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AGENDA ITEM 79


CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS
(concluded)

1. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) recalled that he had already submitted amendments (A/C.1/L.262) to the draft resolution submitted by Indonesia, Jordan and Libya (A/C.1/L.261). However, after consulting with the sponsors and various other delegations, his delegation had decided to revise its amendments, which now read as follows:

"1. Delete the second paragraph of the preamble, beginning with the words 'Considering that Morocco and France . . .'"

"2. In operative paragraph 2:

"(a) Replace the words 'France and Morocco' by the words 'the parties concerned';

"(b) Replace the words 'in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter of the United Nations' by the words 'on the basis of the right of self-determination'."

2. Operative paragraph 1 would remain unchanged and his first amendment to operative paragraph 2 would be the same as the one he had already proposed in document A/C.1/L.262. His second amendment to that paragraph was intended to replace the new operative paragraph 3 he had proposed in document A/C.1/L.262 and had now withdrawn. He expressed the hope that the sponsors would be able to accept his amendments in their new form and that the amended text would have the Committee's support.

3. Mr. RIPA'I (Jordan) remarked that the sponsors of the draft resolution were more concerned with principles than with political facts. Since the principles reflected in both the draft resolution and the amendments to it were recognized in the Charter of the United Nations and were basic to the settlement of any international problem involving the independence and territorial integrity of a Member State, he did not see how the Committee could fail to support them.

4. Mr. DADET (Congo (Brazzaville)) disagreed with the contention put forward by the Moroccan representative at the 1117th meeting that the situation in Mauritania was not comparable to that in the other African States. Morocco's claim to Mauritania had been bolstered up by all sorts of ethnic, linguistic, religious and other considerations which were plainly out of date, as the representative of the Ivory Coast had intimated at the 1117th meeting. The Moroccan representative had protested against the United Nations being asked to give its sanction to a "fait accompli"; but surely it had done precisely that in many African States. In any event the principle invoked by Morocco to establish its sovereignty over Mauritania was not applicable in practice. His own country was making no claim to the territory now belonging to neighbouring States, although it had at one time belonged to his country's former rulers. Nor was Dahomey claiming part of Nigeria because a number of Dahomans were Nigerian citizens. Indeed, if all the newly independent States were to try to annex all the territory where some of their people were living, the United Nations would have dozens of such problems before it. The analogy with the situation between Morocco and Mauritania was obvious.

5. To his regret, he was unable to support the draft resolution and the amendments to it. It would be most unwise to take rash decisions about Africa without leaving time to study the problems involved. The adoption of such a text would establish a very dangerous precedent which would certainly open the way for an avalanche of territorial claims.

6. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom) associated himself with the principles so admirably stated by the representative of Dahomey at the 1117th meeting. After careful consideration, his delegation had been forced—regretfully, for his Government had close and friendly relations with the Government of Morocco—to the conclusion that the facts did not support the arguments or the claims of the Moroccan Government.

7. There was no escaping the conclusion that operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution necessarily implied the postponement of the independence of Mauritania, which had been set for 28 November. After that date, neither France nor any other country could enter into negotiations with Morocco about the future of Mauritania. It would then be for the Mauritanian people to decide upon their future; if they wished to join the Moroccan community they would be perfectly free to do so.

8. The amendments introduced by Afghanistan did not remove the inherent weaknesses of the draft resolution. There could be no "parties concerned" except the people of Mauritania, and they had already decided for independence. Within a matter of hours, Mauritania would be independent and it would be
unwarranted — and in fact impractical — for the Committee to take any decision which involved the postponement of independence. For those reasons, his delegation was unable to support either the draft resolution or the amendments to it.

9. Mr. BERARD (France) expressed appreciation of the spirit in which the Afghan representative had submitted his amendments. The deletion of the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, in particular, was welcome to the French delegation. Nevertheless, the amendments did not entirely dispel the misgivings felt by his own and many of the African delegations.

10. In the first place, as the draft resolution was sponsored by three States which supported the Moroccan cause, it might appear to be a condemnation of the Mauritanian view. He did not think that the Committee really wished to endorse such a view.

11. Secondly, the first paragraph of the preamble read: "Having examined the question of Mauritania". The Committee had in fact considered an item on its agenda, but he wondered whether there really was a question of Mauritania which required settlement. It seemed to be more a figment of the imagination of those who wished there to be such a question. The present Government of Mauritania represented 90 per cent of the population and, even among the other 10 per cent, there were very few persons who were opposed to the existence and integrity of the present State.

12. Thirdly, operative paragraph 1 referred to the principle of respect for the unity and territorial integrity of Member States, which merely strengthened the misgivings of his delegation. That was of course one of the principles of the United Nations, but at the present juncture the important thing was not the unity and territorial integrity of Member States but the fact that Mauritania would be independent in the immediate future, and that was not mentioned in the draft resolution. Furthermore, it would be unfortunate for the Committee to adopt a text which gave the impression that the United Nations was concerned for the unity and territorial integrity of its Members only. He was convinced that the sponsors had not intended to imply that, but the text might give that impression.

13. Operative paragraph 2 of the revised text (A/C. 3/L.261/Rev.1) recommended that the parties concerned should enter into negotiations, but who were the parties concerned? From the statements of the Jordanian and Afghan representatives, it was clear that the parties were not France and Morocco, so they must be Morocco and Mauritania. His delegation had no objection whatever to negotiations between those two countries, but that was a matter for the countries concerned and not for the Committee. If two fully independent States wished to come to an agreement and, above all, establish relations as good neighbours, that was their affair. However, one of the prerequisites of such negotiations was the recognition by Morocco of the Nouakchott Government; but the Moroccan representative had stated that his Government was not prepared to recognize the independence of Mauritania.

14. The reference in the latter part of operative paragraph 2 to the solution of the problem on the basis of the right of self-determination seemed to imply that that right had not yet been exercised; but there had been several consultations and a referendum, in which the Mauritanian people had stated their wishes by an overwhelming majority. If the validity of the consultations and referendum was to be contested, that of the consultations or referendums which had been held in the twelve new African Member States must also be contested. That would be a very bad precedent, and no delegation would wish to cast doubt on the independence of the new African countries. As the representative of the Congo (Brazzaville) had said earlier in the meeting, what the Committee was being asked to do was to recognize only a conditional independence for the Islamic Republic of Mauritania; but he doubted that it was entitled to do so. Mauritania was a completely independent republic which had entered into an agreement with France with the full consent of both Parliaments and was about to celebrate its independence. Most of the States represented on the Committee were to be represented at the independence celebrations and had agreed to appoint ambassadors to Mauritania. If the Committee adopted a draft resolution making no reference to independence, it would appear to be casting doubts on the attitude of most Member States, which would be most unfortunate.

15. In common with the delegations of Dahomey, Gabon, the Ivory Coast and the Congo (Brazzaville), he urged the Moroccan delegation not to cast doubt on Mauritania's independence. For many years, France had had close bonds of friendship with Morocco which no passing disagreements could destroy. In granting independence to Mauritania, as it had to Morocco, the French Government felt that it had been above board in its attitude to both. The Moroccan representative had presented his case with great skill and eloquence and had explained his Government's position clearly. Perhaps it would be best to leave it at that.

16. As he had said before, the independent Republic of Mauritania was certainly anxious to establish friendly relations with all countries and particularly with its neighbours. Whether it wished to establish special links with one country or another was a matter for Mauritania to decide. The French delegation was most anxious that relations of trust and good neighbourliness should exist between Mauritania and Morocco. The essential condition for that was a sincere recognition of the complete independence of the Republic of Mauritania.

17. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said that he was somewhat bewildered by some of the statements made in the debate, particularly by the representative of France, who seemed to be putting himself forward as a champion of Mauritanian independence, the implications being that Morocco and the other Arab States were seeking to delay or prevent it. Such a travesty of the truth was grotesque. The French representative must know how hard the Arab delegations and a few others had fought for the independence of the African peoples. There was no question of preventing the independence of Mauritania; the question was whether that independence should be achieved by mutilating another African territory or by attaining unity with it. The question was the partitioning of Morocco, not the independence of Mauritania; the Arab delegations were opposed to partition, not to independence. Morocco was not claiming a territory
that was not its own; historically and culturally, Mauritania had always been part of Morocco.

18. It was most unjust to accuse the sponsors of the revised draft resolution (A/C.3/L.281/Rev.1) and the representative of Afghanistan of wishing to obstruct the independence of another African country. Such an accusation was particularly inappropriate from France, which was fighting a desperate colonial war in Africa. The French representative had said that the people of Mauritania had already exercised their right of self-determination in the referendum. But they had not been offered the alternative of uniting with Morocco. Only if the people of Mauritania had been allowed to state, in a referendum supervised by the United Nations, whether they wished for independence separate from Morocco or in association with it, would the result be valid.

19. He expressed the hope that the Committee would be able to adopt the draft resolution, which was simple and straightforward. There could be no objection to the first paragraph of the preamble, although the French representative had maintained that there was no "question of Mauritania". All the paragraph meant was that the Committee had considered its agenda item on Mauritania. He could not follow the French representative's argument against operative paragraph 1; surely all Member States must be anxious for their own unity and territorial integrity to be recognized. Lastly, there could hardly be an objection to operative paragraph 2. Everyone was anxious for a peaceful solution of the problem and the United Nations was committed to the principle of self-determination.

20. Mr. PAZHWA (Afghanistan), thanking the French representative for his tribute to the Afghan delegation, said he had proposed the deletion of the second paragraph of the preamble and the amendment of the first part of operative paragraph 2 in order to meet objections made by France. However, the French representative still had some objections to the formulation "the parties concerned". As France itself would very shortly not be one of the parties concerned—at least in its own opinion—the French delegation need not be concerned about those words. Both the United Nations and the parties concerned knew very well who they were.

21. He found it difficult to understand how the French representative could maintain that there was no "question of Mauritania". By the very fact of placing the problem of Mauritania on its agenda, the United Nations had recognized its existence. That was why the Afghan delegation had accepted the first paragraph of the preamble. It was also difficult to see how any objection could be made to a recommendation that the parties concerned should enter into negotiations with a view to reaching a peaceful solution, whether the parties were independent countries or not. The reference to the right of self-determination, a right which the United Nations had affirmed many times, was equally unobjectionable. Although there was no specific mention of independence, surely it was implicit in self-determination, which certainly did not exclude independence. He hoped that his proposal would be acceptable to the Committee and thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution for incorporating his revised amendments into their text (A/C.1/L.281/Rev.1).

22. Mr. BOGUTTA (Morocco), exercising his right of reply, recalled that references had been made to the fact that certain international bodies, and in particular the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, had granted loans to Mauritania without taking account of the fact that the territory was part of Morocco. It should be pointed out, however, that in allocating the loan in question, the International Bank had made it clear that its decisions should, in no account be interpreted as prejudging the final definition of the political status of Mauritania and that Morocco should not consider that its rights had been overlooked, since the decision was a purely commercial one.

23. It was important to emphasize that point, because, for the first time in the Committee, an attempt was being made to disregard Morocco's contention that part of its territory was being taken as the basis for the establishment of a new State.

24. With regard to the allegations made by the representative of France at the 1117th meeting, several Moroccan regions which were now free had been in exactly the same position as Tindouf and Fort Trinquet and although they had also been under military command, Morocco's authority over those areas had also extended to administrative and political matters and the only currency used there had been Moroccan.

25. While Morocco was certainly not opposed to the attainment of independence by an African State, it feared that the independence about to be granted was far from complete, and felt that it would be unfortunate if the Committee were to ratify "a fait accompli". His delegation therefore wished to emphasize, for the benefit of other African States, that the case under consideration was by no means comparable to their own, because it concerned a territory that had been taken from Morocco and used for the creation of a separate State.

26. Much had been said about the need for peoples to express their wishes freely, but the fact was that the Mauritanian people had not been given a proper opportunity to express its wishes. Morocco would give its support to any proposal that would promote a satisfactory solution without establishing dangerous precedents or jeopardizing the future. Since the question of precedents had been raised, Morocco felt it necessary to point out that there would have been more likelihood of establishing a dangerous precedent if it had remained silent and failed to place the matter before the United Nations. The example of Katanga should not be forgotten.

27. Mr. JHA (India) observed that there still seemed to be some misapprehensions and qualms among members of the Committee concerning the draft resolution. It had been implied that an attempt was being made to bring pressure to bear on a State which was about to become independent and had exercised its right of self-determination. However, India did not consider that the revised draft resolution could be construed as jeopardizing the future independence of any territory. Any independent country was free to enter into negotiations and the right of self-determination was available to all peoples who wished to exercise it at any time. There was therefore no constraint in the revised draft or any commitment to accept the claims advanced by the delegation of Mo-
rocco. However, in an effort to dispel any lingering apprehensions, India formally proposed an amendment to the revised draft resolution (A/C.1/L.261/Rev.1) whereby operative paragraph 2 would read:

"Expresses the hope that the parties concerned will reach a peaceful solution of the problem on the basis of the right of self-determination."

The substitution of the words "Expresses the hope" and the deletion of any reference to "negotiations" should make the draft more acceptable. The terms "peaceful solution" and "parties concerned" had been retained because it was obviously the function of the General Assembly to promote the peaceful solution of problems and the duty of all to seek such solutions. Moreover, to allege that there were no parties to the dispute, or that there was no problem at all, would be entirely consistent with the fact that the present item had been included in the Assembly's agenda and that considerable time had been devoted to its discussion. As for the right of self-determination, it could not be circumscribed, for all peoples should be free to exercise it in respect of any subject and it was not confined only to dependent peoples.

28. Mr. TOURE Ismaël (Guinea) commended the Afghan amendments, which he felt would help to solve the problem. They fully accorded with the policy of the Guinean delegation, which was anxious to assist the Moroccan Government in seeking a solution that would meet its own wishes for a union with Mauritania and at the same time satisfy the aspirations of the Mauritians.

29. Representing a young African nation, the Guinean delegation felt that it had the duty to warn public opinion of the very real dangers to the people of Mauritania inherent in the form in which independence was offered to them. Guinea regarded independence as an inalienable right of all peoples; but independence was not an end in itself or a mere abstract principle. It was of value only in so far as it enabled a people genuinely to advance its well-being in all spheres. The Mauritanian problem certainly existed, for it was always alarming to see an African country, on the threshold of nationhood, bound by treaties imposed against its will and subjected to economic control, as Mauritania obviously was. Guinea was also concerned over the preparations that were being made to install military bases in Mauritania. Such a situation indicated that there was no real desire to bring about genuine independence and well-being. In the interests of true solidarity, all peoples of Africa should be united in opposing spurious offers of independence, for the Mauritanian problem showed that unity was needed to face a common danger. Colonialism had been based on two main factors, the deprivation of liberty and the "divide and rule" principle. True independence and unity—the antithesis of those factors—were needed to counter them.

30. The real danger to Mauritania lay in its lack of economic freedom. Guinea did not regard Morocco's claim as indicative of a revival of colonialism. Indeed, while Morocco wished to see Mauritania a part of its national territory, there was a parallel trend of opinion in Mauritania which favoured reunification with Morocco. If the extent of Mauritanian feeling in favour of unification were to be gauged, the referendum held by France could not be taken as a reliable guide. The amendments proposed by Afghanistan were therefore to be welcomed, as they introduced the fundamental principle of self-determination, and only the exercise of that right would enable the true feelings of the people of Mauritania to be ascertained.

31. There was no denying that elsewhere in Africa there existed problems similar to that of Mauritania. But that was all the more reason for discussing the problem. Guinea itself had a similar problem. The peoples of Portuguese Guinea and Sierra Leone, who had ethnical and linguistic ties with Guinea, would one day be freed from colonial rule and the question of reunification would arise. Those problems could not be evaded and would have to be solved on the basis of self-determination. Unfortunately, those who in the past had assumed responsibility in Africa were now opposed to genuine unity.

32. Guinea was against all forms of unity under the protection of colonialists, and for that reason had rejected the Franco-African Community, which offered an artificial unity and could only impede Africa's evolution. One particular instance of imposed unity was that based on language. The fact that Guinea's neighbour Sierra Leone was an English-speaking territory did not justify placing a dividing wall between them. The dismemberment of African federations had not been the doing of Africans. The threat to the unity of the Congo and the recent breaking up of the Federation of Mali showed the very real danger that existed. The trouble must be sought among those who promoted African unity when it suited them and discarded it on other occasions. For that reason, the problem of Mauritania should be approached with an open mind and a proper understanding of the position of the Moroccan Government.

33. With regard to the Afghan amendments, now incorporated in the revised draft resolution (A/C.1/L.261/Rev.1), Guinea fully approved of the deletion from the preamble of the reference to the 1956 agreements between France and Morocco, because the problem went beyond those agreements and should be viewed in the light of the evolution of the entire African continent. Since the problem was not merely a territorial claim concerning Morocco and France, a solution must be sought that provided for genuine unity and the establishment of a viable entity. Those who were insisting on Mauritania's accession to independence were undoubtedly doing so with a view to isolating the country and so weakening it as to make it into an instrument of their policy. But that did not mean that Guinea was opposed to Mauritanian independence; it merely wished to warn the Mauritanian people against measures which might alienate it from its friends and neighbours. By eliminating any suggestion of claims the Afghan amendments gave hope that the problem of Mauritania could be solved constructively.

34. As Guinea interpreted the term, "the parties concerned" meant all those who had an interest in the problem of Mauritania, namely the French Government—so long as its responsibilities lasted—the Government and people of Morocco, and the people of Mauritania. Mauritania had the option of deciding against a fusion of the two States; indeed, the matter was for the people of Mauritania alone to decide. On that point the amendment was quite clear and proposed a solution on the basis of self-determination.
Accordingly Guinea could support the revised draft resolution without violating any of its principles. Guinea also favoured regroupings and was opposed to any form of Balkanization designed to make Mauritania a strategic base.

35. Thus in supporting the revised draft resolution Guinea was in no way opposing genuine independence for Mauritania, as some had contended. On the contrary, the motive of those members who supported the revised draft resolution was the desire to safeguard the future of Africa.

36. The Guinean delegation had not been a party to the regrettable attacks made against the League of Arab States, the United Arab Republic, Ghana and other delegations, for it was anxious to see greater unity among those African nations which had been afflicted with the same problems. He expressed appreciation to the sponsors of the draft resolution for having incorporated the Afghan amendments into their text.

37. Mr. Rifa'i (Jordan) said that he and the other sponsors of the draft resolution welcomed the initiative taken by the Indian representative and would be prepared to support his amendment if it was put to the vote.

38. Mr. Rossides (Cyprus) said that the Afghan amendments coincided broadly with Cyprus's own views, and were of considerable importance, since they altered the whole tenor of the draft resolution. However, the amendment submitted by the Indian delegation would improve the text still further, because the expression of a hope, rather than a recommendation, would give less impression of exercising pressure upon the parties concerned. The delegation of Cyprus would support the revised draft resolution, since it did not constitute any interference with Mauritania's right to independence, and it might help to clarify the situation. If, as was alleged, the people of Mauritania did not want union with Morocco, their wishes could easily be ascertained since provision was made for a peaceful solution on the basis of the right of self-determination. The United Nations must not overlook any course that might promote a satisfactory solution of the problem, and while all were agreed that the right of independence should be protected, there was no reason why the aspirations towards unity should not be encouraged provided they were determined freely. Cyprus, accordingly, would support the revised draft resolution and the Indian amendment.

39. Mr. Fourie (Union of South Africa) observed that by the time the draft resolution came before the General Assembly Mauritania would be a fully sovereign and independent State. It was therefore no longer appropriate or even possible for France to negotiate with another country concerning the frontiers or the future of Mauritania. Furthermore it would be contrary to the provisions of the Charter if the United Nations were to ask Mauritania to enter into negotiations with Morocco about its future. Of course if, in the exercise of its sovereignty, Mauritania wished to enter into negotiations with or even join Morocco, it should be free to decide the question itself, through its Government. But so far, the Government of Mauritania had not had an opportunity of expressing its point of view.

40. The South African delegation considered that the revised draft resolution would constitute interference in the internal affairs of Mauritania and, indeed, impose limitations on the sovereignty and independence of a new State. It would therefore vote against the draft as a whole, and would refrain from voting on any of its constituent parts if voted on separately.

41. Mr. Hasan (Pakistan) considered that the debate had been inconclusive and that the purpose of the draft resolution submitted was far from clear. Since the revised draft to a great extent merely echoed the Charter, it would only be emphasizing the obvious. The principle of the Charter could be presumed to be the basis of all Members' international relations and actions. It was not clear whether the intention of the draft was to postpone the independence of Mauritania pending negotiations, and it also failed to specify the parties concerned. Since Pakistan's main concern was with the freedom and independence of Mauritania, any measure that might delay that independence would be unacceptable. Since the purpose and the possible effects of the draft resolution seemed doubtful, the Pakistan delegation had decided not to vote for it. As for the Indian amendment, it did not make it clear to which party the right of self-determination applied.

42. Mr. Son Sann (Cambodia) regretted having to express a view on the question of Mauritania on the eve of the proclamation of its independence in accordance with the wishes of its people. Even if there were any doubts as to the validity of the consultations held, it was too late to rectify the matter before independence was achieved. His delegation could only express the hope, therefore, that the independent Mauritania would, in the full exercise of its sovereignty, enter into negotiations with the countries concerned with a view to establishing new relations and settling all common problems on the basis of the right of self-determination. Bearing those considerations in mind, and the appeals made by the members of African delegations, Cambodia would abstain from voting on the texts submitted.

43. Mr. Coulibaly (Ivory Coast) said that, in the present instance, the right of self-determination must be exercised by the responsible authorities of an independent Mauritania and of Morocco, and not by Mauritaneans who had left their country.

44. Although he was reluctant to make distinctions between white and black Africans, he could not help noting the tendency of North African countries to expand southward rather than, for example, eastward. A new imperialism appeared to be taking the place of the old.

45. The Committee should take no action on the present question until Mauritania had attained independence and had been admitted to the United Nations, so that it could state its own wishes with regard to its political future. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution (A/C.1/ L.261/Rev.1), which was intended to commit Mauritania in absentia. He requested that a roll-call vote be taken on the resolution.

46. Mr. Herrera (Guatemala) said that in the present dispute two basic principles of the United Nations Charter, both of which his delegation strongly supported, were pitted against each other: the principle of the Independence and self-determination of
peoples, and the principle of the territorial integrity of States. He wished to commend France for its far-sighted policy of granting independence to its former colonies. However, in view of the serious doubts raised by the arguments put forward on both sides and the vagueness of the drafts submitted, his delegation would abstain from voting.

47. Mr. SALL (Senegal) said his delegation felt that nothing should be done to place obstacles in the way of Mauritania's attainment of independence, and would therefore vote against the draft resolution and the amendments.

46. Mr. SLIM (Tunisia) said that despite the close ties between his country and Morocco, his delegation would be guided in its stand on the present issue by what it considered to be right and just; he was certain that the long friendship between Tunisia and Morocco would survive their present differences. He did not share the view of some delegations that Morocco was pursuing a policy of domination with regard to Mauritania; it was understandable that, on the basis of historic bonds, Morocco should have sought union with Mauritania. However, the fact remained that Mauritania was to attain independence in two days. His country was firmly attached to the principle of self-determination and could not support any move to prevent Mauritania from attaining independence, particularly since it would in the process be freeing itself from colonial domination. His country would reject, once it was independent, the Mauritanian proposal to link its future with that of Morocco. The revised draft resolution and the amendment submitted by India still contained certain ambiguities which might jeopardize Mauritania's future, including its ties with Morocco. His delegation would therefore abstain from voting on both the draft resolution and the amendment.

49. Mr. JHA (India) said that his delegation's purpose in submitting its amendment had been to find a formula generally acceptable to the members of the Committee. Since the amendment apparently could not serve that purpose, he would withdraw it.

50. Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq) said he would like to reintroduce the amendment in the name of his delegation.

51. The CHAIRMAN called for a vote on the Iraqi amendment.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Australia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Austria, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Gabon, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta.

Abstaining: Cambodia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iran, Japan, Laos, Liberia, Mali, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina.

The amendment was rejected by 39 votes to 31, with 25 abstentions.

52. Mr. JHA (India) said that in view of the closeness of the vote on the Iraqi amendment, and in order to avoid creating further bitterness between African nations, his delegation proposed that no vote be taken on the draft resolution and that the disposition of the question of Mauritania should be left to the good sense of the people concerned.

53. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) supported the Indian representative's proposal, on the ground that the Committee's first concern must be the promotion of good relations between the Mauritanian and Moroccan peoples.

54. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan) said that the three sponsors of the draft resolution would not insist that it be put to the vote.

55. Mr. BOUCETTA (Morocco) said that his delegation was prepared to accept any decision that seemed advisable with regard to taking a vote on the draft resolution. He wished to thank all the members of the Committee for their effort to understand the problem, and particularly those who had supported his delegation's position.

56. Mr. BERARD (France) observed that his delegation had never felt that a debate on the problem of Mauritania would serve any useful purpose; he therefore fully endorsed the proposal that no vote should be taken.

57. Mr. BOUCETTA (Morocco) said that the debate on Mauritania had been very useful, the French representative's statement notwithstanding. His delegation continued to feel that its case was just and sound.

58. The CHAIRMAN announced that in the absence of any objection by the Committee no vote would be taken on the three-Power draft resolution.

59. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands) said that his delegation was gratified by the decision taken by the Committee and was grateful to the Afghan representative for having introduced into operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution a reference to self-determination, the only principle that should govern decisions on the political form of States. Nevertheless, it would have voted against the draft resolution if a vote had been taken, since the draft had sought to influence the Mauritanian people's exercise of its right to self-determination and the nature of its relations with Morocco. His delegation would also have voted against operative paragraph 1, since it could not agree that the principle of respect for the territorial integrity of States applied only to Members of the United Nations; it also regretted the clear implication in that paragraph that Mauritania constituted part of Morocco, inasmuch as the Iraqi amend-
ment had contained a reference to the right of self-determination, although presenting a recommendation which the Netherlands had found unacceptable, his delegation had abstained from the vote in order to indicate its support for the principle of self-determination.

60. Mr. AMADEO (Argentina) said that the vote which his delegation had cast on the Iraq amendment should not be taken as prejudging in any way the vote it would have cast on the draft resolution itself.

The meeting rose at 1:40 p.m.