

The Moroccan Dossier

Democratic Party of Independence

(Hizb Choura - Istiqlal)



MEMORIALS ON MOROCCO

in her struggle for

Democracy and Independence

(DESTOUR)

(ISTIQLAL)



BEFORE RESORTING TO THE U. N. O.

Morocco and the Arab League

called in vain for

amicable mediation of U.S.A.

with a view to settling the Moroccan problem



N° 3

Published by the office of the D. P. I.

English Edition

Juanary 1952

هندیہ ایف جی اے
ایس ایس ایف ایس
21/1/25

ملل

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE UNITED STATES WITH REGARD TO THE MOROCCAN PROBLEM

Before appealing to U.N.O. the Arab League decided, during its session of March 1951, to address itself *directly* to France for a solution of the Moroccan problem. So every member state of the Arab League submitted to the French Government a memorandum on the Moroccan problem. No answer was forthcoming.

Since the approaches made by the states of the Arab League separately to the French Government had no result, those states then had recourse to the *mediation of a third power* with a view to bringing France to envisage a satisfactory solution of the Moroccan problem. Here are the very terms in which, during a press conference held in the Palais de Chaillot, H.E. Abdurrahman Azzam Pacha, General Secretary of the Arab League, made public his attempts at a mediation with France, before appealing to U.N.O.:

"The Moroccan question", he said, "had been in need of a solution for many years. This was recognised by President Roosevelt in 1942 at Casablanca when he promised the Sultan independence in exchange for the cooperation of his people in the allied cause. During the last five years, the Arab League has tried to find a peaceful solution to that problem. It had recourse to different means, among others to the intervention of a third party. The United States and Brazil were approached for this purpose with a view to a mediation. All these attempts proved to be vain. The repression, oppression and humiliation of the Moroccan people went on. Last winter, General Juin took a certain number of steps to an end to the drive of Moroccan nationalism, especially by trying to depose the Sultan..."

On December 6th, 1951, H.E. Azzam Pacha made the following enlightening declarations to the Parisian newspaper "Liberation" about the American mediation solicited by the Arab League. To the question of the French newspaper:

"Did you not consider any other solution before appealing to U.N.O.?"

H.E. Azzam Pacha answered:

"I spoke to the Americans on the subject... They declared that it was not an opportune moment to bring it up. I tried to get the United States and Brazil to mediate... They both declined. It is now the turn of the French Government to face its responsibilities. In the present state of things, we have decided, as far as we are concerned, to bring the discussion before the next General Assembly, of the United Nations and to do our utmost to prevent U.N.O. eluding the discussion."

Such declarations, apart from the fact that they correspond to those made on the 13th December 1951 at the tribune of U.N.O. by the spokesman of the American delegation, define the responsibilities of the U.S.A. in regard to the Moroccan problem. The United States have done everything, behind the scenes as well as in the committees and in the General Assembly, to avoid this problem being brought to public debate. By declaring themselves, through their delegation to U.N.O., the advocates of "semi-official negotiations" between the Sultan and the French Government with a view to certain so-called "democratic" reforms, the U.S.A. upheld wholeheartedly the French Colonialism

L 12

which is more than ever attached to the *status quo* in a Morocco subjected to the protectorate regime since the treaty of March 30th, 1912. What is nothing less than surprising in the official position adopted by the U.S.A. in the Moroccan affair, is that they claim to have been led to it, on one hand by their concern to safeguard the "powers and responsibilities" of the General Assembly by "respecting the principles of the Charter of the United Nations", and, on the other hand, by the desire to defend the "higher interests of the Moroccan people"!

So the United States prove to be more royalist than the King, that is to say more Moroccan than the Moroccans themselves! But this does not gull anybody. The delegations to U.N.O. understand perfectly the true motives of the position of the United States of America in the Moroccan affair. When the spokesman of the Czech delegation succeeded the American delegate at the tribune of the General Assembly, did he not in fact that very day give public utterance to what everyone was thinking privately?

"Morocco", he then said, "plays, and has to play, an important part in Atlantic strategy, for the French Government has allowed the United States of America to settle on Moroccan territory to establish their aeronautical bases there. With the approbation of the French Government, the United States are turning Morocco into an important supplementary base for aggression. So then, Morocco is being changed against her will... Peace is at stake in Morocco, by the sole fact, among others, that military bases are being established there at the present moment and this, as I have said, against the will of the Moroccan people."

This is unfortunately true and explains the American vote for the adjournment of the debate on the Moroccan problem. It is obviously not a question of the principles of the Charter, or of the higher interests of the Moroccan people, or even of the French, but only of the strategical interests of the U.S.A. in the Maghreb. It is precisely because of these very interests — and for no other reason — that the mechanism of the "Atlantic solidarity" was brought into play at the moment of the vote on the Moroccan affair at U.N.O.

Already before the poll of December 13, 1951, it was said in the French press that the position of the United States of America depended, to a great extent, on strategical considerations.

Thus, "Le Monde" wrote, on October 25, 1951, under the striking headline: "The Moroccan Affair, a Crucial Test of Atlantic Solidarity":

"...Will anybody in Cairo doubt that this manoeuvre of dissociation... constitutes a crucial test of Atlantic solidarity? Already now it is perfectly normal that London and Paris should agree upon mutual moral support. It remains to see what decision Washington will take..."

"A mere abstention from the vote on a possible inscription of the Egyptian complaint would be considered as its manifest approbation... *It depends mainly on the United States whether the policy of cooperation with the Shereefan authorities practised by France in Morocco will continue to develop in an atmosphere of peace and justice.* The support by Washington of the French thesis as to the incompetence of the United Nations to treat the Moroccan question would probably suffice to avoid the calling into existence of a dispute up to now imaginary. But can one count on the American delegation to assume a clear standpoint in this respect? In any case, they are now given an excellent occasion to put in action this Atlantic solidarity which the U.S. are constantly admonishing their friends to give proof of."

It is now a known fact that the United States did not act otherwise

by voting — and inciting certain delegations to vote — for the French colonialist thesis and against that upheld by 23 States in favour of the Moroccan independence.

Thus, it has become obvious that, in the eyes of the Americans, Atlantic solidarity *PREVAILS* over rights and liberties of oppressed peoples.

The foreign press did not fail to emphasize this. As an example, we quote the important English Conservative paper, "The Economist" which gives the following explanation of the Franco-Anglo-American solidarity concerning Morocco:

"In short, from the diplomatic point of view, the French thesis concerning Morocco is supported by the British *in exchange* for Franco-British solidarity on Egypt — and Sudan — while both powers are supported by the United States, partly *in the interest of allied security*, partly in application of the principle of the inviolability of treaties." (Translated from French.) It is impossible to be clearer or more precise.

"*La Tribune de Lausanne*" wrote in its turn, on December 16th, 1951:

"England and the United States have not abandoned their principal partner in the Atlantic pact, any more than colonial and ex-colonial powers like Holland and Belgium."

So it is by *strategical and colonial* solidarity that certain states, big and small, have voted in favour of the *provisional* adjournment of the inscription of the Moroccan question of the agenda of U.N.O.

As for the American press itself, it did not conceal, before the adjournment, what was going to be the attitude of the government of the United States. *The Washington Post* which is known to be the interpreter of the opinion in official circles, expressed itself as follows on the eve of the discussion at U.N.O.:

"What attitude ought we to take? To us, the situation presents two sides. On one hand, we must not hesitate a single moment to vote against the Egyptian resolution..."

"But the United States would not be true to herself if she restricted herself to wrecking the Egyptian "manoeuvre"..."

"She has always proved to be a good friend of France, and we think she would not dispute a new help (for the sake of her own interest)..."

"But it is urgent and indispensable that France take, as soon as possible, a strong turn in her African policy."

As we know, the U.S.A. were not content with voting for the provisional adjournment of the debate on Morocco. They have pushed the matter to the point of taking up the cudgels for an indefensible cause, to the point of assuming, at the very tribune of the United Nations, the spectacular role, not to call it something else, of directing, by a kind of moral pressure, the opinion of the General Assembly towards a vote favourable to the interests of Atlanticism and colonialism in fix. By doing so, the U.S.A. have revealed of what importance the adjournment of the debate on Morocco was to them as well as to the occidental colonialist world. If their spokesman, in his address from the tribune, has not succeeded in reconciling the irreconcilable, that is to say, colonialism and liberalism, the vote of December 13th, 1951 has been, notably for the U.S.A., full of international political significance. All the bargaining, all the pressure behind the scenes (and even during the meetings) and all the quibbles used in the plenary session, have, in fact, not brought about, more than a *very relative majority* for the thesis of the western powers. It is a slender success, far from the great and overwhelming victory forestalled by them.

Thus, proof has been given, since December 13th, 1951, that those "leading" powers are far from "ruling the roast" under the roof of the United Nations. And it is so much the better for the latter, and for all the causes of justice, liberty and peace which occupy their minds.

Proof is no the less given for the United States of America, as well as the French Government, trying to obtain the adjournment of the debate on the Moroccan problem only in order to *escape* all discussion of this subject, and to *evade* any explanation, on either side, before the United Nations; for the inscription of the Moroccan question and its bringing forward involved, in the eyes of the U.S.A. a risk, at the least rather embarrassing: namely, the institution of legal proceedings, on the initiative of certain antagonistic nations, against *American strategic activities* in Morocco, simultaneously with the opening of the case against French colonialism in Morocco.

That "Western" flight before the debate on the Moroccan question at the United Nations has, moreover, been severely judged at the tribune by M. Andraos Pacha, the Egyptian delegate, who stated the following:

"I cannot tell you what a *bad impression* those *tactics* of eluding discussion give. There is an adage in French law which says "he pleads his cause who is in the wrong". Those who invoke exceptions in procedure are generally those *who fear to have the heart of the matter examined.*"

To these words we add nothing except that the elusion of the great powers had indeed made a very bad impression on the the delegations to the United Nations in general, as well as on international opinion, and that the U.S.A. in particular has not left, after the vote of December 13th, 1951, on the Moroccan affair, with her prestige unimpaired and increased.

Even before the General Assembly of the United Nations where the debate on the Moroccan problem was to take place on December 13th, 1951, the *Democratic Party of Independence* had made a point of contacting the American delegation to U.N.O. through the intermediary of its delegates in Paris. A dossier, as complete as possible, was afterwards handed to that delegation who, we hoped, would take an altogether different attitude towards the Moroccan affair during the debates at U.N.O.

In view of the position assumed by the U.S.A. in the Moroccan affair at the General Assembly, the *Democratic Party of Independence* deems it necessary today to make public certain documents from that dossier. These are, in particular, two memoranda, of which one is addressed to Mr. MacGhee, former Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and the other to Mr. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and President of the American delegation to U.N.O.

In the first document, our party, after having briefly outlined the Moroccan problem, suggests a *friendly mediation* of the U.S.A. to France.

In the second document we recall to the American Minister for Foreign Affairs certain historical facts and certain political realities which, to our mind, ought to govern the attitude of the U.S.A. concerning the present Moroccan problem.

But before presenting the text of these two documents, we wish to publish the letter which our Party, on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the "Protectorate" in Morocco, addressed to the Consul General of the United States at Rabat and to his colleagues of the other nations.

This is the letter in extenso:

**LETTER ADDRESSED
TO THE CONSUL GENERAL OF THE U.S.A. AND
TO THE DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE POWERS IN MOROCCO**

Casablanca, March 29th, 1947.

Sir,

The *Democratic Party of Independence*, the faithful interpreter of the will and the national aspirations of the Moroccan people, seizes the opportunity, on March 30th, the anniversary of the establishment of the protectorate in Morocco, to state the following before Your Excellency:

After a decade of rivalry, intrigue and foreign aggression, a regime of occupation and imperialism euphemistically called "regime of protection or protectorate" was *imposed* on Morocco by military force as well as by diplomatic pressure. How much machiavelism that regime conceals! Morocco has been and still is its great victim.

Who talks of "protectorate", talks of a regime imposed by force to the profit of colonisation in a subjected, exploited country. This is worth an explanation:

It is useless to evoke here the different stages of the Moroccan crisis, our purpose being to speak of the protectorate.

Nobody contests the fact that this regime was imposed on the Moroccan people. We do not make an unfounded statement when asserting that the ratification of the protectorate treaty was *extorted* from the former Sultan Moulay Hafid. Let us recall, in fact, in order to prove it, the circumstances which attended the establishment of the Protectorate in Morocco.

As soon as the Cabinet had given their approval of the Treaty scheme, in Paris, the French Embassy with their President M. Regnault, went from Tangiers to Fès where Moulay Hafid was fulminating his refusal to sign "his own fall" and made known to France that he was not the kind of a Sultan to submit to it. Regnault, who, from Tangiers, repeated his appeals to the Sovereign, persuading him not to accelerate the crisis, arrived at Fès, not only with the treaty-scheme in his packet, but also provided with a present of diplomatic assurances and personal contentments destined to the rightly furious and incensed sovereign. "In Fès, at the arrival of the Embassy, there was an *icy silence* among the population. At court, the solemn audience held in the usual way, accentuated for us the *suspicious mood* and *dark distrust of the Sultan*." ("Le Temps", 30-3-1932.)

Undeniable testimonies assert that Moulay Hafid's behaviour did not change in the least after the establishment of the Protectorate in Morocco. The former President of the Cabinet, Louis Barthou writes in his book: *Lyautey and Morocco*: "For three months the General Resident (Lyautey) had to fight against the hostility of Sultan Moulay Hafid. This signatory to the treaty was actually opposed to it and, far from favouring the beginnings of the protectorate with his cooperation,

he was bent upon compromising them by an obstructionism which at every difficulty manifested itself by the offer or the threat of resignation... without saying any more, we are sure of keeping strictly to the truth if we assert that his heart was not with us."

Finally, Moulay Hafid decided to abdicate. The Quai d'Orsay feared the abdication, for all the European powers had not yet recognised the protectorate. On April 10th, 1912, during a reception given by Lyautey, although overwhelmed with attentions so as to be put in good humour, Moulay Hafid "had a long and strange conversation with General Lyautey in the course of which he said that France was wrong in demanding a treaty of protectorate". (Maurois: "Lyautey", p. 203.)

The representatives of the French government in Morocco did their best to abate the intransigency of Moulay Hafid and his decision to abdicate. One of them, Consul Gaillard, was answered in this way: "I am not, and I do not want to become a Sultan under a Protectorate. It would be contrary to all my past and to my need for freedom and independence. I cannot forget and all my people remember it, that if I am now the Sultan, and that is precisely why, in Marrakech, I proclaimed myself the defender of my country against any foreign intrusion. I cannot, without betraying my conscience, accept and myself request the very yoke against which I stood in an attitude which earned me the Throne. I do not want to betray the confidence with which my people have entrusted me... I cannot make up my mind to accept a control which would limit my will and would subject my deeds to its assent. No, indeed, it is not possible, I am not the man required to play the part of a Sultan under a Protectorate. It is useless to insist, my decision is irrevocable."

Before embarking on the cruiser "Du-Chayla", on his way to his place of exile in France, Moulay Hafid was anxious to explain to his people the major reasons which had made him resign his throne. In fact, addressing the Grand Vizier in his letter of abdications, the former Sultan wrote in particular: "We have found Ourselves prevented from properly fulfilling our duties as the sovereign of our people. For that reason, we have decided and to retire abdicate and resign sovereign power."

If we have insisted on recalling that page of the history of Morocco here, it is in order to make it clear that the protectorate is a regime which was imposed by force and diplomacy with the preconceived support of some Powers which France had bought out, of Moroccan affairs, with concessions granted to them elsewhere.

The protectorate was meant to support the Sultan in the necessary reforms. As a famous French writer says, Chancelleries have a liking for these modest, virtuous formulas. In fact, nothing of the kind happened. The application of the protectorate actually resulted only in a total and downright annexation of Morocco and in her organisation to the advantage of an unrestrained colonisation. A short explanation is necessary here.

It has been advanced that the conception of the protectorate was the only one possible and consistent with the international treaties which constitute the diplomatic statute of Morocco. However, this pretension could only be accepted if the protectorate would, in principle as in fact, safeguard entirely and constantly the sovereignty of Morocco, her territorial integrity, and the economic liberty based on the equality of

Powers. This triple principle is expressly stipulated in the preamble to the general act of Algesiras. But, in actual fact, neither the stipulations of the protectorate treaty, nor the applications of it which have been made, respect the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of the Shereefan Empire.

But by sovereignty we must logically understand the real right of the Moroccan state and its head, the Sultan, to act freely both inside and outside the country. Therefore there can be no sovereignty where there is no independence, since it alone allows freedom of action to the sovereign, that is to say, to the state, as well in the totality of national territory as in the field of external relations. So sovereignty is necessarily based on independence.

As for territorial integrity, it is necessary that:— under no pretext must Moroccan territory be made the object of a sharing out of zones of influence, still less of annexation, even if temporary and disguised.

This cannot be the case with a protectorate based on military occupation, political domination and economic exploitation.

There is also talk of a double sovereignty in the case of protectorates. This does not exist. A protectorate never represents in theory or in practice a co-existence of two equal sovereignties. In fact from the moment a country falls under the yoke of a protectorate it ceases to be sovereign.

Certain official propaganda also claims that the conception of the protectorate is founded on a mere control, exclusive of any direct administration. In reality, a protectorate always degenerates into a system of direct administration, where "the protecting country holds all the reins, manœuvres the works. The governors of the protected country have only the appearance of authority," and where "all they do is suggested to them, and sometimes imposed on them."

From what precedes, we must conclude that the protectorate treaty of the thirtieth of March 1912 violates, in the most flagrant way, in its clauses as much as in its applications, the principles which constitute the basis of the diplomatic statute still in force in Morocco. Every declaration of the official French policy concerning the respect for the obligations and intangibility of international treaties, which can be applied to Morocco, constitutes an aggravating circumstance.

Seen from a strictly Moroccan point of view the result of thirty five years of protectorate does no credit to the present policy in our country.

The Colonists and all the profiteers of the regime may very well exalt the colonisation, the Moroccan enterprise, to use the official expression, and beatify its creators living or dead.

As for the Moroccan people, they cannot consider this colonisation, this enterprise and its promoters in the same light. Everything forbids them, in fact, to magnify an effort, considerable though it may be, which is to the profit above all of the Franco-European colony, owners of so many privileges, beside frightful misery and crying injustice which has been imposed on the Moroccan people by a regime which has proved a complete failure and which this same people have fought with arms for a quarter of a century before the start, in January 1944, of a popular movement of independence that the repressive force of the unleashed protectorate could not by any means master. The attitude, so little democratic, of the French authorities at that time really amazed all those who could get any knowledge of it. Moroccans especially could not help sharing the thoughts of the son of another subject-people:

"Foreign torture and domination is never so bitter, so painful, never so full of humiliation as when a nation imposes it on another and maintains it with all its political, economic and military resources. An appeal to the generosity, the magnanimity or the sense of justice of a sovereign or an individual dictator can succeed in an exceptional case, but an appeal to a democracy, never. No domination is more tyrannical, more pitiless in its deeds than that of a democracy. A democratic form of government may be very good for internal affairs, but its domination over other peoples is disastrous in its effects. It is fraught with the possibility of innumerable evils. Indeed, political subjugation is the punishment for social taints and national crimes, but once imposed, it adds to their number and intensity. It sterilizes, it impedes all renewal, all rebuilding. It aggravates the evil; it drives to misery under its most hideous forms: a wretchedness, mental, moral and physical. If ever the wakening comes it will be weakened, stifled and crushed by the forces of the Law, diplomacy, by ruse and fraud. The representation of the subject people under the most sombre colours, diffamation and calomny, all are part of imperialistic policy. Its aim is to create and perpetuate a slave mentality and to obtain the sanction of the rest of the world for this usurpation of the rights, property and freedom of a foreign people."

Since the existence of the movement for independence, the French government has done nothing to meet the legitimate aspirations of the Moroccan people with regard to their liberty, democracy and independence. Those in high place continue to ignore the will of the Moroccan people, who does not cease to claim, with the full support of the Arab League, its absolute right to dispose of itself.

Every attempt to divert them from their aim by a so-called policy or reform is doomed to failure. Every manoeuvre to intimidate our people will share the same fate. Morocco is sure of her right, and has full confidence in the final triumph of her national cause. The future is not to colonial imperialism, irrevocably condemned by international morality and conscience, but to the rights of nations, big and small, to dispose of themselves within the framework of a universal cooperation and solidarity in the service of Justice and Peace.

The Democratic Party of Independence, which holds the breach for the realisation of the deeply felt and legitimate aspirations of the Moroccan people, had the opportunity of laying the problem of the independence of Morocco before M. Vincent Auriol when he passed through Fez on the sixth of January this year. The P.D.I., with its usual frankness, made a point of informing the ex-President of the National Assembly, who today presides over the destiny of the Republic, that in default of a Franco-Moroccan solution, our problem risks to present itself on an international level.

Yours respectfully,

On behalf of THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF INDEPENDENCE.

General Secretary:

MOHAMED HASSAN OUAZZANI.

These one the two memoranda which our Party addressed to the State Department on one hand, and to Mr. Dean Acheson, Chairman of the American Delegation to the 6th Session of U.N. in Paris, on the other hand.

Casablanca, October 1950.

**TO HIS EXCELLENCY Mr. MAC GHEE,
ASSISTANT SECRETARY
OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
care of the Consul General of the United States**

RABAT

Your Excellency,

I have the honour of addressing to you, in the name of the *Democratic Party of Independence*, the memorandum submitted on September 23rd, 1947, to the French and the Moroccan government.

I also take the liberty of reminding you, Sir, in your double capacity as Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs and as Chairman of the recent American diplomatic conference at Tangiers, of certain historical facts and declarations which involve obligations as well as solemn promises.

On the third of September, 1939, in a message to the Moroccan people, His Majesty the Sultan said, *"From this day on, until the flag of France and her allies is crowned with glory, we must give her our unreserved support without bargaining with her for any of our resources and without shrinking from any sacrifice."*

Echoing this imperial appeal, the Resident General in his turn, declared on September 21st, 1939, *"France will never forget with what a generous impulse the Sovereign of Morocco and all his people ranged themselves on her side for the defence of Justice and Right."*

These two declarations prove that during the last war the Moroccans fought as allies and defenders of Justice and Right.

The Atlantic Charter solemnly guaranteed by the signature of the late President Roosevelt, has come to confirm the oppressed peoples in their hope and confidence in the allied victory.

Does not this Charter in fact declare that the allied governments « wish the *sovereign rights* and the *free exercise of government* to be given back to those who have been deprived of it by force. »

This certainly referred to totalitarianism, declared enemy of peoples and democracies; but his article of the Atlantic Charter also referred, and no less certainly, to colonialism, that other enemy of nations and democracies.

The Moroccan people found itself more particularly confirmed in its national aspirations when the late President Roosevelt said, on November 22nd, 1942, in a message to H.M. the Sultan, "at the present time the Axis countries are the enemies of our two countries. They want to impose on North Africa a regime which politically and econo-

mically aims at domination. Therefore I am particularly happy to see our two countries allied.

"Our victory over the Germans and the Italians will mark the point of departure for a new era of peace and prosperity for the whole Moroccan people..."

So the Moroccan people had been given the formal promise if not the certainty that the Allied victory would bring them, with peace and prosperity, the satisfaction of their national aspirations.

During the war American statesmen and famous personalities made themselves the eloquent defenders of the freedom of peoples against colonial imperialism in all its forms.

Did not Mr. Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, say in his important speech of September 13th, 1943, "Free nations are responsible for the people who depend on them and aspire to freedom. The duty of these nations, when they have political strings in the form of a mandate, a protectorate, or anything else of the same kind, is to assist their material and moral development, to prepare them for the duties and responsibilities of self-government and to encourage their efforts towards liberty. The best example of this is what we have done in the Philippines." (From the French translation.)

But colonialism is incapable of preparing the peoples it dominates for liberty. For, any colonial domination is the very negation of the political liberty to which the oppressed peoples aspire. The preparation of these peoples for liberty can only be conceived in necessarily freeing them from the chains and constraint inherent in any colonial policy, or else in entrusting an international organisation of supervision with this preparation, as for example the one which is acting at present in Lybia.

Another American statesman, M. Sumner Welles, wrote even more explicitly in the *New York Times* of the 17th of October 1943 :

"How can we hope for the coming of a free and stable world if half its population is still in bondage?... I am convinced that every international organisation, whatever it may be, must be based on the principle that no nation has the right to subjugate, and make the law for, other peoples" (from the French).

In his book *One World*, M. Wilkie defined the aim of the last war in these precise terms : "We believe that this war must mark the end of the domination of certain nations over others. We are convinced that the world must set itself to help the colonial peoples which have joined the cause of the United Nations to win their freedom and independence. We must fix definite dates according to which these peoples will work towards the establishment of their own government, and extremely solid guarantees on which all the United Nations have agreed, which will prevent them from falling back into the state of colonies." (From the French translation.)

All these professions of faith and these definitions of principle find their expression and their ratification in the Charter of the United Nations, one of the aims of which is to : "develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples..."

As for the United States of America, did not President Truman declare on October 27, 1945, in the course of an important speech on foreign policy, of which the main lines were defined in *twelve points*, among others, the following :

I) "We believe that the peoples who were despoiled by force will finally recover their sovereign rights."

II) "We will not accept territorial change in any part of the world unless it is in accordance with the freely expressed wish of the interested peoples."

III) "We believe that all peoples who are ready to govern themselves should have the right to choose the form of their own governments without foreign intervention. This is true for Europe, Asia and Africa as well as for the western hemisphere." (Translation from the French.)

Such principles condemn not only Nazism, Fascism, and other such regimes, but also colonialism, the policy of which is always based on force and authority, on the oppression and the exploitation of men and nations.

Turning to MOROCCO, we feel we must recall the declarations of H.M. The Sultan who in a speech of March 25th, 1946, when welcoming M. Labonne, former Resident General, affirmed that our country had, during the two world wars, "*fulfilled her obligations.*"

Consequently H.M. The Sultan claimed the liberty for Morocco in these words: "Far from sparing her resources, she helped with all the means in her power. Her men were everywhere worthy of their race, their traditions of courage and endurance."

"She has the right to hope to see her condition improve in every field, to *accede to the liberty* which the new times bring with them, to attain the glory to which those have the right who, to perfect their qualities, *have accomplished their duty to enjoy their rights.*"

It is impossible to be more explicit and more precise in recalling the *duties* which Morocco has *accomplished* and the rights she has consequently *deserved*.

M. Labonne, former Resident General, did not understand during his proconsulate, that this appeal alluded to the declaration of his predecessor General Nogues who had said on 21 September 1939 that: "France will never forget the sacrifices made by MOROCCO and her people, in fighting on our side to defend Justice and the Right".

The Sovereign of Morocco, addressing the diplomatic representative of the United States in the course of his journey to Tangiers in April 1947, was anxious to remind him that Morocco had served as a base for departure during the years of liberation and that our people had welcomed the American soldiers enthusiastically seeing in them the defenders of human liberties.

His Majesty The Sultan added that, even if President Roosevelt was dead, his principles, on the contrary, should continue to live among the nations, big and little, and that their interrelations should be based on friendship and cooperation, and not on bondage and oppression.

It is true that the pragmatism as well as the idealism of the United States led them in 1946 to grant independence to the Philippines.

It is equally true that the pragmatism and the idealism of the United States intervened and even exercised their *diplomatic pressure*, in the affairs of Indochina and Indonesia, not to mention any other Asiatic country.

The American attitude to the colonial problem was still more strongly determined, a few months ago, when Your Excellency publicly defined the basis of the foreign policy of the United States: "*that policy*", as you declared, Sir, "*favours the liberation of the African peoples as well as those of Asia.*"

Later on, when the Conference of the three Ministers for Foreign Affairs was held in London, the American delegates probably raised the North African problem; and according to an important European newspaper "threw on the negotiating table a note urging the French to grant the North African countries the independence demanded by the nationalists".

The claims for the independence of Morocco were interpreted by some European newspapers as a means for the United States of obtaining the revision or the suppression of the Franco-Spanish treaties of protectorate and of coming back to the international regime established in 1906 by the General Act of Algeiras.

The last conference of the three Ministers for Foreign Affairs, held in New-York last year, was informed about the North African problem by Emir Abd El Krim, the President of the Committee for the Liberation of Arabic Maghreb.

The Diplomatic Conference of Tangiers is being held just at the moment when His Majesty the Sultan is journeying to France, in order to start the conversations about the political problems concerning Morocco.

The attitude of the *Democratic Party of Independence* on the subject of the *political journey* of His Majesty the Sultan has already been defined since September 23d 1947, in a memorandum delivered on that Sovereign through the intermediary of the Grand Vizier.

In that letter, in fact, we express the unanimous wish of the Moroccan people to see the coming conversations in Paris centered, not on questions of details or persons, but on the *very heart of the Moroccan problem*, the only solution of which consists in abolishing the regime of protectorate and reestablishing the sovereignty and the independence of Morocco.

In our letter to His Majesty the Sultan, we made a point of specifying that the Moroccan People *could by no means be satisfied with half measures as regards their problems* and that they do not in the least want *superficial reforms*, to the advantage of individuals at the expense of a whole nation, as a reward for their immense sacrifices, especially those of the last war.

In general, the position of our party on the Moroccan problem was defined since September 23d, 1947, in a memorandum delivered on that date to the French and the Moroccan government.

After having been transmitted to the French government by General Juin, this document has been for weeks used as a basis for *official discussions* between our party representatives and high officials of the Residency General.

In letters and memorandums addressed to General Juin by the Democratic Party of Independence, notably on January 11th, March 13th and September 23d, 1950, we each time denounced the regime of protectorate, insisted on its repeal, and claimed our national independence.

Those political documents which are already in your possession, your Excellency, together with others emanating from Moroccan organisations or personalities, will help us to a certain extent to plead the cause of our country before the American government, which has been informed of the *colonialist methods* in force in this country since 1912. Therefore, it is not necessary to say anything more about the oppression and misery which result from it for the Moroccan people in town and country.

Let us only recall, however, that such methods are in no way differ-

ent from those of racism and fascism, *the two enemies we have fought and destroyed* during the last world war.

Is it in order to perpetuate colonialism in Morocco that our valiant soldiers won their glory and generously shed their blood on all the battlefields of Africa and Europe? Indeed, it is not in order to remain under a *regime of political bondage* that they sacrificed themselves to free France and deliver Europe from German domination!

At the very moment when there is talk of integrating our country into the Western Strategic System in view of a possible world war, we have the right to claim all our share of justice and liberty, that very same Justice and that very same Liberty so often promised and never granted to our people, who so passionately desire it.

"The victory over the Germans and the Italians will be the *starting point for a new era of peace and prosperity* for the whole of the Moroccan people" said President Roosevelt to H.M. The Sultan on November 20d, 1942.

"France will never forget with what a generous impulse the Sovereign of Morocco and all his people stood up on her side to defend Justice and the Right", proclaimed General Nogues on September 21st, 1939.

But, in fact, what has happened since the end of the War? The United States, have, so to speak, kept to their former position on the Moroccan question, which, up to now, seemed to interest them only from a strategic point of view. The political aspect of the question appeared, therefore, to be secondary to the former in their opinion.

As for France, once Victory was won, she carried on her traditional colonial policy, which is at the Source of the *political crisis* experienced by the Moroccan people, especially since 1944, when the movement for Independence appeared.

Whenever the French recognise the existence of this crisis, they generally impute its cause to either the consequences of the post-war period, or the difficulties of international economy.

This may be true to a certain extent, but *the real cause* of the political-crisis in Morocco lies *undoubtedly* in the regime of protectorate which was *imposed on Morocco*, and violated her diplomatic and juridical statute. In support of this assertion, we recall that Morocco, who had always been a sovereign and independent state by no means negotiated the Treaty of March 30th, 1912, and that, afterwards, *she has been fighting it with arms, for about a quarter of a century.*

The Moroccan people laid down arms in 1934 only because of their lack of means to carry on an armed resistance; if from the *military* point of view, they lost the battle they never considered themselves as conquered for that. In the materially unequal struggle that they have undertaken against colonial imperialism, concealed under the label of the protectorate, then have given evidence of the greatest warlike qualities of our race: abnegation, self-denial, intrepidity and heroism.

In the "pacified" part of Morocco itself, the nationalist movement made its appearance as early as 1930, that is to say four years before the end of the armed resistance of the Moroccan people.

A "scheme for Moroccan reform" was simultaneously presented in Rabat and in Paris on December 1934. In spite of the moderation of that programme of national revendications, the French government refused to consider it. That attitude inevitably led, in October 1937, to serious events and bloodshed, and repressive methods which will finally throw discredit on the policy of the protectorate.

War having caused the failure of colonial regime, in January 1944, Morocco, in a unanimous popular movement rose against the regime of protectorate and claimed her national independence.

The fierce repression used by the authorities of the protectorate to subdue our movement for national liberation did not in the least stop the rising tide of our people against foreign domination.

Since then, the Moroccans have not renounced what they consider to be their fundamental national aspiration and the only solution to their general problem: *the abolition of protectorate and the reestablishment of Morocco in her sovereign rights.*

The Democratic Party of Independence in its memorandum of September 23d, 1947, has had the merit of making of the claim for independence a programme both precise and methodic, and up to now has neglected nothing to persuade the French Government into the path of concession, in view of a national and radical solution to the Moroccan problem.

But instead of following the example of the United States in the Philippines, of Great Britain in Asia and elsewhere, of Holland in Indonesia, France has carried on her traditional colonial policy in the name of an outworn protectorate hated by all the Moroccans.

Moreover, that policy, far from becoming more lenient and modelling itself upon the ideal for which Morocco fought so heroically on the side of the Allies, has on the contrary known a hardening which is without precedent. To give one example out of a thousand, preventive censorship, abolished after the war in Algeria and Tunisia, still runs with extreme severity in the Moroccan national press. As a proof, we quote the case of two recent special numbers devoted by our national organ, *Rai Al Am* (Public Opinion) one to the Tunisian question, and the other to the third anniversary of our memorandum of September 23d, 1947. In fact, these two numbers were purely and simply suppressed in the form of the refusal of *the censorship visa*. This serious blow to the little freedom of opinion which exists in Morocco is worthy of the most arbitrary and police-ridden regime that are known in our times.

Your Excellency,

The above very succinct exposition is only a simple reminder of facts already known to American diplomacy which to-day is better informed of the colonial policy which reigns in Morocco.

Our party wishes to add to this modest exposition a message consisting in two points, addressed to American Diplomacy, which is assuming great obligations and corresponding responsibilities in the world to-day.

1° *First point*

The United States of America, during the last war, undertook the solemn engagement of creating after victory a new order including all nations, big and little, and founded on a human and democratic ideal of justice and liberty.

Has this *new order* been created yet? We do not hesitate to answer in the negative. Indeed the world does not know and will never know this new order for which we have fought and sacrificed so much, while colonialism still exercises a domination over peoples, *under the tolerant eyes* of the powers responsible for peace and international cooperation.

Since the United States knows of the colonialist regime which holds sway in Morocco, many of our compatriots wonder if the *silence* of American diplomacy should be interpreted as *support* of the colonial system against which our people protests increasingly.

Our compatriots have the impression that the Americans have become in some way the "policemen" of French colonialism in the Far East as well as in North Africa. So, it is for the Americans and them alone, to dispell this impression *which seriously harms American influence and prestige in colonial countries*, for whatever reason it may be.

Any different attitude on the part of the United States risks alienating the peoples which are fighting against oppressive colonialism.

2° *Second point*

As for what more particularly concerns Morocco, we think it fit to ask the question if the hour of *American mediation* between Morocco and France has not already struck.

Without doubt, American Diplomacy will answer in the affirmative to the question which has just been clearly placed before it and consequently will act with only the supreme care for peace and for the new order in mind which has to be created in the world for the benefit of all nations.

The friendly and firm relations which our country has always had with yours on one side, and on the other side, the feelings of the noble people of the United States which are known everywhere as the defenders of liberty, democracy and oppressed humanity are, we are persuaded, the surest guarantee that our present message will receive the warmest welcome from the American government.

Yours faithfully,

MOHAMED HASSAN OUAZZANI,
Secretary-General.

Paris, December 11, 1951.

**TO HIS EXCELLENCY DEAN ACHESON
SECRETARY OF STATE
OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT,
PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN DELEGATION
TO THE UNITED NATIONS**

Paris

Dear Sir,

The DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF INDEPENDENCE has the honour of calling to the attention of the United States Delegation to U.N.O. the following facts in support of the claims brought against France by the Arab States on the Moroccan case.

**I. THE EARLIER RELATIONS BETWEEN MOROCCO
AND THE UNITED STATES**

The relations between the United States and Morocco date back to the very foundation of the Independent State of North America.

As far back as 1784, His Shereefan Majesty, Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdallah, not afraid of impairing his good relations with Great Britain, recognized the young Republic. Thus, Morocco was the *first State* to recognize the American Independence.

A few years later, in 1788, the representative of the United States, Mr. Thomas Barkley, signed a commercial treaty with the representative of the Sultan in Tangier, which treaty was later on renewed at the moment of its expiration, i.e. in 1836. By virtue of this treaty, the United States benefitted by the provisions for the most privileged nation.

The Shereefan Government, on this occasion, granted to the United States a palace at Tangier in which the American Embassy in this city was installed from then on.

But Morocco did even more to help the young American Republic. She took the initiative of *officially* inciting the Bey of Tunisia and the Sovereign of Tripolis to recognize, in their turn, the American independence.

The following is the text of the *message* addressed by *President Georges Washington* to H.M. the Sultan of Morocco in 1789:

"Immediately after my having been elected as President and Chief Executive of State, I was honoured by the message, dated August 17, 1788, which Your Imperial Majesty addressed to me. The reason why the reply was not issued at once, is the fact that the provisional government was in a state of liquidation which, of course, had repercussions on the reorganization of the administrative services.

"I have also received copy of the message which Your Majesty took the initiative of sending to the government of Tunisia as well as to that of Tripolis with a view to helping and encouraging these Powers to recognize our independence.

"I herewith beg to express to Your Majesty, on behalf of the United States, my respectful and most sincere gratitude for Your Majesty's generous solicitude in favour of the American people.

"The members of my government ascertain with great satisfaction the good-will evinced by Your Majesty with a view to encouraging the expansion of our trade, the delicacy and swiftness with which the conclusion of the commercial treaty between our two friendly countries was brought about and all the dispositions taken by Your Majesty in order to reach a satisfactory settlement of the case of Cap. Berctor."

As a consequence of this Moroccan attitude towards the United States, the American Representatives have always given evidence of respect for the sovereignty of our country.

On the occasion of his visit to Morocco, President F.D. Roosevelt stated in a message H.M. the Sultan, on November 22, 1942:

"At present, the Axis countries are the enemies of our two countries. They want to impose on North Africa a regime aiming at political and economical domination. Therefore, I am glad to see our two peoples united in a common effort to destroy the Axis Powers.

"Our victory over the Germans and the Italians will mark the beginning of a new era of peace and prosperity for the whole Moroccan people, as well as for all the French residing in North Africa."

II. THE NEWLY ADOPTED ATTITUDE OF THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

Taking advantage of the *privileges granted by the Capitulatory Jurisdiction*, the American citizens, up to recent times, seemed to ignore the Treaty of Protectorate of 1912. Relying on the stipulations of the Treaty of Meknes of 1836 and on those of the Treaty of Algeiras — the international treaty the clauses of which were never abrogated — the American citizens addressed all their requests to H.M. the Sultan, ignoring the French administration installed in our country in application and in violation of the "Protectorate" Treaty. The United States of America, through the agency of their Consulates in Morocco, always declared, and still do, as non-applicable to their citizens the "Dahirs" and the Vizirial and Residential decrees in all the cases where the latter were likely to interfere with the material or moral interests of the Americans.

Since 1950, and more particularly, this year, the position of the United States towards our country has undergone a complete change.

The equivocal attitude of the American Delegation at the meeting

of the committee in charge of the establishment of the agenda on the United Nations — where this delegation, contrary to their habits and principles, rejected the case of Morocco brought up by the Arab States and debarred its inscription on the agenda of the present U.N. session, thus complying with the attitude of the French delegation — is but one of the multiple symptoms of this change of policy in regard to our country.

The Democratic Party of Independence addressed to the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. MacGhee, in his capacity as chairman of the American Diplomatic Conference held at Tangier in October 1950, a memorandum copy of which is enclosed herewith.

After having tersely outlined the Moroccan problem, the Democratic Party of Independence asked the United States in this memorandum whether it would not be opportune to envisage *American mediation between Morocco and France*.

This document having been drafted last year, it does not, of course, bear upon the measures of oppression and arbitrariness which have swooped down on our country this year directed against H.M. the Sultan as well as against our compatriotes.

The campaign of lies which took place in February and March 1951 — and which clearly shows to what point the French administration is able to extend its will to weaken the Moroccan national movement and the equitable aspirations of this country — is too well known to be taken up here again.

Of much closer interest to us is the repression, carried out with much bloodshed, that followed our compatriotes' pacific boycott of the "Elections to the Consultative Chambers of Commerce and Agriculture" (November 1, 1951).

Up to this very day, the forces in charge of the repression are pursuing their gloomy task in all the Moroccan districts of Casablanca on the pretence of looking for "prawlers", "vagabonds" or "prospective bandits" (extract from French newspapers in Morocco of November 21, 1951).

On the other hand, the Moroccans who were arrested in the first days of November, are submitted, in French prisons, to cruelties, as humiliating as they are barbaric. Thus, for example, it has been confirmed by the physicians who attended to the victims after the latter had been set free, that the French policeman introduce into the anus of the victims tubes by means of which their stomachs are filled with water from a tap connected with those tubes etc. There is no need to elaborate on these methods which can easily be proved and verified.

The number of persons in jail has exceeded two thousand, and we herewith enclose a list of those sentenced for "troubling the established order" or for "rebellion against officials on duty". These acts are punished in France with 6 to 8 days' imprisonment, but in Morocco, the sentences vary between six months and two years!

The change of the political and diplomatic attitude of the United States Government with regard to Morocco is made evident by two facts of outstanding importance:

- A — The Franco-American case before the International Court of Justice at The Hague;
- B — The installation of American air bases.

A — THE FRANCO-AMERICAN CASE

It was for the sake of constraining the American citizens to observe the decree on Morocco issued by the French administration by virtue of the Treaty of 1912 that France bore complaint against the United States before the International Court of Justice at The Hague, on March 1, 1951.

As the case concerned Morocco, an autonomous and, with reference to France, foreign territory of distinct sovereignty, the American Government denied France the right to plead on behalf of Morocco and to annul *unilaterally* the stipulations of the American-Moroccan Commercial Treaty of 1836. It deemed it necessary for the Shereefan Empire to be represented at Court.

Washington, consequently, requested France "to specify whether she acted on her own behalf only, or as a representative of Morocco". The United States thus raised a *preliminary objection*.

In a series of statements submitted to the Hague Court, the French Government requested the Court not to recognize the American objection as being well founded. The French Government then devoted itself to demonstrating that France, "who, by virtue of the Protectorate Treaty, is in charge of the foreign affairs of Morocco, was competent to ask the Hague Court their interpretation of the bilateral and multilateral treaties concluded between Morocco and the United States of America".

The American Government, however, maintaining its preliminary objection, addressed a letter to the Court on August 21, 1951, informing the latter that it was "not specified in the French statements whether France and Morocco were, both of them, parties in the affair".

On August 24, 1951, the French Government was asked by the Hague Court "to specify on whose behalf France was pleading in this matter, and to specify in particular, whether she was doing so in behalf of Morocco" considering that there existed certain doubts on this subject in the minds of the American representatives to the Hague Court.

On October 6, 1951, the French Government confirmed to the Hague Court that France "acted on her own behalf and, at the same time, as the protecting power of Morocco and that the judgement of the Court would be equally binding upon France and Morocco".

On November 16, 1951, the State Department announced in a communiqué that "*the identity between the two parties having been clearly established*, the United States accepted to continue the procedure" and that they had decided to "submit their memorandum to the Court of The Hague on December 20, 1951".

B — THE INSTALLATION OF AMERICAN AIR BASES ON THE MOROCCAN TERRITORY

After the negotiations between France and the United States, France decided *unilaterally*, at a Minister Conference on August 12, 1950, to make the United States the concessionaire of air bases on the Moroccan territory.

At no phase of these negotiations had Morocco been informed of the situation; she was perfectly ignorant of the American demand and of the French concessions.

However, as soon as the novel fact of these installations became known, it gave rise to violent protests from all over the country.

H.M. the Sultan and the Moroccan people had been put before the fait accompli of Morocco's incorporation with the Atlantic defence system. This implies:

- 1° The expropriation of the peasants from tens of thousands of acres;
- 2° The fact that some hundred thousands Americans are settling down in Morocco, this increasing the number of foreign immigrants, without any moral or material counterpart to the benefit of the Moroccans, all this, on the contrary, rendering their working conditions all the more difficult and disparaging them to drudgery in their own country;
- 3° The danger of a war becoming imminent in our country, this being a perilous danger, for there are stocks of atom bombs and other "strategic weapons" being laid in;
- 4° The development of war industry in Morocco for the upkeep of the armies stationed in the country;
- 5° The actual adherence of the United States of America to the policy of hypocrisy and oppression which the Moroccan people has been fighting against since 1912 and which it has solemnly denounced in 1944 when proclaiming her will to independence.

We are, consequently, surprised to find that the Government of the United States has allowed France to act in these two matters as if she disposed of Morocco as of a French territory, a kind of colony, and as if Morocco were not a State which, internationally speaking, has maintained her sovereignty.

As concerns this sovereignty, we take the liberty of enclosing herewith a document, N° 3, specially dealing with this question.

III. IS MOROCCO A SOVEREIGN, AUTONOMOUS OR SEMI-AUTONOMOUS STATE?

According to the French themselves, Morocco is a *sovereign country* of *international sovereignty* clearly distinct from that of France.

In support of this thesis, we take the liberty of quoting two decisions of the *Supreme Court of Paris*.

In its *decision N° 262 of April 12, 1924*, the Supreme Court (Criminal Section), presided by Mr. Bart, declared as follows:

"Having heard the report of Mr. Bourgeon, assistant Judge, and the address to the Court of Mr. Bloch-Laroque, Attorney General;

"In view of the memorandum produced by the plaintiff to sustain his appeal;

"Considering that the treaty concluded between France and Morocco, providing for the organisation of the protectorate in the Shereefan Empire, has not had for its consequence the loss of the Moroccan autonomy, *the Moroccan territories placed under this protectorship remain foreign territories*, in accordance with Articles 235 and 236 of the Military Justice Rules."

In its *decision N° 1399 of May 7, 1934*, the Supreme Court (Civil Section), presided by Mr. Péan, declared as follows:

"In view of Articles 1 and 4 of the Treaty of Fès dated March 30, 1912, approved by the Law of July 15, 1915,

"Following which Treaty any French legislation bearing on this new regime must have been sanctioned by a "Dahir", *signed by the Sultan*, before enforcement..."

Thus, according to the highest French jurisdiction, Morocco is, in spite of the Treaty of 1912:

1. An autonomous country the territory of which is foreign territory with reference to the French territory;
2. A sovereign country, and distinct from France, in which any French legislation must bear the signature of H.M. the Sultan and be transformed into a Shereefan "Dahir", before enforcement.

Despite these decisions, certain French lawyers and the French Government have attempted to create confusion, in the conceptions of foreign governments, as to the real character of the Moroccan sovereignty.

They interpreted Article 5 of the Treaty of Fès dated March 30, 1912, which authorizes the French Commissary Resident General to act as an intermediary between the Shereefan Empire and other foreign Powers, as a relinquishment of one of the prerogatives of the Moroccan sovereignty.

Now, according to Article 6 of this Treaty, "H.M. the Sultan has the right to conclude treaties of international character with the previous agreement of the French Government".

Consequently, it pertains neither to the Commissary Resident General nor to the French Government to substitute for the State of Morocco for concluding treaties in the name of H.M. the Sultan. It is *indispensable* that any international engagement that commits the future of Morocco be made by the Government of H.M. the Sultan.

According to the statements hereinabove, the United States are to-day occupying considerable surfaces of our country, without being competent or entitled thereto.

Should this be the reason why the idea of the Moroccan affair being discussed before the U.N. Assembly is particularly disagreeable to them?

Be that as it may, the United States should realize that the Moroccan people — in spite of the assertions made by the Commissary Residents General or other French high officials — cannot possibly consider itself as an allied to a nation that not only disregards its right to Freedom and Independence but that scoffs at its most legitimate rights as the *incontested master* of the Moroccan soil!

And if General Guillaume affirms that the Moroccan is the best soldier in the world, the United States may be assured that this soldier will know how to prove it by fighting to the very end for his national aspirations.

The DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF INDEPENDENCE felt obliged to call these facts to the attention of the American Delegation by remitting to them this memorandum.

They do not hesitate to affirm the fact that the government of the United States, by ignoring the existence of the authority of H.M. the Sultan and the rights of the Moroccan people, may sooner or later

bring about difficulties similar to those already created by the policy of the Western Powers in the countries of the Middle East.

The DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF INDEPENDENCE, allowing for the possibility of the Government of the United States having been led into error by affirmations that have proved untrue, wishes to point out to the Delegation of the United States that it is necessary for them to revise their standpoint and bring it more into conformity with their own interests, as well as with the aspirations of the Moroccan people, recognizing thus the primacy of sacred rights over privileges extorted by force. Once their standpoint revised, the United States could work for a just cause and help to construct a world in which the human liberties would no longer be confined to a written Charter but would endow mankind with relief and happiness...

The DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF INDEPENDENCE wishes to recall the position taken by Morocco who was the first State to recognize and to incite the recognition by other States of the American independence, which is clearly shown by the message Georges Washington, the first President of the Republic, sent to H.M. Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdallah in behalf of the American Congress. The Party establishes that the position recently adopted by the American Government is in strange contrast with the good relations that existed between our two countries for centuries.

The DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF INDEPENDENCE which voices the national aspirations, maintains the firm hope that the American Nation, whose anti-colonialist and humanitarian sentiments are proclaimed everywhere in the world, will show comprehension for the just cause of the Moroccan people and will support it in its struggle for its Freedom and Independence.

Respectfully Yours,

ON BEHALF OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY
OF INDEPENDENCE,

The Secretary General:
Mohamed Hassan OUAZZANI.

SUMMARY

We feel that the best way of summarizing the statements analysed in this booklet would be to quote some of the principal declarations made by Sir Mohammad Zafrulla Khan, Minister of Foreign Affairs and President of the Pakistan Delegation to the United Nations.

In his second address to the Assembly, after the American delegate, he showed that he did not wish to let the spokesman of the United States Delegation have the last word in the Moroccan Affair.

The distinguished delegate of Pakistan, proving to be a brilliant orator, with the argumentation of an outstanding dialectician and the courage of a determined fighter for the ideals of mankind, refuted the statement of his American colleague before the General Assembly of the United Nations in the following terms:

"... The representative of the United States added to his undoubted skill a great deal of subtlety. This convinced me that he had no case, for I have had many conversations with him which have engendered in me a deep respect 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...

"...Let me state that our experience in this Organization has been that we hear a lot 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 freedom, liberty, independence and self-determination of a particular people, that role is, by and large, 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...

"...Let us discuss this question, we have been told, because tension is mounting. Today, we are told that we should not discuss it, because tension will mount. Strange. 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 reasons not disclosed, it is not considered convenient to discuss a question.

"...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, having the same culture and being, by and large, of the same race. How should they know what the interests of the people of Morocco are? It is left to the 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 which refers to a woman who professes more solicitude for a child than the child's own mother. This is disappointing.

"...But here is an attempt to to shut out a relevant and important matter relating to the freedom and liberty of 9,000,000 people...

"...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 be heard to put their case — 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? Certainly not a decrease of the tension. 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 and the tension and for the struggle and for the gaoilings and for the murders*, and 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 argue this question."

"...Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." 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..."

Thus, the United States have been publicly confronted with their responsibilities which derive, on one hand, from the *practical situation* created by them in Morocco, especially after the last world war, and on the other hand, from the *official stand* taken by their U.N. delegation in the Moroccan affair.

The question is this: Will the United States be able to face their responsibilities concerning Morocco?

In any case, those in charge of the American policy should take well into consideration certain matters of fact which were brought forward by a well-known French magazine (in December, 1951) which declared that they "can no longer find the proper terms for their propaganda to disguise, also in future, their actual aims. Their words and deeds enhance mistrust in the rest of the world and isolate them more and more every day.

"It is equally impossible for them to carry on with their anti-colonialist deniagogy while supporting the colonialist governments of Great Britain and France, which are their allies — and the peoples in a state of dependency are turning away from them, towards other shores of hope."

Is this what the United States of America really want?