphold these principles and to strive to put them into practice in the firm conviction that this régime will assure to our people the maximum of liberty, justice and human dignity. We shall spare no effort when it is a question of our nation or the safeguarding of its integrity until it attains the realization of its aspirations.

"It was with this purpose in mind that we went last year to Paris with the special aim of making known to the French Government the whole Moroccan problem and of seeking with the latter a solution which would be in conformity with our aspirations and ideals. As we have already declared in our previous speech from the Throne, we have presented to the French Government two memoranda dated respectively 3 October and 1 November 1950. These memoranda leave no room for misunderstandings and make clear our desire to see Franco-Moroccan relations defined in a convention guaranteeing to Morocco its full sovereignty and constructing its relations with France on a new basis, on the principles of mutual friendship and respect for the interests of both countries while safeguarding the various elements residing in our Kingdom. We continue to hope, and we shall continue to hope from now on, for the opening of those negotiations for which we have been waiting, firm in our conviction of the justice of our high principles and our aims.

"The successful outcome of this question is of the very greatest importance to all, and depends for us upon the perseverance which yields neither to despair nor to discouragement. Despite the crises and the distressing events through which we have passed in the course of the last year, we shall persist firmly in our efforts until we shall have attained full satisfaction. God strengthen us in our efforts and those of our Arab and Moslem brothers of the East and West. May He grant them His powerful aid and inspire them with His divine goodness."

To that prayer we subscribe the most sincere "Amen".

15. On 2 February 1951 Mr. Schuman, so we are informed, stated in the French parliament that France regarded His Majesty the Sultan as the sole legal head of Morocco. The statement that I have just read out proceeds, therefore, from the exalted personage who alone is regarded by France as the legal head of his country, and as thus legally and constitutionally fully entitled, and also best qualified, to speak on behalf of his people.

16. What does all this amount to: the statements made on the one side by Mr. Schuman, which, as I have said, are entitled to the most careful and sympathetic consideration, the statement made on the other side by His Majesty the Sultan, and the statements that have been made in support of the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the Assembly? Let us try to appraise the degree of agreement that exists on this matter before we address ourselves to ascertaining the points that might be in controversy, and needing consideration and discussion.

17. The obligation, the trust, the pledge undertaken by France in respect of Morocco have been clearly stated by the distinguished Foreign Minister of France. They are that whilst safeguarding the culture of the people of Morocco France would promote the economic and other developments of Morocco, its social and educational advancement, the just treatment of its people and their protection against abuse, and bring them to freedom, rejecting every system of colonization based on constraint or coercion. I have been careful to confine myself to the precise terms employed by Mr. Schuman himself. We find here no cause for quarrel, controversy or difference. We consider this a fair statement. It is, in addition, in exact accord with the Charter of the United Nations. In our view this declaration safeguards fundamental human rights, the dignity and worth of the human person, and the principles of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. The object here, we presume—and if our presumption is erroneous we shall no doubt be set right—is to bring Morocco and its people to the fullest exercise of sovereign self-government at the earliest possible moment, it being understood that it is for the people of Morocco, by virtue and in exercise of their sovereign rights—for no other basis would have any validity—to decide freely, and without any kind of coercion, pressure or influence, the relationship which shall exist between Morocco and France. We have no doubt that, as announced by His Majesty the Sultan of Morocco, the people of Morocco would wish to establish that relationship on a basis of mutual friendship and co-operation. This, it appears to us, is exactly what His Majesty the Sultan announced as the objective towards which he is working and will continue to work unflinchingly and perseveringly until it is fully achieved.

18. I am sure the States that have sponsored the item under consideration would agree that so far there is no room for controversy. What then is in question? The objective being unquestionable, the controversy, we conceive, centres around the methods by which the objective is sought to be achieved and the pace of progress towards its complete achievement. The people and His Majesty the Sultan of Morocco appear to believe that the time has come when they should assume, in full sovereignty, the exercise of the right of self-determination and should, as a sovereign people, freely come to a settlement with France with regard to their future relationship with that country. This, after almost forty years of French tutelage, is the highest compliment that the people of Morocco could pay to France.

19. France claims that its record of achievements in Morocco is deserving of appreciation and praise by the people of Morocco and by the United Nations. What deeper appreciation, what higher praise could the United Nations accord to France than to affirm that on consideration of that record they are satisfied that France has fully discharged its trust and has completely redeemed its pledge to bring Morocco to a brilliant future and to a state where the people of that country are free to assume the full obligations of sovereign self-government? All

that is needed is for France to take the United Nations into its confidence by placing before it a summary of its achievements in Morocco and making a clear statement whether, in the opinion of France itself, its stewardship in respect of the Protectorate of Morocco, which it undertook nearly forty years ago, has been so humane, diligent, devoted, fruitful and unselfish that the Moroccan people are now, at the end of those forty years, fit to take over the full discharge of the responsibilities of a sovereign and self-governing people free from every possible handicap or discrimination savouring of colonialism. This would serve to reassure the people of Morocco and to win their gratitude, to evoke the admiration of non-colonial peoples and States and to excite the emulation, let us hope, of colonial Powers. It would set a noble example. Why should France seek to hide in any manner the record of its brilliant achievements in Morocco in respect of the advancement, both economic and political, of the Moroccan peoples and the preparation of those peoples for the exercise of sovereign self-government on democratic lines? This is a consummation which deserves to be proclaimed from the housetops rather than to be pushed into the background.

20. We appreciate that there may be some embarrassment for France in undertaking the presentation of its case on Morocco when the item charges France with violation in Morocco of the provisions of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. If that should be so, I would appeal to our colleagues who have sponsored this item to agree so to modify its language as to leave out the charge of violation by France in Morocco of the provisions of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We venture to submit for their consideration that the purpose which they have in mind would be fully served if the item were worded "The question of the independence and sovereignty of Morocco". Such a modification should relieve France of any sense of embarrassment and of any feeling of resentment in respect of the wording of the item. We feel convinced that for France to come before the General Assembly not as a State accused of violation of the provision of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights but as a State with a proud record of achievement, for the purpose of expounding the various aspects of that achievement, would be a matter of gratification rather than of embarrassment or resentment. France should embrace that opportunity with eagerness. France has an undoubtedly proud record in respect of its championship of freedom and liberty through the centuries. It should be jealous that that record should be maintained unquestioned. Let us hope that France will still maintain itself in the van of those who are seeking to make liberty and freedom universal.

21. As I have said, the consideration of this item and the decision to which the General Assembly may come in respect of it is a test for the United Nations. If the General Assembly should decide that this is not an item that it can discuss, what would we be left to conclude? We would perforce have to conclude that those who talk loudest of liberty are least concerned when it comes to its practical establishment. It so happens that the dependent areas and peoples are all of Asia and Africa; the dominant peoples are of Europe and America. What has been the attitude of the General Assembly in the past in respect of matters where similar issues though very much more limited in their scope and far less urgent in their intensity, have arisen? We have had the instance of the trial of a dignitary of the church in Hungary, in regard to which exception was taken. This item was put upon the agenda

of the General Assembly with a very large majority in spite of the contention with which it was opposed, that it was a matter completely of domestic jurisdiction. Here is a question relating to the independence of 9 million human beings. The manner in which this question is determined by the General Assembly will provide us with a measure, a standard, a yardstick which we should, those of us in Asia and Africa, apply to similar questions when we are invited to assist in placing matters upon the agenda of the General Assembly. Let the General Assembly make the choice.

22. SALAH-EL-DIN Pasha (Egypt): It is only natural that, speaking after the Foreign Minister of the French Republic and referring to his remarks in this Assembly some time ago, I should emphasize how much the Egyptian delegation shares the feelings of all other delegations in their sincere appreciation of the hospitality offered to us by the French Government. I am convinced that this hospitality will extend to a free and friendly discussion of all matters with which the Members of the United Nations may be concerned, including the Moroccan question. It is only by a fair discussion of the matter brought before the United Nations by several Member States that the atmosphere can be clarified and any causes of friction between the Arab world and France removed. I wish to assure the Foreign Minister of the French Republic that it is with the sincere desire of eliminating all subjects of conflict that we have asked for the question of Morocco to be put on the agenda. I am convinced that such a discussion can do nothing but help to maintain the friendly relations that have always existed between our two countries.

23. It is not my aim at this stage to enter into the object of our complaint. The Assembly now is only asked to decide on a matter of procedure, leaving the substance for a future debate. However, the representative of France brought into the discussion before this Assembly many considerations which were not entirely within the range of procedure, and I feel that the Assembly is entitled to hear some comment on those points, strictly within the limits that the representative of France has himself prescribed.

24. Many of you may think that our first step was to bring the case of Morocco before the Assembly, but actually we have exhausted all other means of understanding. We tried diplomatic contact to make our views known to the French Government. The Arab Governments then, collectively and by separate notes couched in the most courteous terms, endeavoured to move the French Government with regard to Morocco. We also turned to some friendly Powers who might be willing to assume this task and to use their good offices in this connexion. Their reluctance may have been inspired by what they knew of the French stand on the question. The persistent contention of the French Government that the question of Morocco was nobody's business, and that France intended to take no notice of any opinion other than its own on a matter which it considered to be of a purely internal and domestic character made every effort useless. Our repeated attempts were of no avail. It is the attitude of France that has led us to bring the matter before the General Assembly of the United Nations in accordance with the principles of the Charter. Could the fact of resorting to an Assembly of which both France and Egypt are Members, and of invoking a covenant by whose principles we both wish to abide, offend either of us in any way? Is this not a most appropriate way of settling our difference in a peaceful manner?

25. This being the case, I must confess my surprise at the vote taken by six members of the General Committee against the inclusion of the Moroccan affair in the present

agenda. The fact that this decision was taken by six votes to four with four abstentions proves how reluctant the members of that Committee were to adopt such a sterile and non-constructive line of conduct. Moreover, this decision is in complete contradiction to the explicit terms of the rules of procedure. Rule 40 of the rules of procedure stipulates one of three recommendations for any matter considered by the General Committee. This Committee shall recommend to the Assembly either to include the item in the agenda, or to reject the request for inclusion of the item in the agenda, or to include the item in the provisional agenda of a future session. No other course is open to the General Committee, and there is sufficient scope within those three limitative recommendations mentioned in rule 40. To try to pass over this step and give such a bold interpretation of its terms is quite irregular. In suggesting postponing the matter indefinitely *sine die* the General Committee has not only exceeded its authority, but has in fact committed a denial of justice. Such a refusal even to hear a case, so as to be able to judge it on its merits, is one of the most dangerous precedents our Assembly could possibly set up. I am afraid that those who suggested this arbitrary manner of proceeding are not aware of its possible implications for the future.

26. I am also convinced that this is not the spirit of our Organization as it was formed at the San Francisco Conference, and I should like to recall to you the words of the late Senator Vandenberg, one of the outstanding members of the United States delegation, when he dealt at length on the competence of the General Assembly and described it as the "town hall of the world". Indeed, any Member of this Organization has a right to bring a case for hearing before this Assembly. The Assembly might, of course, eventually declare itself to be incompetent, but even to do that one must begin by putting the case on the agenda. Nobody expressed this view more forcibly than the French representative, Mr. Parodi, when discussing the question of Czechoslovakia. On this occasion he stated that any question raised by Member States should first be placed on the agenda even if the competence of the United Nations was contested. To examine whether the United Nations were competent or not, he said that we must first of all include the question in the agenda. You will also remember the ruling by Dr. Evatt, the President of the third session of the General Assembly, which I should like to quote to you. Dr. Evatt said that :

"There was no question or problem which came within the scope of the Charter and which concerned its aims, its principles or any one of its provisions which could not be discussed by the General Assembly. If any question could be covered by an article of the Charter, that question could no longer be held to be a matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a State."

27. The Assembly would be evading one of its most elementary duties if it were to close its ears to the voice of those who appeal to it. Nations both large and small should all have a fair chance of being heard. I am certain that many of you will share the view that it is only by giving a fair hearing to the case brought before you that we shall be able to form a just opinion. At any rate, you would be working for the elimination of friction between the Arab world and France. On the contrary, by evading your obligations you would deprive the United Nations of the confidence of the people who are, in the last resort, the

real support of this Organization. The deception thus created would also diminish the prestige and moral authority of the United Nations and limit its chances of action in the future. I am sure that this is not your aim. You will have the courage to face this situation not only in the light of immediate opportunity, but also bearing in mind the far-reaching consequences of the narrow view which is proposed by some members of the General Committee.

28. A few days ago, during this very session, the General Assembly of the United Nations celebrated the third anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. What trust can the world have in this Assembly if, while proclaiming its high-sounding principles, it wishes to avoid the inclusion in its agenda of a complaint which is so closely related to that proclamation? Would it not be shameful if the right of free speech and of free discussion were denied even to the Members of this General Assembly because the subject of this discussion was disagreeable to certain Members of our Organization?

29. I shall not deal with the substance of the complaint, with which you are not asked to deal at this stage; but I am bound to point out that, by taking the view that Morocco is exclusively the concern of France, the representative of France has taken a stand with which I entirely disagree for reasons which I shall elaborate at the appropriate time. Mr. Schuman himself felt that this Assembly was entitled to more light than he was himself ready to give on the matter. He made us understand that, although France was proceeding of her own free will to direct the evolution of Morocco upon modern lines, this could only be done in a measure compatible with what he seems to consider as the backward state of the Moroccan people. Furthermore, the distinguished Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic alluded to conversations with His Majesty the Sultan to the end of assuring these progressive measures.

30. If we take it for granted that, despite forty years of French administration, Morocco is so backward, may we ask who is to blame for this situation? May we also ask what was the state of Morocco when the French first laid their hands on that country? Perhaps the late Marshal Lyautey—behind whose name Mr. Schuman tried to cover up the policy followed by Marshal Lyautey's successors—would be better qualified than anybody to give the answer. I quote from a speech made by Marshal Lyautey at Lyon on 29 February 1916, and I do so in French.

31. (*Translated from French*) :

"In Morocco, we are faced by a historic and independent empire, extremely jealous of its independence and not amenable to any form of servitude, which until recent years still functioned as a constituted State, with its hierarchy of officials, its representatives abroad and its social organs, most of which continue to exist in spite of the recent collapse of the central power.

"Remember that in Morocco there are still many persons who until six years ago were ambassadors of independent Morocco in St. Petersburg, London, Berlin, Madrid and Paris, with their secretaries and attachés, men of general culture who have dealt on an equal footing with European statesmen and who have a feeling and aptitude for political affairs.

"Side by side with that political general staff, there is also a religious general staff which is not to be neglected. The Sultan's present Minister of Justice taught for many years at the University of El Azhar, in Cairo, Istanbul, Brusa and Damascus, is in correspondence with scholars as far off as India and is not the only one who is in contact with the Islamic élite of the East. There is a first-rate

* See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Part II, General Committee, 58th meeting.*

economic team, made up of important merchants who have establishments at Manchester, Hamburg and Marseilles and who in most cases have been there themselves.

"We have before us a political, religious and economic *élite* which it would be madness to overlook, to ignore or not to use, for, if it is closely associated in the work that lies before us in Morocco, it can and must help that work enormously."

32. (*Continued in English*): Those were, in the very words of Marshal Lyautey, the people of Morocco as they stood, before the French intervention some forty years ago. If this advanced state of civil service has not been upheld since then, who is responsible for the retrogression? I think that we are completely justified in concluding that, contrary to the assertions made before this Assembly by my distinguished colleague, the French have never shown any readiness to bring up the younger generations on the lines of free and democratic institutions.

33. As for the contacts with His Majesty the Sultan, signs lead us to doubt their results. Indeed, certain contacts have been made whenever some upheaval within Morocco or some pressure coming from without has forced the French administration to take a broader view of Moroccan affairs. I am revealing no secret in reminding this Assembly that the late President Roosevelt pledged himself to the Sultan that the state of affairs in Morocco would not be maintained after the war. In 1950, the Sultan paid a visit to Paris with the object of negotiating the new status of his country; but it was in vain that His Majesty more than once reminded the French Government, in terms which leave no doubt as to their meaning, that he claims for his people an agreement which will recognize the sovereignty of his country, and will establish its relationship with France on a sounder basis. His repeated insistence has had no effect, and it is exploited by the French as an alibi in order to say that "conversations are still going on". Meanwhile, the Moroccan people are deprived of their essential freedoms and democratic institutions. There is no freedom of information under the French administration, no freedom of meeting, no freedom of speech, no political parties, no professional trade unions nor even workmen's syndicates.

34. We all pay tribute to the sincerity of a man like Mr. Schuman, but many of us would very much like to see him in a position to deal with the Moroccan question as his better judgment would dictate, for we know that the French Government is constantly pressed by powerful groups representing vested interests and by French colonists established in Morocco who envisage with horror any reforms which would deprive them of their privileged situation. It is for them, and their like, that the French Administration in Morocco must work, not for the Moroccan people, and that is what those having special interests are clamouring for when they insist on "reasserting the presence of France in North Africa". That may also explain why Mr. Schuman, while trying to justify the French Administration in Morocco, was so diffident when he came to talk of the future of that country. Indeed, he spoke to us of the ideals which are those of the French people, and of how the French people have always cherished liberty and equality and all the higher thoughts of humanity. But he did not give the Assembly any explicit or constructive plan for the future of the people of Morocco. Mr. Schuman did not tell the Assembly what positive steps would be taken, how long, in his view, would this evolution of the Moroccan people last, nor when their legitimate aspirations towards freedom, self-determination and independence

would be fulfilled. On all this Mr. Schuman was most elusive.

35. We are all concerned with these problems, more especially those of us who by bonds of race, language and creed are more closely bound to the Moroccan people. These ties are not the ties of some artificial partition of Africa, which put Morocco in France's lot. These ties are not forty years old but go back over centuries. They are written in the laws of history, of geography and of nature itself.

36. It is no intrusion on the part of the Arab Member States to invite France to a free discussion in this international forum. This discussion would give the French Government an opportunity of putting before the world the record of its administration in North Africa which it deems so praiseworthy. Whatever the divergencies of opinion on this administration may be, we are convinced that this discussion can remain both friendly and courteous. We sincerely reciprocate the feelings expressed by the distinguished members of the French delegation, that they wish to maintain the traditional friendship between France and the Arab world. We are convinced that it is only by a frank debate on this matter that the Assembly can accomplish one of its primary duties. This course, if it is followed in all fairness and earnestness, can prove to be a most useful device in helping to remove a subject of continual international tension and the rising tide of disquiet and social discontent. It might be the means by which France could respond, without prejudice to her moral prestige, to the legitimate demands of Morocco towards those fundamental freedoms which are the common right of all mankind.

37. My eminent colleague, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, expressed the view that it might be preferable to change the wording of the item the inclusion of which in the agenda we are now considering, to make it read "The question of the independence and sovereignty of Morocco". As for my delegation we should say that we have no objection to such a change provided that it may be agreeable to this Assembly and, furthermore, to the French delegation. We should first wish to hear the representative of France on this proposal.

38. Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) (*translated from French*): On 4 October the Egyptian Government asked [A/1894] that the following item should be added to the agenda of the sixth session of the General Assembly: "Complaint of violation by France in Morocco of the principles of the Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights". Similar requests were submitted by the Governments of Syria [A/1908], Lebanon [A/1904], Iraq [A/1898], Saudi Arabia [A/1918] and Yemen [A/1909].

39. The General Committee, after examining the provisional agenda and the supplementary list of items, together with the requests for the inclusion of additional items, at its 75th, 76th and 77th meetings, recommended in paragraph 5 of its report [A/1950], that the General Assembly should for the time being defer consideration of the item I have mentioned.

40. This recommendation by the General Committee does not accord with rule 40 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure, which states explicitly that the General Committee may act in three ways: first, it may recommend the inclusion of an item in the agenda; secondly, it may reject the request for inclusion; thirdly, it may recommend the inclusion of the item in the provisional agenda of a future session. The General Committee's recommendation to the General Assembly with regard to this item and the

indefinite postponement of the discussion on it—unless that recommendation receives the interpretation placed upon it by the Philippine representative [342nd meeting]—does not conform with rule 40 of the rules of procedure.

41. The representatives of Egypt, Iraq and other States explained why they had asked for the inclusion of this complaint in the agenda. Mr. Schuman, the French Foreign Minister, explained why he did not consider the General Assembly competent to deal with this item and, at the request of the Egyptian Minister for Foreign Affairs, the debate was postponed for a few days. The General Assembly now has the item before it once again and must decide on the General Committee's recommendation.

42. Since, at this stage, we must determine whether the complaint against France should or should not be included in the agenda, the substance of the question not being at issue, I shall confine myself to this aspect of the matter.

43. I wish first of all to state that my delegation supports the request for the inclusion of this complaint in the agenda, submitted by the Egyptian Government and the other Moslem governments to which we are linked by age-old cultural and religious ties. It is a matter of surprise to my delegation, and I presume to all delegations which take an unbiased and impartial view, that the representatives of certain great Powers should argue, without any justification and with unusual vehemence, that the United Nations organs are competent in the case of material questions of a private and national character, which the General Assembly and the other United Nations organs are not competent to consider, whereas, on a question of great importance which concerns human lives and the hopes of millions of persons, and the consideration of which by the General Assembly is in accordance with the Charter, these same great Powers, with complete indifference, regard its discussion as untimely and declare the General Assembly incompetent to discuss it.

44. I venture, at this point, to recall the views expressed by the French representative when there was a question of including an item in the agenda of another important United Nations organ. He said that: "Several delegations have already spoken in favour of including [the item] in our agenda... [while] several other delegations have spoken against... inclusion on the ground that the case is not within the... competence [of the organ to which it was to be submitted]. It seems to my delegation that this very divergence of views on the subject among members... clearly indicates the need for a debate..."

45. I consider, moreover, that a decision by the General Assembly to reject consideration of this item, which, as I have just indicated, lies within its competence—and does so in conformity with the Charter—can only be taken with a full knowledge of the facts, that is to say, after studying the question and deciding upon it after mature consideration.

46. My delegation therefore considers that this item must be placed on the General Assembly's agenda and we will strongly oppose the General Committee's recommendation that discussion of it should be postponed indefinitely. It is now for the General Assembly to reject the General Committee's recommendation and to decide to place this item on its agenda.

47. You need only look at Article 73 of the Charter to realize that the Members of the United Nations which

have assumed responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained self-government, have recognized the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount and have accepted the obligation to promote their well-being, to ensure their political, economic and social advancement, to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions.

48. Furthermore, under Article 55 of the Charter, which deals with international economic and social co-operation, the United Nations is required to promote "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion".

49. Any violation of the undertakings assumed by Members under Articles 73 and 55 of the Charter must clearly cause the United Nations to intervene and consider any complaint which may be lodged in that regard by Member States, and this is precisely the situation with which we are faced today.

50. My delegation notes with satisfaction that Mr. Schuman, the distinguished Minister for Foreign Affairs of France, in his statement of 13 November, acknowledges these undertakings, saying that Morocco has entrusted to France the difficult task of guiding it towards a brilliant future. The Egyptian delegation, however, and several other delegations have complained to the General Assembly that France has failed to carry out its mission. Despite the time-honoured friendship which exists between France and Iran, there are certain principles which the Iranian Government holds very dear and on which it cannot compromise; I mean the liberation of the peoples who are struggling for their independence, who are aspiring to the benefits enshrined in the principles of the United Nations Charter and who are only asking that the principles contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be observed.

51. In considering this complaint, therefore, the General Assembly will only be doing its duty under the Charter.

52. Mr. FRANCO FRANCO (Dominican Republic) (*translated from Spanish*): I should like to explain and to confirm my delegation's position with regard to the important question which has been raised in connexion with the examination by the General Committee of item 6 of the supplementary list of items for inclusion in the agenda of the sixth session of the General Assembly and in connexion with the General Committee's recommendation contained in paragraph 5 of its report [A/1950].

53. As we all know, the wording of this important supplementary item as amended in accordance with the suggestion made in the General Committee is: "Complaint of violation by France in Morocco of the principles of the Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights."

54. When the Committee considered the request submitted by the Government of Egypt and supported by similar requests from the Governments of Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Yemen, a very natural desire for calm and careful reflection led to the proposal of the representative of Canada in which it was recommended, without going into the substance of the question, that the General Assembly should postpone for the time being the consideration of the inclusion of item 6 of the supplementary list.

55. The Dominican Republic was among the delegations which acted in accordance with that desire and it voted

^a See *Official Records of the Security Council, Sixth Year, 559th meeting.*

in favour of the proposal to which I have just referred. In doing so, the delegation of the Dominican Republic, without considering the substance of the question, was actuated both by its conviction that the General Committee was fully competent to make such a recommendation to the General Assembly and by its full recognition of the fact that the recommendation was appropriate in view of a whole series of circumstances which make it inopportune for the time being to consider the inclusion of this item in our agenda.

56. During the interval which has elapsed between the time that the General Committee discussed and approved the Canadian proposal and the present moment when I have the honour of addressing you, no new argument has been raised to weaken these two considerations: the legal competence of the Committee and the inadvisability of discussing the question at the present time. On the contrary, our further study of the position has simply served to confirm us in our original opinion.

57. As a people of Spanish descent, the Dominican people is irrevocably linked with the Arab world and the Arab race in its innermost being, in its character and even in its national language. Furthermore, our destiny, growing out of these very circumstances which are a source of pride and pleasure to us, has always led us to live on the most friendly and cordial terms with the Arab world. But neither these considerations nor those rooted in the deep admiration and profound gratitude that the whole world, and especially the Latin world, feels towards France, a nation with eternal qualities, the home of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the torchbearer of democracy—these feelings, I say, are not of themselves enough to determine our attitude towards the question at issue. Indeed, in situations of this kind, memories of our ancestry and sympathy for the high ideals to which I have just referred, could only prompt us to make a most urgent appeal for calm and deliberation.

58. First and foremost therefore, we have maintained that, contrary to what has been argued in the General Committee and the Assembly itself, the General Committee was acting within its competence in making the recommendation contained in paragraph 5 of its report.

59. Indeed, rule 40 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure states that the General Committee shall, at the beginning of each session, consider the provisional agenda, together with the supplementary list, and shall make recommendations to the General Assembly with regard to each item proposed, concerning its inclusion in the agenda, the rejection of the request for inclusion, or the inclusion of the item in the provisional agenda of a future session. The rule adds that the General Committee shall, in the same manner, examine requests for the inclusion of additional items in the agenda, and shall make recommendations thereon to the General Assembly. Finally, the last part of the rule provides that, in considering matters relating to the agenda of the General Assembly, the General Committee shall not discuss the substance of any item, except in so far as this bears upon the question whether the General Committee should recommend the inclusion of the item in the agenda, the rejection of the request for inclusion, or the inclusion of the item in the provisional agenda of a future session.

60. That is the text of the relevant rule and it must be admitted that it is sufficiently clear and specific. It, in spite of this, anyone should wish to argue that the letter of rule 40 does not provide separately and expressly for a

recommendation that the Assembly should for the time being postpone consideration of the inclusion of a given item, I would reply without hesitation that the letter kills but the spirit gives life; that the law rules expressly on the most usual cases and, finally, that the greater power includes the less.

61. Indeed, since the General Committee could have recommended the rejection of the request for inclusion, and since it could equally have recommended inclusion of the item in the provisional agenda of a future session (and I would have you note that the rule refers to a future session without specifying that it must be the next session) the Committee can surely also take a less unfavourable decision on the request and recommend that the General Assembly should, for the time being, postpone a decision on the inclusion of the item requested.

62. Consequently, with regard to this aspect of the case, it can be maintained that the Committee was acting wholly within its terms of reference in making this recommendation just as the Assembly would be fully competent to take a similar decision with or without a recommendation to that effect.

63. Now we must consider the reasons or the motive which led the General Committee to make the recommendation contained in paragraph 5 of its report. The answer is as easy as it is obvious. The Committee reached its decision after considering whether or not it was opportune to discuss the inclusion of this item in the agenda. In taking this decision, the General Committee took into account a variety of factors and circumstances, but did not touch upon the substance of the question, except in so far as it was permitted to do so, under rule 40 of the rules of procedure, in order to formulate its recommendation to the General Assembly.

64. As regards the question of timeliness, it can be said without a shadow of doubt that it is a question of fact, the outcome of various circumstances and factors which had to be and were given due weight by each Member of the Committee. In the same way, the General Assembly can and must consider the matter as the supreme organ with the right of final decision, again without being entitled to discuss the substance of the request except in so far as is permitted by rule 40 of the rules of procedure.

65. Among the many important and diverse factors and circumstances to which I referred is the consideration that, at the present time, mutual understanding, sincere co-operation and the conciliation of the rights and interests involved are most likely to be achieved if at the same moment everyone concerned adopts an attitude of calm reflection.

66. Accordingly, without in any way prejudging the actual substance of the important question before us, the delegation of the Dominican Republic has explained and clarified the vote it cast in the General Committee. We shall confirm this vote in the General Assembly in view of the legal position and the question of timeliness on account of which it was and is still advisable to postpone, for the time being, the inclusion in the agenda of the present session of the Egyptian complaint against France.

67. Mrs. DOMANSKA (Poland) (*translated from French*): The Egyptian Government and the Governments of Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Lebanon, Israel and Yemen have requested that the question of Morocco should be included in the agenda of the sixth session. The point at issue is the violation, in Morocco, of the principles of the Charter and of

the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The statement of reasons in support of the request for this addition to the agenda [A/1894] and the trustworthy reports which have reached us bear witness to the serious situation in that country.

68. During the General Assembly's current session we have heard, in particular from the Egyptian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Salah-el-Din Pasha, an account of the recent bloody occurrences in Morocco. The Moroccan question was also mentioned during the discussion in the Fourth Committee on the development of Non-Self-Governing Territories, when the representatives of Egypt and Iraq⁴ painted a broad picture of the real situation of the Moroccan people. In spite of the French representative's attempts to prevent discussion of that subject, the representatives of Egypt and Iraq, with the aid of many concrete examples, testified to the results of colonial domination in Morocco. The Egyptian representative said that Morocco is still without a legislative assembly; that there is no legislation for the protection of Moroccan workers and their families; that there are no trade unions for indigeneous workers; that the local Press is subject to strict censorship. The reply of the metropolitan authorities to the justified claims of the Moroccan people is bloody repression. The slightest move by the Moroccan people to improve their living conditions is immediately repressed.

69. That being the situation, we can readily understand why some want to put off the day of discussion in the General Assembly of the Moroccan question. We can understand too the attitude adopted on the same question by the French delegation on the Fourth Committee. In both cases, discussion is to be prevented; in both cases, every means is used to conceal from public opinion the tragic situation of the Moroccan people.

70. We do not propose to examine the substance of the Moroccan problem at this moment. We feel, however, that the situation in Morocco is too tense for examination of the complaint to be postponed. We consider that the Assembly should study this question at its present session.

71. My delegation cannot accept as valid the argument that examination of the situation in Morocco would constitute intervention in the domestic affairs of the metropolitan country, in the first place because Morocco is not part of the metropolitan country, and secondly because it is a Non-Self-Governing Territory within the meaning of Chapter XI of the Charter. This fact entails on the one hand, the obligation for the administering Power, under Article 73 of the Charter, to transmit regularly to the Secretary-General information on the situation in Morocco and, on the other hand, for the United Nations the obligation of examining and following developments in that country.

72. Moreover, the French Government has concluded with the Sultan of Morocco arrangements in the nature of agreements between States; these agreements are the basis of French rights in Morocco. It is difficult to concede that the affairs of a country with which another country has signed agreements of that kind are the "domestic affairs" of the other contracting party.

73. In these circumstances, the delegation of Poland considers that no reference can be made here to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. That paragraph deals with the domestic affairs of States and not with those which, in

accordance with the principles of the Charter, can be subjected to examination by the United Nations.

74. My delegation supports the proposal for the inclusion of the Moroccan problem in the agenda of this session, because it considers it the duty of the United Nations to help oppressed peoples in their aspirations towards freedom and independence. My delegation considers finally that the General Committee's recommendation to the General Assembly to postpone, for the time being, consideration of the complaint by Egypt and the other Arab States with regard to Morocco, has no justification in the rules of procedure. According to rule 40, the General Committee can make recommendations to the General Assembly for the inclusion in the agenda of items proposed, the rejection of the request for inclusion, or the inclusion of the item in the provisional agenda of a future session. My delegation has every ground for believing that the recommendation that the consideration of the Moroccan question should be postponed for the time being is dictated by the desire to postpone it to the Greek calends.

75. In my delegation's view, the General Assembly would be failing in its duty under the Charter were it to adopt the solution proposed by the General Committee, instead of examining the complaints fully and in detail. My delegation will therefore vote against the postponement of the problem and in favour of its inclusion in the agenda.

76. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia): I have asked for the floor to urge upon my fellow representatives the necessity of rejecting the recommendation of the General Committee which would postpone debate on the question of placing the question of Morocco on the agenda of the General Assembly.

77. We are now deeply involved in consideration of the incredibly difficult problems of arms reduction and the abolition of the atomic weapon. We are all agreed that the solution of these questions is becoming more complicated because of the existing political tensions. We have even heard it said that it will be impossible to carry out proposals to reduce armed forces and armaments, assuming their adoption, before the underlying causes of the tension now existing in world politics are removed.

78. It would seem to be a well-established fact that the Moroccan question constitutes a situation fraught with danger and one in which the tension between France and the Moroccan people mounts daily. This fact would be perhaps less hideous if the Moroccan people were not being vigorously supported and championed by the Arab States. Still more important is the fact that hundreds of millions of Asians have declared their solidarity in the Moroccan struggle for independence.

79. It can be generally assumed that several Western Powers are backing France, which means that a rift exists between East and West on the question of Morocco. It might be well to point out here that in this case the composition of West and East differs from the popular conception of Western and Eastern Powers as is currently interpreted in the East-West controversy. Undoubtedly each of these East-West line-ups will attempt to influence the other and take advantage of the opportunities implicit in a situation of this kind. In my opinion, the West should be especially desirous of avoiding such a critical state of affairs, and this certainly cannot be accomplished by postponing consideration of the Moroccan question.

80. This question must be solved as soon as possible for the good of France and Morocco, and indeed for the good

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Fourth Committee*, 209th and 210th meetings.

of the whole world. To ignore it is tantamount to further complicating the solution of the question of arms reduction and the prohibition of the atomic weapon. Consequently, I urge upon this Assembly the urgent need to place consideration of the Moroccan question on its agenda.

81. Mr. PHARAON (Saudi Arabia) (*translated from French*): The General Assembly is today called upon to take a decision with regard to the problem of Morocco. We have already discussed the question and the General Assembly has been able to judge of its importance and of the need for a debate on it. There is urgent need for a just and equitable solution which will satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the people of Morocco and contribute to the maintenance of peace and security in one of the most sore and sensitive spots in the world.

82. During the discussion in the General Committee there was no division of opinion as to whether the question should be brought before the United Nations. That is clear from the small majority by which the Committee recommended postponement. The fact that the only votes in favour of that decision in the General Committee were cast by certain countries is significant, and one can hardly help feeling that it was the result of a solidarity dictated by those having certain interests in common which are not entirely compatible with the United Nations Charter. It is a pity that the same energetic and firm solidarity is not shown when the question arises of hastening the emancipation of peoples and encouraging their progress towards independence and sovereignty.

83. The debate which has taken place in the General Assembly shows that there is a Moroccan problem. There is still disagreement with regard to the scope and seriousness of the crisis, but it would be idle and futile to allow a latent threat to develop into an acute danger and deliberately to postpone dealing with it or to pretend to be unaware of its existence. The dispute exists and its importance cannot be overestimated, especially by the United Nations, whose most elementary duty is to settle it. Is not that the very reason why the Organization was created? The dispute calls for United Nations attention and intervention, the more so as it endangers friendly relations not only between France and Morocco, but between France and the whole Arab and Moslem world.

84. In saying this, I am not being carried away by any desire to exaggerate or to indulge in conjecture. The facts are there to confirm my words. The awakening of the Arab peoples and their consciousness of solidarity have reached such a point that nothing can prevent them from joining forces to gain their rightful place in the international community.

85. Neither Saudi Arabia nor the other Arab countries have any desire to quarrel with anyone, still less with France, with which they are linked by traditional friendship. They ardently wish not only to maintain that friendship, but to see it develop and become closer.

86. Despite the vague and evasive nature of the statements made here by the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, the Arab countries have given proof of their goodwill and of their desire to see the problem settled by means of direct negotiations between France and Morocco. Mr. Schuman had only to refer to such negotiations and to ask that nothing should be done to hamper them for the Arab countries to accede to his request and agree that the debate should be postponed until the conclusion of the negotiations.

87. Since then, however, an event has taken place which throws new light on the situation. In his speech from the Throne the Sultan of Morocco reminded the French authorities of his requests, constantly reiterated since his visit to France last year, that negotiations should be begun with a view to re-defining the relations between France and Morocco. In the same speech he repeated his request in terms lacking neither in sincerity, nor in clarity, nor in goodwill.

88. Hence we are faced with an obscure and contradictory situation. On the one hand, the French Minister for Foreign Affairs asserts that negotiations are in progress; on the other, the Sultan asks that such negotiations shall begin. Is there then some misunderstanding between the parties as to the nature and object of the negotiations? Otherwise, there might be a temptation to suspect a desire to draw out a business which has already lasted too long, in order to prevent its being discussed by the United Nations.

89. Mr. Robert Schuman's statements, to which we listened with great interest, might help to bridge the gulf between the antagonists and promote agreement between them. But the bridge is still fragile and must be given more solid bases, more clarity and definition, thus elucidating the situation and facilitating the task of the General Assembly and the parties concerned. We are convinced that on this occasion France will discharge its historic mission and continue its age-long tradition by helping a people, whose protection is its sacred trust, to realize their legitimate national aspirations.

90. On 22 November Mr. Robert Schuman, speaking in the French National Assembly, said: "The people of Morocco should be able to govern themselves and settle their affairs in a democratic manner. That has always been the attitude of France".

91. In reply, Mr. Pierre Cot, a French deputy and member of the National Assembly, asked him the question: "If France's attitude is so irreproachable, why not take the opportunity to explain it to the United Nations?"

92. Is not that still further proof, provided by a Frenchman, that it is urgent and timely for the United Nations to deal with the question?

93. It is for France to take the next step, and the Arab countries are prepared to co-operate with France to the full in all sincerity in finding a solution of the problem. They hope and believe that France shares their feelings and will also co-operate in achieving a just settlement of the problem and dispersing a cloud which might darken what should be an atmosphere of understanding and goodwill.

94. Finally, I should like to declare my Government's good intentions and its ardent desire to participate in all the efforts of the United Nations to achieve a pacific settlement of any dispute, and in particular that concerning Morocco, because Saudi Arabia firmly believes that such action is in the general interest, and especially in the interests of Morocco and of France itself.

95. I appeal to the goodwill of all delegations here present—above all, to the goodwill of those chiefly concerned in the problem—to prove their fidelity to the spirit of the Charter which they have signed. I hope that my sincere and heart-felt appeal will receive from all the welcome it deserves.

96. Mr. CHAUDHURI (India): My delegation gives full support to the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the

General Assembly. Stripped of all niceties of language, this item in substance raises a question of fundamental human rights and is one which is fit for consideration by the General Assembly at this session. At the present stage of the debate we refrain from pronouncing any views on the merits of the matter. Such pronouncements would be premature, as well as being founded on inadequate material. The question we have to consider now is quite simple: is this item to be included in the agenda or is it to be excluded?

97. The representative of Pakistan has very pertinently pointed out, as have also some other representatives, that in the light of rule 40 of our rules of procedure there is a question of some doubt whether the General Committee is competent to make a recommendation that consideration of the item should be postponed for the time being.

98. This question of the competence of the General Committee is probably, however, a little out of place at the present moment. This question is before us; we have to debate it, and we have to decide whether to include the item or to exclude it. Before we can decide on this item, which is in substance sufficiently important to merit consideration, we have to find a good reason for doing so. What is the principal reason which is being put forward for saying that we must reject the inclusion of this item? The principal argument which can be put forward against its inclusion is that the question is a domestic one. But we have to decide first whether or not it is within the domestic field. Without discussion and without ascertaining the facts of the relationship between France and Morocco it will be difficult for us to make up our minds whether this Assembly is competent to go into the question or not. To debar discussion in every shape and form would be to stultify ourselves and to deny our jurisdiction even to decide whether we are competent to take up the question at all or not. Such a situation is certainly not intended by our rules of procedure. Rules 80 and 120 both say that the question of the competence of the General Assembly can be determined by either the General Assembly or the appropriate Committee. Rule 80 reads:

"Subject to rule 78, any motion calling for a decision on the competence of the General Assembly to adopt a proposal submitted to it shall be put to the vote before a vote is taken on the proposal in question."

Rule 120 is in very similar terms:

"Subject to rule 118, any motion calling for a decision on the competence of the General Assembly or the committee to adopt a proposal submitted to it shall be put to the vote before a vote is taken on the proposal in question."

That is the rule for determining the competence of the General Assembly.

99. A similar question arose in the General Assembly in 1948, and I take the liberty of reminding my fellow representatives of that question. It was an item relating to the treatment of persons of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa. The then President, Dr. Evatt, suggested, and the General Assembly agreed, that the best course was to include the item and send it to the appropriate Committee for discussion in the light of the rule in force at that time corresponding to the present rule 120 of the rules of procedure. If this procedure is adopted here—and we warmly recommend that it should be—we shall come to a definite conclusion on this question of competence based on a debate of the pertinent facts and not on empty discussion *in vacuo*.

100. My delegation therefore suggests that this particular item should be included in the agenda and should be debated in the appropriate Committee, first as to the

competence of the General Assembly to go into the matter, and then, if it is decided that it can do so—and we hope it will be so decided—we can have a general debate on the whole matter and settle this rather uneasy problem of Morocco.

101. Mr. QUEVEDO (Ecuador) (*translated from Spanish*): I propose simply to explain how my delegation will vote on the General Committee's recommendation "that consideration of the question of placing item 6 of the supplementary list... on the final agenda of the General Assembly be postponed for the time being".

102. I interpret rule 40 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly to mean that the General Committee can recommend that an item should be included in the agenda, or that the request for its inclusion should be rejected, or that the item should be included in the provisional agenda of a future session. Accordingly I do not agree with the General Committee's recommendation concerning this item. Even if its recommendation conformed to the rules, I feel that, as it decided merely to postpone the question of the inclusion of the item for the time being and as over a month has passed since 9 November 1951, even that wish of the General Committee has been fulfilled and, consequently, it would be inadvisable to approve the report.

103. Hence I shall vote against the adoption of the General Committee's report. My delegation will, in the light of the Preamble and Articles 1, 11, 13, 14 and 35 of the Charter, vote for the inclusion of the item in the agenda. When, as in the present case, six Members of the United Nations request the inclusion of so important an item, I do not think that our Organization can decline to include the question in the agenda.

104. My delegation does not, of course, prejudice the question as to when the General Assembly should actually take the matter up. In our opinion, it should do so at its next and not at this session, so as to allow sufficient time in which any difficulty may be settled between the parties in an atmosphere of friendly co-operation. That is to say that, in our view, the Assembly should place the question on its agenda and decide, as it can do, to discuss it at its seventh session. Nor does my delegation prejudice the question of the Assembly's competence to take decisions in the matter, for we feel that this is a point which it will have to settle finally after studying the question and hearing the States concerned.

105. No more does it prejudice the conduct of France, a great nation towards which the people, the Government and the delegation of Ecuador are most amicably disposed. I would add that my delegation is aware of and admires the remarkable and constructive civilizing achievements of France in more than one continent. In this case, however, we are dealing with a question of principle from which we cannot depart and we believe that this principle compels our delegation to vote for the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

106. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) (*translated from French*): In a world in which spiritual values and the claims of justice, good sense and equity seem to be yielding to an upsurge of materialism, to a storm of bitter propaganda and to a mad armaments race; in a world in which powerful countries and countries considered to be highly developed hide their intentions from their own people and from world opinion by propaganda or other barriers in order to disguise the facts and the real situation—in such a world

the presence of a genuine evolutionary and humanitarian force is greatly to be desired.

107. France, the land of equilibrium and of moderation, the land of liberty, equality and fraternity, and also, as we all have reason to know, the land of hospitality, should, we believe, hold aloft the torch of pure democracy undimmed by any cloud which might give a distorted view either of facts or of words.

108. France, that great nation, after displaying to the world its martial virtues, would have lost nothing by championing the values of the spirit. Throughout the world, right-thinking people, free and healthy minds, and all humanitarian, peace-loving and progressive thinkers would have regarded that country, which enjoys the blessings of a fertile soil, as being also enriched by the fertile intelligence of its people. The world would have regarded it as the stronghold of a third force, the force of peace, true justice, the evolution of mankind and unimpaired respect for freedom.

109. The supporters of this force, which I call the third force, are by no means negligible; they are to be found in every country in the world. Qualitatively, they include all alert and clear-sighted thinkers, no matter the camp to which their country belongs; quantitatively, they are certainly a majority of the world population, the majority which embraces the peoples who are without the strength of a mechanized civilization, peoples who may be counted in hundreds of millions and who have known the tribulations of foreign occupation and exploitation.

110. Among those exploited peoples are those who have known the yoke of colonization, and particularly French colonization. These people, who should see in France and who wished to see in France the defender of freedom, the stronghold of human rights and the refuge of the oppressed, these people who should have been the true friends of the French Republic, find themselves exploited, ill-treated and oppressed by this very France, which seemed destined to play quite another part from that which it is at present playing in the countries it occupies. What we have learned of the actions of France in North Africa, and more particularly in recent months in the Sherifian Empire of Morocco, is so contrary to what was expected from that country that not only should our international Organization act without delay to put an end to an intolerable state of affairs which every human conscience must condemn...

111. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I would request the representative to keep to the procedural issue under discussion and not to touch upon the substance of the matter.

112. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) (*translated from French*): I regret that I did not quite understand what the President was just saying to me. I believe he said that I was not speaking to the point.

113. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I am asking you to keep to the procedural aspects of the question.

114. Mr. TARCICI (Yemen) (*translated from French*): I am giving my reasons and I am only following the example of all the other speakers who have furnished similar explanations.

115. Morocco is a country with its own civilization, a country which has served the cause of progress in every field, which has made its contribution to the well-being of mankind during the twelve centuries of its independence, a country whose valiant people have sacrificed the best

of their young men in two victorious wars to serve the cause of that democracy from which they ought to benefit. The facts have shown unfortunately that this valiant people participated in the victory of democracy only to see it later travestied at their expense. Morocco's reward for its services to democracy has been the continuance of tutelage and occupation.

116. The chairman of the French delegation has told us that France has no need to be ashamed of its attitude in Morocco. Since that is so, why does he not want the question to be discussed in the General Assembly? Six Arab countries, supported by other countries, want to put the question of Morocco on the agenda of this Assembly. France, which is a country of good sense and has no need to be ashamed of its work in Morocco, should not, if it wishes to respect good sense, oppose the inclusion of that question in the agenda. The delegation of Yemen, disappointed and distressed by what it has learnt of the treatment of its Moroccan brothers, therefore asks the United Nations to do its duty during the present session and try to persuade France to adopt a constructive policy towards the Moroccan nation, in the hope that soon the world will see the Sherifian Empire of Morocco sitting among us as a sovereign State and maintaining the most friendly relations with France as well as with all the other United Nations.

117. We therefore ask the French delegation and all other delegations to join with us in seeing that this matter is settled at the present session and, as a first step, placed without delay on the agenda.

118. There is an Arab proverb which says "Discussion cleanses the heart". This question lies deep in the hearts of all Moslems and all Arabs. Let us discuss it here; let us try to cleanse our hearts in the interest of good relations between France and the Arab countries and, let us hope also, in the interest of Moroccan independence and full sovereignty, as well as friendly relations between the Moroccan nation and the French nation.

119. In conclusion, my delegation has no objection to placing the item on the agenda in the form suggested by the chairman of the Pakistan delegation if France is willing to accept that proposal.

120. Ato Zelleka GASHAOU (Ethiopia) (*translated from French*): I should like to be allowed to indicate, in a few words, the position of the Ethiopian delegation with regard to the matter under discussion, that is, the inclusion of the question of Morocco in the agenda of this session.

121. I shall not go into detail to show that there is no article of the Charter which prevents that matter from being placed on the agenda or discussed by the United Nations; several distinguished representatives who spoke before me have already established that point.

122. If a matter affects a country's domestic jurisdiction, we invoke the provisions of the Charter. Ethiopia made no objection when in its case there was a proposal to hear other voices than its own in the United Nations. Whenever problems of this kind have been raised, the Ethiopian delegation has always agreed that they should be discussed in the United Nations; this has been our consistent attitude and it is our position today on this matter. Our attitude on similar cases which may arise in the future will be the same.

123. However, I should like to say that the affirmative vote of my delegation in no way prejudices the attitude we shall adopt towards the problem when it is discussed at a later date.

124. Mr. TAKIEDDINE (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): After the able statements of the previous speakers setting forth and defending the point of view of the Arab countries on the Moroccan question, our task is very much easier. Any further elaboration of the points they have so skilfully explained would only be needless repetition. Nevertheless, I shall make a brief statement in order to associate Lebanon with the other countries of the Arab League which signed the request to have the Moroccan question placed on the agenda.

125. The discussion now taking place on the inclusion in the agenda of this question is both painful and paradoxical, since on a basic question of the violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, my delegation and the Arab delegations disagree with the delegation of a great country which has so often and in such memorable circumstances championed freedom and the right. This discussion is taking place in the very city in which in the past, human rights received solemn confirmation and in which, quite recently, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was approved by the United Nations [resolution 217 (III)].

126. The discussion has two aspects: it raises a question of procedure and a moral problem.

127. From the point of view of procedure, I have not yet heard any convincing objection to the inclusion in the agenda of the request of the Arab States regarding Morocco. On the contrary if the most explicit articles of the Charter were applied, particularly Article 1, paragraphs 1 and 3, and Articles 10, 14, 34, 35, 55 and 56, the question would be included. Any one of those articles chosen at random would dispel any hesitation on that point. Moreover, we need only consider the text of the recommendation of the General Committee to realize how questionable is the formula of adjournment to which it has had recourse. The General Committee does not recommend to the Assembly to reject the request for inclusion; it simply recommends that any examination should be postponed without saying clearly whether it is to be postponed to a future session or to a future meeting of the present session.

128. Obviously, the Assembly cannot approve such a postponement, which would be neither logical nor just. Then there is the moral aspect of the problem. The moral aspect is of basic importance in our eyes. There is no need to say that my delegation, any more than the other Arab delegations, is not moved by any feeling of hostility in this affair; we are simply obeying the dictates of a constructive policy.

129. You have already been told that, long before they requested the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the sixth session of the United Nations, the States of the Arab League addressed a note directly to the French Government, drawing its attention to the situation in Morocco. For considerations which it is not for us to judge, the French Government did not see fit to reply to that note, that is, to enter into a discussion with the States of the Arab League or any one of them. The procedure adopted by the League proposed, as its second stage, intervention by a third Power. Since this second approach was also unsuccessful, it had only one resource left, the United Nations. According to Article 10 of the Charter the General Assembly "may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter". If this last way were also to be barred by an indefinite postponement, the result would

be that a serious problem, which six States have declared concerns the fate of a whole nation, could not even be discussed; it would prejudice not only the universally proclaimed principles of justice, but also the authority of the United Nations.

130. In requesting the inclusion of this item in the final agenda of this session, my delegation is acting as a Member of the United Nations—in the creation of which France, in particular, played so large a part—and as a member of the Arab League.

131. The discussion thus goes far beyond a simple difference of opinion on a question of procedure; it involves principles which all nations should be equally interested in upholding and respecting. Though they are in part moved by feeling, the small nations in particular are conscious that they are defending themselves when, in this sphere as in all others, they uphold the cause of right without flinching and without hesitation.

132. Mr. ARUTYUNYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the Soviet Union expressed itself in favour of the inclusion in the agenda for this session of the item "Complaint of violation by France in Morocco of the principles of the Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights" at the 342nd plenary meeting of the General Assembly, held on 13 November, and it still supports the inclusion of this item.

133. It sees no reason why the General Assembly should refuse to satisfy the request of Egypt and other Arab countries to consider this question at the sixth session of the General Assembly. Even the General Committee was unable to meet the request to place the question of Morocco on the agenda with a flat refusal; it decided to recommend the General Assembly to postpone consideration of the matter for the time being. Thus the General Committee was unable to associate itself with the opinion that the question of Morocco legally exceeds the competence of the General Assembly or that to discuss it in the General Assembly would be offensive to any Member. On the contrary, the General Committee's recommendation—which even the representative of France in the Committee supported—is based on the premise that the General Assembly has a legal right to consider this question. In the General Committee's view, the point at issue is solely the time at which the matter should be given consideration, and not the question as to whether the General Assembly is competent to consider it or not. That is how matters stand from the legal angle.

134. However, the General Committee's decision was in essence designed to suppress any discussion of the question of Morocco in the General Assembly. It was inexpedient to make such a recommendation openly, and a formula was therefore found which in reality shelves the question of Morocco.

135. The representative of the Dominican Republic, in arguing against the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the present session and supporting the proposal to postpone it for the time being, said—and this was no accident—that no one knew at what session the question would be considered, whether at our next session or even later than that. That was a very revealing remark, since it revealed the true intention of the General Committee's recommendation which is in essence designed to prevent any consideration of the question of Morocco by the General Assembly. The General Committee's negative decision on the question now before us is unjustified and

in contradiction with the principles which should guide the General Assembly in determining the matters with which it should deal.

136. France, in relation to Morocco, is the administering Power, both *de facto* and *de jure*. Under the terms of the United Nations Charter it bears full responsibility for the situation in Morocco. In the resolution [66 (I)] adopted by the General Assembly on 14 November 1946 Morocco is one of the territories listed for which information is to be submitted. A group of States Members of the United Nations, including Egypt, Lebanon and Yemen, are asserting that France is violating its responsibilities in Morocco and violating the rights of the Moroccan people. The delegations of those countries affirm that the situation which has arisen in Morocco as a result of the policy of the French authorities may well threaten the maintenance of international peace and security.

137. The delegation of the USSR—and probably other delegations too—has recently received more than 150 cablegrams from various sections of the Moroccan people, from a variety of social and trade union organizations in many towns and districts of Morocco. There are messages from the Executive Committee of the General Confederation of Labour at Rabat, from the railway workers of Casablanca, from the dockers at Port Lyautey (Medina), from merchants of Rabat, Casablanca, etc., from farmers in various districts of Morocco, students and so on. These cablegrams describe the persecution of the population of Morocco and express the hope that the United Nations will support the legitimate aspirations of the Moroccan people for freedom and independence, and that the General Assembly will to this end give consideration to the question of Morocco at this sixth session of the General Assembly.

138. If we consider the General Assembly's reactions, as revealed in the statements made at the two meetings today and at the plenary meeting of 13 November, it should be noted that the representatives of Asiatic countries who have taken part in the discussion have spoken in favour of including the question of Morocco in the agenda of this session of the General Assembly. That proposal is likewise supported by the delegations of many other countries, including the USSR and Poland. A considerable number of delegations is thus in favour of placing the question of Morocco on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly. Those who have opposed the proposal in the General Committee and at the plenary meeting of 13 November have been primarily the colonial Powers: the United States of America, France, and their partners in the aggressive North Atlantic bloc.

139. We cannot be satisfied with a situation in which the United Nations is being transformed into an institution specifically designed to satisfy the requirements of the United States of America and its partners in the aggressive North Atlantic bloc. It is our duty to demand that the General Assembly should also respect the interests...

140. The PRESIDENT: I must request the representative of the Soviet Union not to go into that. If he does, he will be out of order.

141. Mr. ARUTYUNYAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I have not yet overstepped the bounds of the procedural discussion of this question. If the President thinks that I am about to do so, may I assure him that I am not, out of respect for him and the General Assembly?

142. It is our duty to demand that the General Assembly should show respect for the interests and aspirations of oppressed peoples—more respect certainly than that which our President makes sure that we show for the procedure of the General Assembly. The aspirations of the oppressed peoples and their desire for freedom and independence should certainly be given preference in all respects in the work of our Assembly.

143. The representatives of fifteen countries have taken part in today's discussion. Only one of them, the representative of the Dominican Republic, has spoken against the proposal to include the question of Morocco in the agenda for this session. If discussion in the General Assembly has any meaning at all, this discussion has shown that to refuse to include the Moroccan question in the agenda of this session would be unjustified and unfair. Indeed, today's discussion has once more demonstrated the desirability of placing the question of Morocco on the agenda of the sixth session of the General Assembly. The complaint regarding the policy of the French Government towards Morocco is extremely serious, and the General Assembly cannot and must not turn a deaf ear to it, unless it wishes to discredit itself still further as an international organization.

144. The USSR delegation supports the proposal of Egypt and other Arab countries to include the question of Morocco in the agenda of this session of the General Assembly.

145. I thank the President. As he can see I have in no way overstepped the bounds of the question of the inclusion of this item in the agenda.

146. Mr. PAJVAK (Afghanistan): I wish to take part in this debate only in order to state briefly the position of my delegation. We have listened with great interest to the representatives who have already spoken, and I do not think it is necessary to go into the details of the matter at this stage, especially now that the case has been very clearly placed before us and presented in a most satisfactory way.

147. Before going any further I should like to state here before this august Assembly that it is with great pride that I represent a country that, in the face of a most difficult situation, has preserved its firm and impartial stand. Whenever we have been confronted with small or big international problems we have stood firmly beside the only bloc to which we belong and to which we will remain loyal in all circumstances. This bloc is the bloc of the United Nations, a bloc which is not organized by a number of countries against other countries, but a bloc established against war, hatred and enmity between the peoples of the world, and a bloc organized for the establishment of peaceful and friendly relationships between all peoples, regardless of any other consideration except that of welfare and happiness everywhere and for all. This has been, is and will remain our policy when we speak, when we act and when we vote. Having said this, I need not put it more clearly than I have done, that our stand in the matter before the Assembly is not aimed at anybody.

148. The question before us at this stage is one of procedure. Procedure, however, is going to be an important factor in deciding the fate of a principle so dear to all of us, and of particular interest and significance to the Afghan delegation. Since the procedural side of the question makes it necessary for us not to dwell upon the merits of the subject at this stage, but to confine our remarks as strictly as possible to arguments which would result in a reasonable and just procedural decision, we shall comply with this request.

However, the other side of the question is so important, or important enough, that it cannot be ignored altogether. That side of the question is that we should deem it our duty to see to it that no procedural decision should be allowed to weaken the cause of one of the most sacred principles to which none of us, in the first place, representing the human conscience and, in the second place, representing countries Members of the United Nations, can deny that whole-hearted support which should be accorded to it.

149. As far as procedure is concerned, we have to decide whether the question of Morocco should be put on the agenda or not. The principle being one of liberty, freedom and equality of rights for all peoples and the legitimate and fundamental right of all peoples to self-determination, due account being taken of both the political aspirations of all peoples and of human dignity, we see that the matter is not as complicated as it appears.

150. From the point of view of procedure, the dispute has passed through all the peaceful, diplomatic channels between the peoples of Morocco and the Government of France. We were also told this morning that diplomatic channels have been tested between the supporters of this movement of freedom and the French Government, that is to say, the countries which have brought the case here for our consideration. It is regrettable that these peaceful measures have failed and that no understanding has been reached. However, it is a pleasure to my delegation that no one has failed to keep in mind the existence of this Organization and the possibility of using it as a peaceful means of settling differences and of finding a way to discuss the matter in a friendly spirit in this Organization.

151. I want to emphasize particularly that it was a shock for my delegation to learn that the memorandum presented by the Arab countries to the Government of France had remained unanswered. This is a dangerous policy and very disappointing to those who seek the solution of their problems by friendly and peaceful means. It is a policy which, if not avoided—especially by big Powers—will always result in bitterness in all situations, in connexion with any problem, and in the case of any country. It is tantamount to injustice and leads to grave consequences.

152. The inclusion of this item in the agenda is also in order because it is in harmony with the procedure of the United Nations; it is in conformity with our rules and it is within the limits of the Charter. The decision of the General Committee is not against inclusion although it is not in favour of it. Thus the Assembly, in putting it on the agenda, would not even be acting against any decision taken previously by any other organ of this Assembly. The six Powers do not want more than a discussion of the matter, which would be the fairest stand for any individual country or group of Member countries to take. Thus there is nothing at all to make us think that this item should not be included in the agenda.

153. As far as the term "time being" is concerned, we do not think that arises at all. A suggestion for discussion of this question in one united family of nations could never result in harm. On the contrary, the exclusion of friendly discussion and negotiation might have grave consequences and would complicate even simple problems by reason of the denial of a fair approach. To refuse acceptance of a matter which is within the rules of the United Nations and in conformity with the principles of the Charter is to act against the spirit which should rule in this great parliament of the world. It would be acting against

the rights of peoples as well as against the principles of our Charter, and would break the frame of this Organization which is meant for fair discussion and consideration of the rights of Members, which are entitled to bring forward such questions for discussion. It would also be acting against the right of all people in all parts of the world, whose political aspirations should receive the highest consideration from this Organization.

154. It is because we hold these views that the Afghan delegation will support the inclusion of this item in the agenda, and will look forward to its discussion in that friendly spirit which should prevail all through the discussions in the United Nations.

155. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): It is 6 p.m. I still have four speakers on my list: the representative of the United States of America, the representative of Czechoslovakia, the representative of France and the representative of Australia. If there are no objections, I propose that the list of speakers shall be declared closed.

156. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) (*speaking from the floor*): I ask to have my name inscribed on the list of speakers.

157. SALAH-EL-DIN Pasha (Egypt) (*speaking from the floor*): We object to the closing of the list of speakers.

158. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The representative of Egypt has asked that the list of speakers should not be closed. I had suggested to the Assembly that after the speakers on my list had been heard, the list should be closed. In view of the Egyptian representative's motion, I shall ask the Assembly to decide whether the list of speakers should or should not be closed.

159. SALAH-EL-DIN Pasha (Egypt): I wish to raise a point of order. I have not yet given my reason for objecting to the closing of the list of speakers. The reason is very simple: we have not yet heard the other point of view. All the speakers today have been in favour of including the item in the agenda. It seems to me that all the speakers tomorrow will be against inclusion, and we have not yet heard the French delegation. It seems to me that when we hear them we shall be entitled to answer them, if we see fit. That is why I made my observation.

160. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): With regard to the point raised by the representative of Egypt as a reason for requesting that the list should not be closed, namely, that the representative of France has not yet been heard and that after hearing him some Members of the Assembly might wish to comment or to take the floor again, I feel bound to say that, under rule 74 of the rules of procedure, even if the Assembly declares the list closed after the speakers who wished to do so had placed their names on it, the President can accord the right of reply to any Member if a speech delivered after he has declared the list closed makes this desirable.

161. In any case, I should like to ask the representative of Iraq if he wishes his name to be placed on the list.

162. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq): All I have to say are a few words on what has been said today. If you want me to postpone that until tomorrow I will do so, otherwise I will say them now and finish with it.

163. The PRESIDENT: I think the name of the representative of Iraq had better be added to the list. The representatives of Egypt and Pakistan also ask that their names should be inscribed on the list of speakers. If there is no further objection, the list is closed.

164. Now the situation is this : we have seven speakers. We could go on with this meeting until we finish this item or else we could adjourn now and have another meeting tonight at 8.30 in order to finish. I must tell you that the representatives in the First Committee decided to adjourn this afternoon until tomorrow morning, and if you do not finish this agenda tonight we may meet with the same difficulties tomorrow because the First Committee and the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee will both be meeting, and it is most important that the items which are now being discussed by those two Committees should be continued. For that reason I am asking the General Assembly if it would prefer to remain in session until this item is finished, or whether we should adjourn now and meet tonight at 8.30.

165. I propose that we continue with the discussion of this item now, if there is no objection to that procedure.

It was so decided.

166. Mr. GROSS (United States of America) : The General Committee has recommended that consideration of the question of placing the Moroccan item on the final agenda of the General Assembly should be postponed for the time being. I think that the representative of the Soviet Union, if he was translated correctly, referred to the recommendation of the General Committee as a postponement for some time. I think the precise recommendation was, in fact, postponement for the time being of the question of placing the Moroccan item on the agenda.

167. This is a recommendation which the United States delegation supported in the General Committee and supports here. The Foreign Minister and representative of France stated that France has accepted as a sacred trust, under Article 73 of Chapter XI of the Charter, the obligation to promote, within the system of international peace and security established by the Charter, the well-being of the peoples of Morocco, to ensure their advancement and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions. The representative of France has told the General Assembly that these freely undertaken obligations have been, and continue to be, performed by France. The United States delegation feels that France should not be hindered in its opportunity to put into effect reforms under conditions favourable to their successful execution.

168. The United States Government has given careful attention to the views expressed by the representatives of the six States which have proposed this item. We are aware of the common bonds with the peoples of Morocco and the position which they, as Members of the United Nations, have taken on their duties and their responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations, and we share their concern for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

169. The United States has approached the question before us today from the point of view of its considered estimation of the highest interests of the peoples of Morocco. The powers and responsibilities of the General Assembly, we believe, should be discharged with regard to the principles of the Charter, that persons concerned with problems and controversies should in good faith exhaust efforts for their solution by less formal means than debate in the General Assembly.

170. The representative of Brazil, in opening the general debate in this sixth session of the General Assembly, was I think developing the same principle. He said, and I quote from his statement :

" At the present juncture it is of pressing importance that peoples aspiring to total freedom should endeavour to act with the prudence and calmness demanded by the need for safeguarding the security structure that has been so slowly and painfully built up and that affords the best guarantee of the realization of their desires. It is therefore vital to seek compensatory agreements through friendly negotiation. To bring a dispute before the United Nations without having first exhausted all other means of peaceful solution is to run counter to the spirit of the Charter and to do it considerable harm [335th meeting paras. 12 and 13]. "

171. As we see it, the question is whether the best interests of the peoples of Morocco will be promoted by debates now in the General Assembly on a complaint made by six States which my own country holds in such high esteem. We do not believe that their interests would best be served by this course. Indeed, the Government of France, through its highest sources, has recently renewed the expression of its desire and intention to follow the course of finding a solution of mutual problems by less formal means. The distinguished Foreign Minister of France referred in the General Assembly on 13 November of this year [342nd meeting] to conversations under way which are designed to hasten the democratic reforms proposed by France in Morocco. He has with great statesmanship expressed his desire for rapid action upon reforms, the study of which would be the responsibility of a joint Franco-Moroccan commission. Also His Majesty the Sultan of Morocco has reaffirmed his desire for negotiations with a view to reaching agreement with the Government of France. In these circumstances is it not entirely in accordance with the highest objectives of the Charter of the United Nations to leave it to those intimately concerned to pursue their own avenues of settlement?

172. The traditions and policies of the United States demonstrate our friendship for the peoples of Morocco and our interest in their aspirations. All Members here know that except for that small minority whose views are based upon dogma and reflect autocratic decree. Statements which have been made here today by the representatives of a number of States which my country holds in close friendship have referred to those distinguished leaders of the United States. The representative of Syria eloquently referred to President George Washington, our first President, and his communication with the Sultan of Morocco in the eighteenth century. The distinguished Foreign Minister of Egypt has referred to President Roosevelt and to that leading spirit in the United Nations in 1945, Senator Vandenberg.

173. Who knows better than the people of the United States the contributions which the peoples of Morocco made in the First and Second World Wars, as has been referred to again so eloquently by the representative of Syria? Who, indeed, knows better than the United States of its contribution in the Second World War? It is in the light of the proud history of my country that we believe, after careful consideration, that our position on this matter is sound, logical and forward-looking. The debates in the Assembly will only lead to rancour at this time, a rancour which would profit very few—again those few whose views rest upon a dogma with which we are all familiar.

174. It is for those reasons that my Government feels that the General Committee correctly concluded that this is an item the debate of which at this time in the United Nations would not serve the best interests of the peoples directly concerned and we have reached that conclusion.

with respect for those who sincerely hold different views and do not seek to fish in troubled waters. It would in no way detract from the dignity and prestige of the General Assembly to recognize that it is highly expedient to postpone this item as recommended by the General Committee. We shall therefore vote to support the recommendation of the General Committee.

175. Mr. TAUBER (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from French*): It is precisely one month [342nd meeting] since the General Assembly decided, at the request of the representative of Egypt, not to deal with the Moroccan question for the time being, in order to enable delegations to study the reply of the French Minister for Foreign Affairs. In his memorandum [A/1894], the Egyptian representative pointed out that the existing dispute between France and Morocco had again entered a particularly critical phase, incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations and in conflict with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. He also drew the attention of our Assembly to the fact that the treaty of 1912 establishing the protectorate of France over Morocco was in itself incompatible with the principles laid down in the Charter, and he asked that the rightful aspirations of the Moroccan people should be taken into consideration and the possible consequences of the existing tension, which is endangering peace in that part of the world, should be avoided.

176. In the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation, the provisions of the protectorate treaty in themselves represent a flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter and of the right of peoples to self-determination. These provisions in no way correspond to France's duty to develop the capacity of the Moroccan people towards self-determination and to assist the progressive development of its free political institutions, as is expressly stipulated in Article 73 of the Charter.

177. One of the arguments which was especially stressed by the representative of France and head of the French delegation was, as has already been stressed here, that any consideration of the Moroccan question by the United Nations would constitute an insult to the name and honour of France and also that it is unnecessary for the United Nations to deal with the Moroccan question, since all is well in Morocco. If that were indeed so, what could be more logical for France than to invite the United Nations to satisfy itself of the contribution which France is making to the well-being and the economic, cultural, political and social advancement of the Moroccan people?

178. Why, then, is the French delegation, with the support of the other colonial Powers, so violently opposing the inclusion of the Moroccan question in the agenda of this General Assembly?

179. We can gather an idea of the reasons for France's attitude from the statements recently made by General Juin at a meeting of the American Club in Paris, where he is reported by the newspaper *Figaro* of 16 November 1951 as having said: "If I were a Moroccan, I should be a nationalist too. But France condemns a nationalism which is avowedly prepared to resort... to barbarism to achieve its ends..." He added: "The French alone can maintain order in Morocco." Thus, as a Frenchman and former Resident General, General Juin condemned the efforts of the Moroccan people to attain their national and political independence. Yet, if he were a Moroccan, he would fight against the French protectorate, which he is certainly in a position to know better than anyone.

180. But there is still something that General Juin left unsaid. It is that Morocco is playing and is expected to play an important part in Atlantic strategy and that the French Government has allowed the United States of America access to the territory of Morocco in order to establish aviation bases there. With the approval of the French Government, the United States is turning Morocco into an important additional base for aggression. Thus, Morocco is being transformed, against the wishes...

181. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The point referred to by the distinguished representative would appear to have nothing to do with the matter under discussion. I ask him not to continue with that subject.

182. Mr. TAUBER (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from French*): I beg your pardon but I feel it is necessary to explain the reasons for objection to the inclusion of this question in the agenda.

183. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): That would appear to be not in order.

184. Mr. TAUBER (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from French*): With the permission of the President, I should like to say a few words to the representative of the United States who has just spoken. Is he speaking on behalf of a nation which is struggling in a just cause? If this question is not to be placed on the agenda and discussed by the United Nations, what is the purpose of our Organization? Is that purpose not to protect weak nations and to safeguard international peace and security? With what questions, then, does the United States representative think the United Nations should deal?

185. As I have tried to show, all the facts I have quoted and those which I intended to disclose constitute a threat to peace. Peace is threatened in Morocco, among other countries, by the mere fact that military bases are now being established there against the will of the Moroccan people, as I have said.

186. In the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation, that is one of the main reasons why the Moroccan question should be placed on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly.

187. Mr. Robert SCHUMAN (France) (*translated from French*): On 13 November last, I had occasion to state from this rostrum the view of the French Government on the expediency of opening a discussion on the inclusion in the agenda of the item which reads: "Complaint of violation by France in Morocco of the principles of the Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights". I quote the item as it stands; there is no other version.

188. The very wording of this complaint evokes, in my opinion, a negative reply. The complaint is in fact an accusation, and its tone is profoundly unjust and offensive to the country which I represent in the United Nations. It is alleged that France is violating the principles of the Charter, that France is violating the Declaration of Human Rights and, above all, that it is in Morocco that France is constantly committing these offences. We cannot but regard such allegations as a reproach which casts doubt on our adherence to a traditional ideal and our fulfilment of commitments solemnly undertaken. In the face of these accusations, French opinion, the opinion of the French Government and of France as a whole, is justly angered, whilst the reaction of all true friends of France, of those who know France and, knowing it, love it, is one of indignation.

189. I do not need, I think, to speak again of a past which bears witness to the liberal and magnanimous political traditions of my country, to quote texts, or to speak of a living reality which is evident to all and which speaks so eloquently for itself. The truth of such facts is conclusive.

190. I am compelled to make these remarks, because I have to take the text as it stands, with the motives attributed to it. It is not for the defendant to edit or alter the wording of the accusation. Having said that, I must add that I am very grateful for the very courteous suggestion of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan, but although a change in the wording might to some extent mitigate the natural bitterness of French reaction, it would still not solve the question of principle, as I shall try to show.

191. The words I have spoken in this Assembly should, normally, have closed a discussion which had already been completed, and led to an immediate decision. The Assembly has, however, granted the extension requested by one of the plaintiffs. The Assembly has had time, in the intervening month to think the matter over thoroughly.

192. I do not think any new fact has emerged to change the conclusions favourable to France's cause to which many delegations had already come. I should like, however, before the Members of the Assembly give their opinion, to mention a certain aspect of the problem which the Assembly now has to settle.

193. I am aware that several delegations, which are in no doubt regarding the substance of the question, and whose confidence in France is still unshaken, are nevertheless concerned about a question of principle, a question which is, I admit, of great moment, and which the French delegation has in fact not failed to ask itself. Some people wonder whether, apart from the merits of any particular question falling within the scope of the United Nations Charter, any complaint, any request for discussion or examination of any question or matter falling under that head, ought not to be put on the agenda of the General Assembly as soon as it is submitted by one or several States Members. If, the argument goes, we refuse *a priori*, without investigation or discussion, to deal with such-and-such requests or complaints, may there not be a danger of the Assembly failing to fulfil its mission? Is there not a danger that a legitimate demand, a justified complaint might be set aside because the Assembly had refused to consider whether it was well founded? May not any of us one day, perhaps in the near future, find himself in the position of having to request the Assembly urgently to bring a grievance into the open, or of having to denounce a threat before the United Nations? Is it wise to set precedents of wilful negligence, omission and deliberate forgetfulness? Are we not setting a trap into which we ourselves may well fall?

194. To those who ask such questions I answer this: if we were to admit the principle of automatic inclusion in the agenda of the General Assembly of any question or issue in regard to which a request for discussion or a complaint were received; or even if we were to admit the principle of automatic and immediate discussion of the expediency of including such questions or issues in the agenda, there would be a danger of the Assembly's agenda being encumbered with requests for the inclusion of unjustified items. The result would be a serious waste of the Assembly's time and would divert its attention from its real work. Also, which is much more serious, such automatic procedure would leave every State at the mercy of any other spiteful State thinking to gain even a temporary advantage, from preferring false charges against it. No

doubt, it will be said, the truth would always prevail in the end, and the odium of false accusations would rebound on their authors. But, even if we could be sure that in the end the truth would always out, the victim of such accusations would nevertheless have suffered considerable and in some cases irreparable moral damage.

195. It is for this reason that it would be dangerous, in practice, to put too broad an interpretation on the provisions of the Charter. Its authors took great care to avoid any imperative wording which might permit or justify such an automatic approach. Article 10 states that "the General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter", and Article 11, paragraph 2, explains that "the General Assembly may discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security." Thus the Charter protects all Member States against a certain form of international blackmail from which none of us are quite certain to be immune. The safeguard for all of us thus lies not only in the esteem of our peers, but also in the opinion they form, on the basis of a *prima facie* examination, of the validity of the charges preferred. A vote on the expediency of discussing the inclusion of an item in the agenda of the Assembly can thus protect us against an accusation too lightly made or even made from malicious or interested motives. Might there not be cases of States submitting complaints simply for the purpose of diverting attention from certain situations embarrassing to themselves?

196. This is what I think is the sensible view. To maintain that every complaint should, as a matter of principle, be examined, that every accusation must be given preliminary discussion, and that, therefore, every request for inclusion of an item in the agenda must be conceded, would be to play into the hands of those who seek to fish in troubled waters. We should all be laying ourselves open to the risk of being placed in the stocks, only for a short time perhaps, but not without incurring the most serious consequences so far as our honour, our interest and even, perhaps, our security, are concerned.

197. I must add, lest there be any misapprehension, that this is a theoretical discussion of a doctrinal point. In making my exposition I have disregarded certain hypotheses which I have just advanced, and which are not necessarily intended to apply to the present case.

198. The French delegation has already stated in the General Committee—and I have repeated from this rostrum—the nature of the links which bind us to the States which have preferred the charge against us. That such a charge should come from that quarter was, and is a matter of surprise and deep regret to us. But what concerns us most is to reassure them—and to reassure you all—on the subject of the Moroccan peoples. I have already said enough on this point in this Assembly—and elsewhere, as we were reminded just now—in the last month to dispel any fears you might legitimately have felt.

199. France is not violating either the Charter or the Declaration of Human Rights in Morocco. And, in answer to those who wonder how France construes its task in Morocco, how it interprets its duties towards the peoples who inhabit that country, I can do no better than refer them to the chapter of the Charter containing the Declaration regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories. As I said last time, this lofty, noble declaration, containing an uncompromising definition of the sacred duty devolving on those Members of the United Nations which assume responsibility for the administration of Non-Self-Governing Territories is, at the same time, a faithful exposition of

the doctrine which France has made its own from the beginning of the century, when it assumed responsibility for guiding Morocco along the road of progress. Since the very first months of its administration France has never ceased to apply this doctrine. For France, the interests of the Moroccan peoples are paramount. Promotion of their prosperity within the framework of the system of international peace and security established by the Charter is a sacred trust. Must I enumerate, one by one, the obligations mentioned in this declaration as essential for the achievement of this end? I should be forced, at every line, to repeat the same thing: look at what we have done, look at what we are doing—can you doubt our determination to continue thus in the future?

200. We might be grieved to feel that the Arab States, linked as they are with us and with other Member States by the ties of the Charter, have grave doubts about the present and future fate of the Arab population of Morocco. But we do not believe they would really insult our friendship with such doubts. If they have, perhaps, been swayed by emotional considerations, we ask them to reflect that in a task such as we have undertaken there are bound to be temporary difficulties, which can all too easily, alas, be provoked and exploited. We ask them to be chary of giving credence to biased reports and, in particular, of heeding false rumours or malicious interpretations. I ask everyone to have faith in France and in its sincere desire to continue its work in Morocco to the end of preparing the Moroccan people for self-government and for the management of their own affairs.

201. Such is in fact the policy of the French Government. It is based on a mutual agreement, freely negotiated between Morocco and France. Joint examination of the best methods of promoting the reforms necessary to rapid completion of this development is continuing all the time. Contrary to what was said this morning from this rostrum, the negotiations are not, and never have been, broken off. I should add that it is inherent in the nature of this policy, and essential to its success, that it should be allowed to develop without outside interference of any kind.

202. My Government, in the interest of this policy thus defined, of the work which inspires it, and in the interest of the Moroccan peoples which, you will all agree, must be put first in this matter, asks the United Nations to trust France to continue in the spirit of its contract with Morocco, in the spirit of the Charter itself, a task which it has hitherto fulfilled, and which it wishes to continue, for the greater good of Morocco and in close co-operation with it, bringing thereto all its energy and faith.

203. Sir Keith OFFICER (Australia): I should like to commence by paying a tribute to the temperate and fair way in which the representatives of those countries which feel so deeply about this matter have presented their case, and I should like to pay particular tribute to the very distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan for the very judicial way in which he dealt with the matter. But the view of the Australian delegation is that it would be wrong and improper, improper because of the wording of the Charter, but more important still most unwise, to reject the proposal of the General Committee and to have a general debate on this subject at this session. However wide may be certain introductory remarks in the Charter, there are certain restrictive provisions which are quite explicit. One in our view is Article 2, paragraph 7. It is quite clear and it is so well known to all of us that I need not quote it.

204. My delegation is in complete agreement with what has been said by the representatives of France when the question was debated earlier, both here and in the General Committee, and with the arguments which the French representatives brought forward based on Chapter XI of the Charter. The Charter represented the greatest degree of common agreement and unanimity that could be secured at San Francisco. It went further than some delegations would have wished, and it did not go as far as other delegations would have wished. It is not for us here, now, in our enthusiasm, to widen its meaning and to apply it to cases which do not come strictly within its terms. To do so might be very dangerous and we might endanger the whole structure. Let us always remember that it is much easier to destroy than to build, that you can burn in a few minutes the work of many, many months. Therefore, I say that, for a rather dry and legalistic reason, we support the General Committee's recommendation. But we support it also for another reason, apart altogether from the terms of the Charter.

205. This debate has had a certain value. It has shown the great feelings of the Arab States and certain other States about the situation in Morocco. It has elicited from the very distinguished Foreign Minister of France a very emphatic statement on France's policy in the past and in the present and what it is aiming at.

206. Would not it be wise to stop at that at this stage? If we go on, things are going to be said here, there are going to be speeches and counter speeches, and things may be said here which will embitter and make worse a situation which is maintained, and maintained very rightly, to be tense. Would it not be better to wait a little longer and see the result of this debate, of this airing of the matter here, and not go ahead and risk doing something, first of all, which in the opinion of many of us is incorrect and is illegal and which consequently, in the judgment of many of us, is unwise?

207. For those two reasons my delegation will support the recommendation of the General Committee, which it considers wise and statesmanlike.

208. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The three speakers remaining on the list have already spoken, so this will be their second intervention. I understand their statements will be more in the nature of a clarification or reply. I would therefore urge them to be brief.

209. I call upon the representative of Iraq.

210. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq): I shall obey the President's request and be as brief as I can.

211. After I had spoken this morning, in connexion with reporting about this morning's meeting, *Le Monde*, which is considered in many quarters to have some official backing, made the following statement regarding my person, and I apologize to the President for being personal in this matter. The article was entitled "The delegates of Iraq and of Syria criticize the work of France in Morocco". In one paragraph it says [*the speaker read the quotation in French*]:

"Who was the other protagonist of the Arab world who thus rose to attack the work that France has been carrying out in Morocco for forty years? One of them, Mr. Fadel Jamali, an Iraqi, was at the beginning of the war the pampered guest of Hitler and his friends; the other, Mr. Choukeiri, a Palestinian by origin, is placing his adopted government in serious difficulty by the untenable positions he is making it take up in the United Nations."

212. [*Continued in English*] : I wish to declare publicly from this rostrum that my speech this morning was couched in the most friendly language towards France. I have been most considerate and courteous in my language towards France and her people, and I shall continue to be so because of my convictions.

213. In the second place, I wish to state that the statement regarding me personally is entirely untrue. It is based on false Zionist propaganda and fabrications. It was first uttered by Mr. Shertok, in 1947, in connexion with the Palestine problem, and I made it clear then that it was entirely unfounded.

214. In the third place, I wish to state that such attacks and slanders will not shake the faith of my delegation and our desire for a friendly solution to the Moroccan question, a solution based on sovereign equality, independence and collaboration between France and Morocco.

215. After I had spoken the representative of Pakistan suggested an alteration in the wording of the item so as to make it less provocative. I am happy to concur in that suggestion. My delegation has already made that suggestion in the General Committee, when we expressed the view that it was not our intention to be unpleasant to France but to see that Morocco is free.

216. Answering some of my colleagues who have spoken since I spoke this morning, I wish to assure the representative of the Dominican Republic that we do not deny the right of the General Committee to make a certain recommendation, but the General Assembly is master of its own actions. If it deems fit, the General Assembly can reverse any decision taken by the General Committee. There should be no misunderstanding about that.

217. In answer to the representative of the United States of America, I had an opportunity in the General Committee to express the deep appreciation of my delegation for the long tradition of freedom and democracy and of assistance to other nations to become independent which prevails in the United States. I never doubted that, and I concur with my colleague from the United States in the view that a friendly approach is desirable and that this means should first be exhausted. However, I wish to assure him of what I think his delegation is aware, that many friendly approaches, direct and indirect, have been made already. So far we have had no assurances of any result. My delegation would be only too happy if the representative of the United States could assure me that the indirect and friendly approaches which have been made have borne or will bear any fruit.

218. This morning my colleague from Syria pointed out clearly that direct approaches to the French Government, and indirect approaches by friendly nations, have not so far yielded any results. It is because of this state of affairs that we come to the United Nations. Where shall we go? What shall we do if diplomatic communications bring no results, if friendly countries intervene and we get no results? The Fourth Committee, which deals with dependent peoples, is debarred from going into political discussions. We would welcome any friendly, informal method that might lead to a solution of the Moroccan question, but so far we have seen none. It is for that reason that we appeal to this Assembly. It is for the sake of freedom, for the sake of peace, for the sake of friendly relations between ourselves and France that we come here.

219. Now I shall answer a few of the points made by the representative of France. He argued that not every request

or complaint brought to this Assembly should be taken up. Of course we have a sense of values here. We certainly do not accept any insignificant complaint, but when an issue concerns the freedom and independence of a people, that is not an issue to be belittled. That is a very great issue. It is at the heart of the duties of the United Nations. We cannot say that the United Nations can discriminate against certain issues like this one by leaving it out. If there is any issue worth being taken up by the United Nations, it is the issue of the freedom and independence of peoples. Therefore my colleague from France should agree with us that this issue is of great significance, is of great weight, and deserves to be brought here. The bringing forward of this issue should not be taken as being directed against France, nor should it be thought that its object is to criticize and provoke French opinion and French sentiment; far from it. What we want is not to provoke France. What we want is the freedom and independence of Morocco, and the two are not contradictory. In other words, we do not need to provoke France by asking for the freedom and independence of Morocco.

220. Mr. Schuman said that this question is academic. All important issues in the world start by being academic. The independence and freedom of most nations was started by ideologists in academic discussions, but they crystallized; they were made into a force which led those nations to freedom and independence. The fact that this is an academic question does not reduce its great importance. We are certainly not satisfied that it should be academic. We want to make it practical. We want to see a free Morocco, a Morocco friendly to all of us here—France in particular—sitting beside us in this General Assembly.

221. Then Mr. Schuman said that discussion might bring about many falsifications and the Arab States might be inspired by false rumours. I wish to assure him that we are ready to base all our discussions on facts. If there are false rumours about Morocco, it is because none of us can go to Morocco to see what is going on. Open the doors; tear down the curtain. Let us have communication with Morocco. Let us see that all is well and let us put an end to all false rumours and all claims that may be unfounded and put forward by biased people.

222. Mr. Schuman, in his statement last month and in his statement today, applied Article 73 of the Charter to Morocco. My delegation submits that Article 73 applies to Non-Self-Governing Territories which do not have independence and sovereignty. Morocco does not fall under this Article. Morocco is a sovereign State having a treaty with France. That is why in his statements, here or elsewhere, Mr. Schuman has pointed out that France will develop self-government in Morocco. We are not satisfied with that. Self-government is not enough. What we want, and what should be given, is the recognition of equal sovereignty and independence and we have never heard the leader of the French delegation make any reference to that, or attempt to apply the word "independent" to Morocco. It is the word "sovereignty" we want and that does not fall under Article 73 of the Charter. That is what needs and deserves to be discussed and I do not see how we can discuss and agree on this point unless it is put on the agenda. Unless we do that, how can we decide whether Article 73 applies to Morocco or not? My delegation says it does not apply to Morocco for Franco-Moroccan relations are based on a treaty. It is a Protectorate. In other words the Sultan is the chief of Morocco. He represents an autonomous, integrated country, and it is the freedom and independence of that country which we seek.

223. My last word is a word of appeal. I wish to appeal again to the leader of the French delegation, as well as to the French Press and the French people, and to assure them that we speak in the friendliest terms and have the friendliest intentions. Let them agree with us that times have changed and that it is high time to realize that times have changed.

224. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The representative of France has the floor to make an explanation.

225. Mr. Robert SCHUMAN (France) (*translated from French*): The representative of Iraq has complained of an article in an evening paper. I would not have spoken on this subject, I should not have been entitled to do so, if he had not added that the paper had official or semi-official backing. I wish to state that the French Government—it is perhaps one of its weaknesses—has no officially or semi-officially inspired newspaper at its command. Personally I regret this incident. In France we have complete freedom of the Press, and I may add that it exists in Morocco as well and that it is practised widely. I feel that certain comparisons might usefully be made in that respect between the position in Morocco and that in other countries whose representatives have made speeches about Morocco here today.

226. That is all I wanted to say on this point. In accordance with rule 74 of the rules of procedure which the President himself has cited, I reserve the right to reply later, with his permission, to any questions of substance that may be raised subsequently.

227. Adly ANDRAOS Bey (Egypt) (*translated from French*): I pay tribute to France in addressing the Assembly in the French language which is also, I consider, the language of clarity and clear thinking. I find it the more difficult to do so this evening because I find myself in the paradoxical position of defending in France freedoms which are always regarded abroad as French freedoms. Mr. Schuman told us a moment ago that the Press was free in France. That is a fact and I gladly acknowledge it. But would he wish it to be said that because the United Nations is sitting in Paris, discussion is not free? I am persuaded that that cannot be his intention.

228. I should like to reply briefly to three sets of objections that have been made this evening to the inclusion in the Assembly's agenda of the complaint brought by Egypt and other Arab States with regard to Morocco.

229. The first objection—I admit that very few speakers have spoken along this line—was raised by my friend, the Ambassador of the Dominican Republic to Paris. I was the more surprised by it because it was put forward by a man of great intellectual distinction, an eminent jurist with whom I had the honour to collaborate at San Francisco while we were both fighting on the same side of the barricade for freedom of discussion in this Assembly.

230. The representative of the Dominican Republic said in substance—and I hope I am not distorting his views—that it is true that rule 40 of the rules of procedure contemplates only three possible courses in regard to the inclusion of an item in the Assembly's agenda: first, the General Committee may decide to recommend that the Assembly should include the item in its agenda; secondly, the General Committee may decide to recommend that the Assembly should reject the request for inclusion; thirdly, it may decide to recommend the inclusion of the item in the provisional agenda of a future session. On

that hypothesis, the representative of the Dominican Republic said: It is true that the rules of procedure do not provide for the postponement of a question *sine die*, but he who can do more can do less, and, if a question can be postponed to next year or rejected, does it not follow *a posteriori* that a question can also be postponed indefinitely?

231. That is an interpretation to which no jurist could ever subscribe. I have been a magistrate; I have applied procedure, and rules of procedure—it was from French teachers that I learnt this—are rules of strict law. A rule of procedure cannot be interpreted by deduction. If the authors of the rules of procedure had wished to envisage the postponement of an item on grounds of expediency, they would undoubtedly have said so.

232. Moreover, what is this expediency? It is here that I begin to understand the embarrassment of my colleague and friend, the representative of the Dominican Republic. He said—I think these are his own words—"a whole series of circumstances makes it, for the time being..." He was careful not to define the circumstances and no one has defined them; they can, however, easily be guessed. We are told in the world of today the human race is divided into two groups; the question of Morocco might be exploited along lines which would not necessarily be to the advantage of the Moroccan people but which would suit the purposes of one or other of the two opposing blocs.

233. When will it be possible to stop judging all the problems of the smaller States in terms of one or other of the two blocs? Will we never have the courage to judge things on their merits, to say "Yes" when we should say yes and "No" when we should say no?

234. Moreover, why does this argument apply to Morocco alone? Are there not on the agenda other more burning questions on which the two blocs are opposed, the question of the atomic bomb, the question of disarmament, the recently raised question of Germany which was included in our agenda after the opening of the Assembly? Did that raise any difficulty? No, because it involved the great Powers. But when it is a question involving small countries, then "a whole series of circumstances makes it, for the time being", and so on...

235. The representative of the United States of America referred to a speech made at the opening of the Assembly by the Brazilian representative, the theme of which was, if I understood it correctly as I listened to our colleague this afternoon, that questions should not be raised before the Assembly until all other peaceful means had been exhausted. As you know, those means are set forth in the Charter; there are a great many of them: direct negotiations, good offices, mediation, arbitration, and so on. It is the very advice that we were given by the Brazilian representative at Lake Success, in 1947, in connexion with the Anglo-Egyptian dispute. Unfortunately the path we were recommended to follow was so long that it never led to anything. But that is a digression.

236. In spite of that, as the Foreign Ministers of Egypt and Iraq, and several other speakers have told you today, we have tried to exhaust those means, and we have done so in all sincerity and with the utmost courtesy, precisely because we wish to maintain the good relations with France and her friends that we value so highly. We tried first, in a note drafted in the most courteous terms, to stir the French Government's interest in the situation which had developed in Morocco. Not having received any reply to our letters, we tried to interest great Powers which are

particularly friendly to France and which are our friends also, Powers whose liberal traditions are known to us. There again we were knocking at a closed door. Our friends told us : the French are extremely touchy on this matter ; they feel that it is an internal matter in which it would be improper for any outsider to interfere.

237. I put it to you, when one has tried by every means to state one's point of view and has had no success, is it discourteous to say to a friendly country : you and we belong to the same organization, an organization set up for the peaceful settlement of any disputes that may arise between Member States ; you and we signed a Charter in 1945—and heaven knows that our peaceful traditions are much older than the Charter—you and we signed an instrument which lays down a certain number of procedures for the settlement of disputes ; why is it offensive that you and we, acting in concert, should ask our peers in this Assembly, which has been described as a world assembly, not to decide between us, but to assist us to find a solution, to find the right road ? Frankly, I do not agree with those who regard that as a discourteous gesture. If I did, I would not come to this rostrum to urge that an attempt should be made to find an appropriate solution.

238. My reply to the Australian representative will be neither very definite nor specific, because he took his stand on a point of principle and defined his delegation's attitude by using the term statesmanship, which freely translated means a feeling for public affairs. We all have very different ideas on that point and I regret that Mr. Evatt, whose very name symbolizes all the freedoms of the small Powers and who was in 1945 the leader of all those who wanted the Charter to be drafted on more liberal lines, is not here today to receive from his compatriot this lesson in statesmanship.

239. I now come—and I beg my French friends to believe that I am perfectly sincere and that it is not a statement I am making because I am on this platform—to the objections raised by Mr. Schuman. Those objections were raised, I am sure, in the sincere belief that he was rendering a service not only to his own country but to Morocco when he made his observations. He will not take it ill if I venture, on behalf of my delegation, to express certain reservations as to the manner in which he views the problem.

240. He began by what I shall call a procedural objection, although he protested he was doing nothing of the kind. A rule allowing of the immediate inclusion of any item whatsoever involved, he said, a very great danger. A State might be subjected to international blackmail—strong language, but it is not mine. A complaint might be used to create a diversion—he did not tell us from what, and again the words are not mine. Sound doctrine, he said—and it is odd that the word doctrine should be used when one is adopting an expedient—would require us to see which questions can be considered and which questions cannot be considered for reasons of propriety or expediency or on other grounds.

241. Unfortunately that is not at all what the Charter says and I should like first of all to clear up the confusion which has arisen, even in the minds of many of our friends who have discussed the matter with us. The inclusion of a matter in the agenda does not necessarily assume the competence of the Assembly, still less does it prejudice the decision the Assembly will be required to take on the substance of the issue. What you may ask is the criterion ? The criterion is not defined in the Charter but it may be found in its broad lines in our rules of procedure.

242. There are for example time limits : a complaint must be submitted sufficiently in advance to give the Assembly time to examine it. Note that the question of Germany and a number of other questions have been included in the agenda well after the expiry of those time limits and that we did not have the bad grace to object. There is also the question whether the complainant is qualified to submit his complaint : is he a Member of the United Nations ? In the present case, not one but seven Members of the United Nations are requesting that a matter should be discussed and the reply is ; No, we cannot give you a hearing.

243. Is not that the worst method to adopt ? Is not that a method which will cause us to discuss here, as we did for hours this morning, questions which in very many instances go beyond mere procedure and raise questions of substance ? It is difficult to say how bad may be the impression created by this tactic of evading discussion. There is a French legal maxim that a litigant who relies on points of law has a bad case. The parties who raise procedural objections are generally those who are afraid of any discussion of the substance. I do not say that it is so in this case but I do say that it is singularly clumsy to seek to fight the matter out on the question of inclusion in the agenda. I would go further : to my knowledge—and I have followed the discussions since San Francisco—it is the first time it has happened in the history of our Organization.

244. We are told ; Trust us, see what we are doing. But that is all we are asking to do. We would even be content to listen. Let a statement be made, let us be told ; That is how things are. I know that some have said that it is inadmissible that this or that Power should have a special right to inquire into the affairs of Morocco, and I am prepared for the moment to accept that argument. But, when it is not a matter of this or that particular State but of the United Nations which is rightly responsible for eliminating international friction, it is not an individual State that is to have that right ; we all have a right of inquiry, or, more accurately, of discussion.

245. Let me remind the French delegation that in 1947 when the Anglo-Egyptian dispute was considered at Lake Success and the internal administration of the Sudan was under discussion, the Egyptian representative never said ; Excuse me, this is an internal, a domestic matter. And yet the question involved a people which is united to us by a river, by history, by race and by religion, and separated by the artificial line of the 22nd parallel. We could have said that it was an internal matter ; we did not do so.

246. Finally, I trust that it will not be thought that the submission of a complaint here is a sign of ill will. We have done everything to avoid that. We have even proposed today that the wording of the complaint should be amended in case there was any word which might offend the legitimate pride of France. The head of the Pakistani delegation himself made the proposal. Yet we have received no reply. Was it because the second formula was less courteous than the first ? I do not think so. But there was one great objection to it : it contained the word " independence ". That is the heart of the matter. It is talk of the independence of Morocco that is offensive, not the rest.

247. I should like in conclusion to make a last appeal to our French friends. It is argued that the Organization is divided into two blocs and that on every subject one of the blocs tries to score off the other. Unfortunately we cannot help seeing that the same people always stick

together and that those same people maintain a more or less rigid, more or less flexible domination over the peoples who live between the Persian Gulf and the Atlantic Ocean. It is our wish that the division of the world into blocs should cease, that someone should go over to the other side of the barricade and make a gesture capable of conciliating the two worlds. It is a gesture that I ask France to make by not opposing the discussion of a question which, I am convinced, may be to its benefit, to the benefit of Morocco and of peace throughout the world.

248. Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia) (*translated from Spanish*): This meeting has already lasted almost five hours. We have listened with the utmost attention to the argument from both sides. I think the atmosphere in this room is somewhat overheated, and that it would be wiser and more prudent to adjourn until tomorrow. That would enable us, after a light meal and a refreshing sleep, to take up this question in a cooler frame of mind. Accordingly I propose, in accordance with rule 77, the adjournment of the meeting until tomorrow.

249. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The representative of Bolivia has asked for the adjournment of the meeting and has made a motion to that effect. According to rule 77 of the rules of procedure, such a motion must be put to the vote immediately without discussion. A roll call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Venezuela, having been drawn by lot by the President, voted first.

In favour: Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, France, Haiti, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Byelorussian SSR, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian SSR, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Argentina, Chile, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Greece, Thailand.

The proposal was rejected by 28 votes to 22, with 7 abstentions.

250. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): In accordance with the result of the voting we will continue the discussion.

251. Sir Mohammad ZAFRULLA KHAN (Pakistan): One has, of course, listened with great care and attention to what has been said in support of the recommendation of the General Committee. One was the more eager to listen to such reasons, considerations and sentiments to which expression has been given inasmuch as one honestly and sincerely thought that on the merits of the question there was little that could be said on the other side. I shall confine myself to replying to some of the main points which have been made in support of the recommendation.

252. The representative of the United States, who is a lawyer of outstanding ability, brought into service his great dialectical skill in order to make out a case in support of the recommendation of the General Committee, and he added to his undoubted skill a great deal of unsuspected subtlety—at least unsuspected by me—which more than

anything else convinced me that he had no case. I have had considerable very pleasant and agreeable association with him which has engendered in me a deep respect for his ability and for his thinking, and it is my experience—I hope he will forgive me for stating it—that when he has a case he needs no subtlety. That was a disappointment in respect of one so distinguished and occupying so great a position.

253. In the first place he made an analysis of the support which opposition to the recommendation had elicited, and the support which the Egyptian proposal to put the item on the agenda had obtained. He said in effect “We are in sympathy with the Arab States. We appreciate their point of view. We have very friendly relations with them. We have great esteem for them”, and then went on to offer certain advice to them. He then referred to States which were autocratic in their conception and dogmatic in their assertions. He was very subtly trying to convey to the Assembly that there was some kind of unholy alliance. Surely, by those autocratic States and by those dogmatic groups he did not mean, for instance, Pakistan, Iran, Indonesia, India, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, all of whom have supported the States sponsoring this item. It was clear whom he meant.

254. Is a question to be pronounced upon and is its determination to be arrived at through an analysis of which group supports it and which group does not; or is a question to be determined on its merits? Inasmuch as he made reference to this aspect of the question let me state that our experience in this Organization has been that we hear a great deal about freedom, democracy, and the self-determination of peoples from the group which might be called the Western States; but whenever we have had to deal concretely with the freedom, liberty, independence and self-determination of a particular people, that role is, by and large, with rare and noble exceptions, abandoned by the Western States. We have on such occasions always found the Eastern European States in the same lobby with us. We have been forced emphatically to take note of it time after time, and we have been compelled today to give expression to our grateful appreciation in all humility. A recent instance concerned the Italian colonies. I shall not go into that question because we are not discussing the Italian colonies; but in the view of the Western States Libya would not have been fit for independence for ten years. Once their first resolution was defeated, Libya apparently became fit for immediate independence.

255. The reference to these States was a subtle attempt to drive a wedge, if I might so describe it, between the Arab States and their supporters.

256. The learned and distinguished representative of the United States started by drawing attention to what the representative of Brazil, a great South American State, had said with regard to the methods which should be pursued in settling such questions. What was said by the representative of Brazil? He said that steps should be taken to settle problems peacefully. What was one of the great purposes for which this great Organization was established? It was to enable disputes, situations of tension, threats to the peace to be peacefully resolved by discussion. Yet here was this argument being used to shut out the discussion of a question with regard to which, whatever its merits, great tension admittedly exists. The argument was put forward that if you discuss this question here you will intensify the tension. It is a strange argument. Hitherto we used to be told: let us discuss a question because tension is mounting. Today we are told we should not discuss

a question, because tension will mount. It is very strange that on most occasions the argument should be one way and that the same argument should be reversed when, for whatever the reasons not disclosed, it is not considered convenient to discuss a question.

257. The second argument was that all other efforts had not been exhausted before this question was brought here. To that a reply has already been given by others who have spoken. I shall not refer to what they have said on that point; repetition will not add to the argument. But there was one point which the representative of the United States sought to make which has not been touched upon in reply, and to which I propose to advert. He said that the distinguished Foreign Minister of France had assured us that "conversations were under way"—I believe those were his very words. His Majesty the Sultan of Morocco has said that he is waiting for negotiations. The distinguished representative argued: here is an agreement that this question can be settled by negotiation, therefore why try to bring the question here? In the first place those two statements do not say the same thing. The distinguished Foreign Minister of France said that conversations were under way. His Majesty the Sultan says that he is waiting for negotiations to be opened. Those two statements do not amount to the same thing. Surely, unless it was fatigue at the end of a long day which made the able, the distinguished, the learned representative of the United States overlook this disparity between the two statements, a lawyer of his experience and standing would have known—should have known—that the two did not mean the same thing. His Majesty the Sultan of Morocco says that he is still waiting for negotiations to be opened. The French point of view put to us is that France is prepared to carry on conversations which have hitherto been carried on with regard to the reforms that are to be introduced. His Majesty the Sultan says that he desires negotiations to be opened with regard to the establishment of the full sovereignty of Morocco. Where is the meeting of the two minds for which we should allow time so that this effort to settle the question by negotiation should bear fruit? Have we had any assurance that the Sultan's desire, his wish, his request contained in his two memoranda of 23 October 1950 and 1 November 1950 has been met, or that it will be immediately met and that negotiations will be opened for the purpose of the establishment of full sovereignty of Morocco? There is no such assurance. There is a whole world of difference between talking about reforms and negotiations about sovereignty, and we of Pakistan of all people have reason to know that.

258. Then the learned and distinguished representative of the United States went on to say, "But France has announced its policy; what more is needed?" I tried to submit this morning that so far as France had announced its policy it had done so through its distinguished and eminent Foreign Minister on 13 November, so far as we followed it, and I tried to paraphrase and interpret it, we accepted it. There was no difference of opinion on that, at least none between Mr. Schuman and myself. I am satisfied with his statement as put by me, if it is accepted by him. Where the difference arises is: what are the methods being adopted to implement that policy? What is the pace of its implementation? Assuming that even on this, France has announced its policy, is that always enough? Has the great country, today the greatest country, which the distinguished representative has the honour to represent here, always been satisfied when the Prime Minister or the Foreign Minister of a country has announced its policy? If that is enough we shall be willing to be guided by that

statement and insist that such statements be accepted and not further probed.

259. Then the learned and distinguished representative of the United States went on to say, "In the interests of the people of Morocco we think that the Arab States which sponsored this item should accept this position." In the first place according to the representative of the United States, apparently the people of Morocco cannot be trusted to know their own interests. The Arab States cannot apparently be expected to know them either for they have the same culture, faith and language and are by and large of the same race. How should they know what the interests of the people of Morocco are? They are disqualified. It is left to the distinguished representative of the United States to tell us what is in the best interests of the people of Morocco. It reminds me of a proverb of the Punjab: "*Man nalon hechli so phapho kuttan*". It refers to a woman who professes more solicitude for a child than the child's own mother. This is disappointing. One would not have been impelled to speak with so much spirit on the matter had one been convinced that the learned and distinguished representative himself was convinced, on the merits, that this item should not be placed on the agenda.

260. But there is a way out. Not one word has been said here in the course of this debate that this matter does not fall within the scope of the Charter. Even Mr. Schuman's own reference to Article 73 of the Charter puts it beyond doubt that the matter is within the scope of the Charter. All that has been said is whether it would be wise to discuss it at this time. I shall come to that later but, assuming that it is not, if you put it on the agenda, the undoubted tension that exists in Morocco would be eased. The people of Morocco would consider that their case, their aspirations and their demands will receive the attention of this distinguished gathering of sixty nations of the world. That would be the immediate gain. Then in due course, when the consideration of the item is reached in the appropriate Committee, if at that time it is felt that a further postponement of the discussion—to the end of this session or to the next session—would help matters or would avert trouble which would otherwise be likely to follow, then that postponement could easily be secured. But here is an attempt to shut out a relevant and important matter relating to the freedom and liberty of 9 million people, which is within the scope of the Charter. It is said: Shut it out, do not put it on the agenda at all. Has that ever happened before? I would be happy to be told of an instance when under similar circumstances, owing to the tension which existed, that tension was used as an argument against putting an item on the agenda. If you do not put the item on the agenda how will the tension be affected? We know human nature. We know that when people are struggling at least to have their case heard—they may be mistaken with regard to their case—but if they are struggling to get that chance and do not get it, what happens? That will happen here; and if that is what is desired, very good then and when it happens those whose action will have led to it will be responsible for the friction, for the tension, for the struggle, for the gaolings and for the killings on either side. Blood may be shed—French blood, Moroccan blood—and who will be responsible? The distinguished representative of the United States, because he says, "While there is tension, do not discuss this question."

261. I shall now proceed to say a word or two regarding what the distinguished Foreign Minister of France has stated. With regard to Article 73 I desire to say no more than I have said already: that if Article 73 applies—if it

applies—then it brings the matter plumb within the scope of the Charter.

262. But what was disappointing with regard to what fell from the distinguished Foreign Minister of France was that there was no word—there was a reference to reforms, but there was no word, even to the degree to which he had referred to that subject in his previous speech on 13 November—with regard to self-determination, self-government, sovereignty, independence—nothing at all. But he did observe that the present relationship between Morocco and France was based upon a free agreement between France and Morocco. With all respect, and without questioning for one moment the sincerity of the view that he takes of that agreement, we beg to differ. We beg to differ because even a cursory study of Moroccan history between 1900 and 1912 would convince any student how much freedom there was in Morocco. Between England, Germany, France and Spain, how much freedom did they leave to Morocco to make any free, equal and uncoerced agreement with anybody?

263. Mr. Schuman, when he was dealing with what was said by the representative of Iraq, said—and we welcome the assurance—that the Press was free not only in France but also in Morocco. We are very glad to hear that. So long as the Press is free in Morocco, then this question, if not raised here where it is legitimate to raise it, where it would be proper to raise it and where there is a gathering of learned, distinguished and responsible representatives of sixty nations—if this question is shut out from here—the Press being free in Morocco, it would surely be discussed in the Moroccan Press, and what would be gained except that the people would then be bound to give vent to their dissatisfaction with the United Nations in addition to discussing the question. Is that what is desired?

264. I shall now deal with what was said by the distinguished representative of Australia. He said that he thought it would be both legally wrong and unwise to put this item on the agenda. At this late hour, especially in reply, I do not want to enter upon any detailed examination of the legal argument, but may I say that I was surprised that the argument was put forward by the distinguished representative of Australia. When, on the Indonesian question, the Netherlands raised the point that the relationship between the Netherlands and Indonesia was a matter of domestic jurisdiction falling within the purview of paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the Charter, it was Australia which argued that that was not so. I would request the distinguished representative of Australia to look up the argument which was then used on behalf of his great country and seek to apply it here, and either find an answer in it to his contention of this evening, or *vice versa*, if the Australian delegation was right there, why is it putting forward a contrary argument today?

265. If we do not desire to discuss this item, let us frankly say: This matter will embarrass our friend, France. We admit that it is a relevant matter. We admit that it is within the scope of the Charter. We admit that it ought to be on the agenda. But France, being our friend and being our host here in Paris, at least during this session, it should not be put on the agenda. We do not sympathize with that attitude, but we can understand. This kind of argument, however, we fail to appreciate. It was then said: If you put this item on the agenda you endanger the whole structure of the United Nations, although it was not explained how. The argument was: If you start discussing here questions which the Charter says this Organization has been set up to discuss, you will destroy the Organization.

Therefore do not discuss the questions which the Charter says this Organization has been set up to discuss. Then do what?—then come to Paris and, as has already been said, have a concert here on "human rights". If that is not enough, you can go and see the ballet or you can go to the opera. There are many ways of amusing yourself in Paris. Why start discussing questions which the Charter says are the questions which this Organization has been set up to discuss? If you do, it will endanger the whole structure of the Organization. Why? Because it will be doing what it is set up to do; and is there any greater danger to the Organization than by doing that?

266. Again, it was stated, Things may be said here if this item is discussed which may make the situation even more tense than it is. That lets the cat out of the bag. The situation is so tense that any unwise or provocative thing said here, any encouragement given to the people of Morocco, might make the situation even worse, the tension even greater. If that is so, it is the strongest argument in support of discussing the matter, not in support of shutting it out. Otherwise, what will be the consequences? If there is mounting tension, if the problem exists, and if discussion is refused, what are the people to do? They are not represented here; they cannot come and speak here; and those who want to talk about the matter are not permitted to. Speaker after speaker has said that his delegation has come to no *prima facie* view upon this item, and I say the same thing with complete sincerity on behalf of the Pakistan delegation. We are anxious to learn of the great and brilliant work which France claims it has done in Morocco, and learning of it we shall appreciate it. True, we may have a different point of view from France with regard to the pace and even with regard to the objective, but surely those are exactly the matters which ought to be discussed in this great Assembly.

267. Otherwise, hope deferred will make the heart sick. As I had occasion to say at San Francisco not with regard to this item but generally on the question of human bondage and exploitation, the sickness of the heart, if it is not remedied in time, might lead to a devouring madness. That is the risk that would be taken if questions like this were shut out.

268. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Since there are no more speakers on the list, we shall proceed to the vote.

269. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) (*speaking from the floor*): I request a roll call vote.

270. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall put to a vote by roll call the General Committee's recommendation, set out in document A/1950, paragraph 5, that consideration of the question of placing the proposed item on the agenda should be postponed for the time being. Before voting, I call upon the representative of France.

271. Mr. Robert SCHUMAN (France) (*translated from French*): Now that the debate is over I should like to make a few brief remarks in reply to certain objections which have been made to the French point of view.

272. In the first place, I should like to inform this Assembly of a statement which I made to the French National Assembly on 22 November on behalf of the French Government. My object then was to define our policy by a statement which commits France publicly and which merely confirms what we had stated several times before. In particular, I quoted the following passage from our

reply of 31 October 1950 to the memorandum sent by His Majesty the Sultan.

273. Our reply read as follows :

“ In conformity with the treaty and with the principles proclaimed in the Constitution of 1946 ”—as you know, this Constitution contemplates the progressive self-government of all the territories for which France is now responsible—“ the Government considers that Morocco has reached a new phase in an evolution which, according to the actual words of His Majesty the Sultan, will lead the Moroccan people to administer itself and to manage its own affairs. The Government wishes to reaffirm that this principle governs its policy. Accordingly, existing institutions should be planned with a view to this stage in French-Moroccan co-operation, the main feature of which will be the gradual increase of Morocco's share in the administration of the country. ”

274. Then I went on as follows :

“ This policy is based, and will continue to be based, on a mutual understanding freely discussed and concluded without any kind of external interference. His Majesty the Sultan has very recently expressed publicly ”—my statement was made soon after his speech of 18 November—“ his confidence in France's intention to keep its promises. France will keep them, in accordance with its usages and with its age-old tradition. It hopes that rapid headway will be made with the reforms which might, as proposed by the French Government, be studied by a joint French-Moroccan commission ”.

275. That was the statement which I made on 22 November last, in confirmation of the French Government's reply to the Sultan's memorandum of 31 October 1950. Thus, we have all the data and all the possibilities for an amicable, contractual and freely established solution.

276. On the other hand, what would intervention by the United Nations mean now ? What would be the meaning of a debate like the one we had today ? Would it be in the interests of an amicable and rapid solution ? What would the repercussions of such a debate be in Morocco or in France ? Have you thought that we would be risking, though unwillingly, a hardening of attitudes on both sides, which I would regret deeply ? In Morocco and in France we are dealing with two extremely sensitive public opinions and any rash word, even if involuntary, might disturb relations which are amicable today.

277. Moreover, what part could our Organization play ? Of course, we can make speeches for days on end, and we can express our wishes and recommendations. But we would not wish to, and indeed you could not, substitute your responsibility for that of the two parties to the treaty of 1912. Those two parties have stated publicly that they are perfectly willing to negotiate directly between themselves. In these circumstances, you would run the risk of placing our Organization in a dangerous impasse. I do not think that we could reduce the tension if there really is any tension, while everything would conspire to add to it. France does not wish to bear the responsibility for this and, because there is this risk to the relations between France and Morocco and because there is also a risk to the internal situation in our Organization, I beg you to reflect now and not to set a dangerous precedent with regard to my country, which has not deserved this and which is most anxious to solve these extremely delicate problems. My country is fully aware of all the responsibilities which it bears ; I do not believe that you can usefully share these responsibilities.

278. Mr. BATLLE-BERRES (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*) (*speaking from the floor*) : I request the floor.

279. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*) : On a point of order ?

280. Mr. BATLLE-BERRES (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*) (*speaking from the floor*) : I believe so, but I am not sure. If it is not strictly a point of order, I herewith apologize to the President.

281. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*) : I call on the representative of Uruguay on a point of order.

282. Mr. BATLLE-BERRES (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*) : The President, in fulfilling his duty of directing the discussions, with all the difficulties inseparable from that task, considered that the list of speakers should be closed since, in his view, that would be the best way of dealing with a matter of great importance and gravity to this Assembly.

283. For my part, it appeared to me from the outset that the President might be mistaken, although I have the greatest respect for the considerations which led him to adopt this decision. The problem now before us is certainly of the utmost gravity, and it was difficult for some delegations, such as the Uruguayan delegation, to ask to speak before they had heard the opinions of the parties who were more thoroughly acquainted with the problem; likewise, at the present time it is almost impossible for us to vote on the question in view of the way in which it has been presented. I say this because it would appear that France is not respecting human rights and it would be difficult for us to vote against a draft resolution stating that that was the case, since it would seem to indicate that we are turning a deaf ear to the appeals of a people which declares that it is suffering.

284. Consequently, I believe that this discussion should be continued, so that several delegations which are closely following the proceedings may thus have a more thorough knowledge which will enable them to speak on the problem and to cast their votes with a fuller appreciation of the situation. As far as Uruguay is concerned, I feel it necessary to say that if complaints of violations of human rights are to be made, I should have to submit a long list and to refer not only to France, but also to Lithuania, Latvia, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania and other countries. In these circumstances, I wonder whether we are now in a position to vote as we are requested to do in accordance with the President's decision. That decision, with all due respect to him both in his official capacity and personally, I believe to be mistaken.

Therefore, I consider it necessary that this discussion should be re-opened so that delegations may form an opinion and may speak with fuller knowledge on this important matter.

286. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*) : I shall recall that before proposing that the list of speakers should be closed, I consulted the Assembly as to whether or not it wished to proceed in that manner. At that time, objections were raised by those countries which did not wish the list to be closed and whose representatives desired their names to be placed again on the list of speakers. That was done, and in those conditions the opinion of the Assembly was requested ; it was the Assembly—and not the President—which took the decision and agreed to close the list of speakers.

287. That is my reply to the point raised by the representative of Uruguay.

288. Mr. BATLLE-BERRES (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*) (*from the floor*): My motion, therefore, would be to re-open the discussion and to continue it today or to adjourn it until tomorrow. In any case we should resume the debate.

289. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): In reply to the motion of the representative of Uruguay that as regards the adjournment of debate, the Assembly has already voted by roll call, the result being 28 votes against, 22 in favour, and 7 abstentions; consequently, the Assembly has already taken a decision on that point.

290. We shall now proceed to vote and a vote by roll call has been requested. Those representatives who are in favour of the General Committee's recommendation should vote in the affirmative and those who are not in favour should cast a negative vote.

A vote was taken by roll call.

The Netherlands, having been drawn by lot by the President, voted first.

In favour: Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Israel, Luxembourg.

Against: Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Mexico.

Abstaining: Thailand, Argentina, Chile, China, El Salvador, Greece, Liberia.

The recommendation was adopted by 28 votes to 23, with 7 abstentions.

291. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The representative of Egypt has the floor for three minutes to explain his vote.

292. SALAH-EL-DIN Pasha (Egypt): We were confident that voting for the recommendation of the General Committee on the Moroccan question did not mean that we could not take up this question again in this sixth session, the adjournment being only for the time being. That was the definite view of some members of the General Committee expressed by them in explaining their votes. Nevertheless, my delegation did not hesitate to vote against the recommendation since we found no reason for postponement of this question. This is the proper interpretation, indeed the only interpretation, of rule 40 of the rules of procedure. Therefore, after a reasonable time, we shall again ask for consideration of the question that this item should be placed on the agenda of the present session.

The meeting rose at 8.40 p.m.