

**PREPARATORY COMMISSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS**

APPROVED VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTY-FIRST MEETING  
OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PREPARATORY COMMISSION  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Held at Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster, London

at

2.30 p.m. on 3 October, 1945.

PRESENT: Representatives of

Australia	Dr. Rt. Hon. H.V. EVATT
Brazil	H.E. M. C. de FREITAS-VALLE
Canada	H.E. Mr. W.H.A. TURGEON
China	Dr. Victor Chi-tsai HOO
Chile	H.E. Senor don Manuel BIANCHI
Czechoslovakia	M. Ivan KERNO
France	H.E. M. Rene MASSIGLI
Iran	H.E. M. Nasrullah ENTEZAM
Mexico	H.E. Dr. Luis Padilla NERVO
Netherlands	H.E. M. J.H. van ROYEN
U.S.S.R.	H.E. M. A.A. GROMYKO
United Kingdom	Rt. Hon. P.J. NOEL-BAKER
U.S.A.	H.E. Mr. E.R. STETTINIUS, Jr.
Yugoslavia	Dr. V. RYBAR

CHAIRMAN: M. Gromyko, Soviet Union.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: Mr. Gladwyn Jebb, United Kingdom.

CHAIRMAN: The meeting is open. At the last meeting of the Executive Committee we discussed the paper prepared by Sub-Committee 10 on the question of the seat of the International Organisation. We discussed that question from the point of view of the requirements which should be considered in connection with discussion of the matter of the seat for the International Organisation. At that meeting, naturally, since the discussion had a general character, no one of the Delegations made any concrete proposal on this question and as we agreed before, after such general discussion we should discuss this question of the seat for the United Nations under a more practical angle, I wish to invite the members of the Executive Committee to speak on this question and if they have any concrete proposals, I ask them to put forward such proposals.

I will ask the first speaker to signify his willingness to speak.

I recall that at the last meeting, the left side of the desk was more active in the first half of the meeting.

DELEGATE OF CHINA: Mr. Chairman, since you hint that you expect this side to begin first, and since nobody wants to begin, may I say a few words, if only for alphabetical reasons.

Until now, we have not suggested any definite place as regards the seat of the new Organisation. At the last meeting we examined the paper establishing the conditions which the seat should have, and I think we came more or less to an agreement. But there are many places which would comply with those conditions, so the paper which we adopted, or which we discussed, at our last meeting does not solve the question, and I think there must be someone to begin here to discuss and suggest names. Otherwise, we will never come to a decision. As the representative of China, I would express the views of my country on this subject. I think we have something to say in this matter as we had the experience of the former seat of the world Organisation which was at Geneva, and we are, therefore, acquainted with the needs of the next seat.

I think all of you know what kind of experience we have had with Geneva - and although the failure of the League can not be considered as due to its seat - we believe that the memory of the seat where all the attempts to maintain peace have failed, would influence the whole atmosphere of the Organisation if the new Organisation were to be seated in Geneva. I don't want to say anything against Geneva itself, or the country in which it is situated, but the fact is that what was called "the spirit of Geneva", has changed its meaning during the last ten years of the League. As you remember, in 1927 and '28, the "spirit of Geneva" meant something new and constructive from the point of view of cooperation among the nations. But later, it was allowed to change its meaning and the "spirit of Geneva" became almost similar to the expression "spirit of Munich".

I am afraid that if the new Organisation were to be established in Geneva, something of that spirit, the memories of that spirit anyway, would weigh upon the discussions and would influence more or less the work of the new Organisation.

So the Chinese Government would favour another seat, and in another world. We are trying an experiment which is not quite new, but we think this experiment should begin on a new basis, and one of the bases is location. So the Chinese Government would favour as the seat of the new Organisation, the new world, so that a new spirit might imbue the whole organisation. For us, it is not for egoistical, selfish reasons, that we have this preference, because the new world is just as distant from China as the old world, or Europe. So from that point of view, we don't mind having the seat either in the new or old world, because the distance would be the same for China.

And speaking of the new world, we have in mind, of course, the country which has done so much in this war to help the United Nations to win this war and in which the Conference which has established the Charter has been held - I mean the United States of America.

So the Chinese Government would be in favour of having the seat in the United States of America; and as regards the place name, I think all those who have been in San Francisco appreciate its climate which allows one to work much more than in any other place. It really corresponds to all the conditions about the climate which were stated in the paper I have mentioned.

The Chinese Government would favour the United States of America and San Francisco as the new seat of the new Organisation.

CHAIRMAN: I recognise the representative for France.

DELEGATE OF FRANCE: (Speaking in French: English version as delivered by interpreter follows): Unlike my friend Dr. Victor Hoo, I am not of the opinion that our discussion of the last meeting didn't take us any further; on the contrary, because from that discussion and from the agreement which emerged from that discussion of a general nature, there are already certain conclusions to which

we are bound to arrive. The first of these is that every precaution must be taken that the United Nations shall be able to hold its meetings in full independence and in full freedom in all circumstances. If that is the case, I would infer from that that it is impossible to place the seat of the United Nations on the territory of any State whose Government has been given, under the Charter, special rights and prerogatives, which some have thought excessive, because independence doesn't mean merely the fact of having communications galore, being able to use codes, and having a diplomatic pouch. It is also that the seat shall be so placed that the meetings can be held in an atmosphere of real freedom and independence. And I doubt whether it is expedient to place the seat of the Organisation in the territory of any country - and here I am sure that my colleagues will understand the spirit in which I speak. It is realised I am sure all around that toward the particularly privileged countries under the Charter, we have nothing but feelings of friendship and affection. But I wonder whether it would be a skillful thing to do to place the seat in the territory of a country which if it did become a party to a conflict is entitled, in dealing with that conflict, under the terms of the Charter, special rights and privileges.

Suppose you had the seat placed in the territory of a large State which had these privileges and it became involved in a conflict. Do you think that in the present state of political methods and journalistic habits it would be said that it could really operate in freedom if it had to carry out its discussions under the eye of the journalists of that particular country who, I would point out, would be more numerous than the others, and if it had to debate in such surroundings, in an atmosphere of over-excited passion where there would be floods of false news of all sorts, and rumours?

It, therefore, seems to me we are bound to reply in the negative to that, which means to say, I don't think we can contemplate placing the seat of the Organisation in the territory of a permanent member of

the Security Council. If that is the case, if I am right in this inference, having eliminated five countries, we now have to consider where else this seat could be placed. Now the Chinese Delegate was suggesting that the seat should be placed in the new world. Now I should like to plead, and to say why I wish to plead the cause of Europe.

It is certain that if we take a look around Europe and contemplate the possibility of placing the seat there, the spectacle that Europe presents at the moment is not an encouraging one. There are ruins everywhere, and even where there are no ruins, there are terrible problems. We know that Europe is cast down and in the grip of a terrible crisis. But it is also true to say that Europe will rise again out of that crisis, and that it must be raised out of that crisis, and that it is in the interests of all to raise it out of its present condition. And therefore, there is a very great case here. It is very important that Europe should be set on its feet again and that its morale should be re-established, including its faith in an international order because the nations of Europe in their day believed in the League, had faith in it, and they were cruelly disappointed. And therefore, we must re-acustom the European nations to viewing things from the world, and from the wider point of view - both their life and their problems in the wider setting of the world life and world problems. We must endeavour to link the countries in such a way that they can disrupt themselves from the constant preoccupation with purely national problems, with problems that are day by day problems and get them to rise to the level where they can contemplate problems on a European and on a world plane. And therefore, and again, if we wish to restore better conditions in world trade and generally restore the economic position of the world, there again, these problems must be viewed on a world basis, and we must get these countries of Europe out of the habit of looking at their own problems, their own pressing problems from the purely narrow point of view of their own imports, their own unemployment, and get them back again into the habit of contemplating all these problems on a wider basis.

Now if that is the case, it follows that it would be a great thing if the seat of the Organisation could be placed in Europe. Europe of course, consists of poor countries. And that is another point I would like to bring out. And when I say poor countries, I mean these countries are poor alike in men and poor in money. And if you placed the seat of the Organisation in a far distant country, it would be impossible for the European nations to send there Delegations which are adequate in numbers or adequate in quality or to keep them there. And not only that, it would be also impossible for the European Press to be adequately represented at the meetings.

Many of my colleagues here were in London at the time of the San Francisco conference. We are well aware that the English Press is the richest Press of all Press in Europe. It has its foreign correspondents, it is able to subscribe to the news services. Now I would like to ask you what place did news of San Francisco occupy in English newspapers? What opportunity was there to glean from English newspapers a clear account of what was going on in San Francisco? And if we come to continental papers, French or Belgian papers, with even less resources, the situation is still worse. It was quite impossible to follow the debates intelligently from these papers. And you are not going to revive the faith of European nations in an international European and international order unless you keep them informed of the problems which arise, and keep them clearly informed of the manner in which they are being treated.

Therefore, the conclusion I draw is that public opinion in Europe must be placed in the position to follow what is going on in the world organisation and more than that, private organisations must equally

be in a position to send their Delegates there to follow and study the work which is going on. And the problem of money and the problem of transport must not constantly obtrude itself between these Delegates and the Conferences they wish to attend.

There is another reason why I would prefer this that I would like to mention, and which also has its importance. We have, as I said, to recreate that world consciousness. Europe must have contacts in the world, and to do that, the best place in which it can do it is in the United Nations Organisation.

Now in Europe, possibly as a consequence of history, it has been alleged, wrongly alleged that there is an apposition between the east and the west. And it seems to me that although that is untrue, it would be still less true the better opportunities are for the east of Europe to meet the west of Europe and it is a very different thing if you have Europeans from the east and west meeting in Europe rather than that they should meet in some far distant point of the world. In the interest of a rapprochement in Europe, it would be well to have the seat in Europe, and that would be of benefit to the world as a whole. I think you will all agree to that.

I said before, the spectacle of Europe at the moment is not a very engaging one, and I can understand people saying, "Let's have the Organisation in the new world." At the same time, I would like to point this out: I don't think it is possible for the new world to develop on the ruins of the old world. It will serve the greatness of the new world best if it develops in association with the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the old world. It is therefore, I think, to the interest of the new world itself to see that reconstruction and rehabilitation processes go forward. And in any case, it seems to me that in present circumstances, the argument that Europe may be in ruins is no longer an argument and must not be

allowed to be an argument.

Now I am coming to the question of where we might place the seat, and it is because of a certain idea I had in mind that I was reluctant to agree on the last occasion to the idea that the country of the seat must necessarily be a country which speaks one of the working languages of the United Nations. There are various solutions. I think as regards accessibility, there are certainly points in Europe readily accessible. One can even say there are certain points in Europe more accessible to most than certain parts of North America are from many other places and places which it is easier to reach from South America than certain spots in North America are.

As regards which town should be chosen - as far as Geneva is concerned, there are many pros and cons. If it is felt that there is an absolute objection to Geneva, I should be the last to insist for one moment on Geneva, but if we are going, as I said, to find an adequate point of contact between the east and the west of Europe, I wonder whether Denmark would not afford us such a place, or Austria? Either might afford us a solution. And I wonder whether there wouldn't be great political advantage in placing the seat in Austria. But of course, there may be other solutions but it seems to me before we go into the question of the actual place, we should first of all settle the question whether the seat is to be in Europe or outside of Europe. And I would point out, if the choice was made in Europe, it would, to my mind, follow as a necessary consequence that the Secretary-General should in that case be a non-European.

CHAIRMAN: I recognise the representative for Australia, Dr. Evatt.

DELEGATE OF AUSTRALIA: Mr. President, I think that what we are called upon to do is recommend a seat for the permanent headquarters



of the Organisation. And in my opinion, nothing could be worse than to start off by deciding that it is to be in Europe or not in Europe, and then to choose by way of compensation or compromise a Secretary-General from the continent or zone which is not selected for the seat of the Organisation. In my view the Secretary-General question must be kept absolutely distinct from the question of the seat. Clearly the Secretary-General should be elected upon personal qualifications.

What we are required to do is ask what place is most suitable for the seat of the United Nations. Our view is in favour of San Francisco - not because it is part of the United States or because it is not in Europe - but because, after considering all the available evidence, San Francisco is the most suitable site.

I think it is obvious that the peoples of the world expect a fresh start to be made in world organisation; we consider that that can best be done by choosing a new site. That view tells strongly against Geneva, but the case for San Francisco is not a negative case but a positive case. San Francisco has all the facilities. So far as the argument of distance is concerned, modern transport has greatly reduced its importance and the facilities for transport to and from San Francisco are excellent.

It has been claimed that it is essential that the Organization should operate in complete freedom from local or governmental pressure. I agree with that. But it does not follow that the seat should not be situated in the territory of a great power. There is nothing in the Charter that suggests that the site should not be in the territory of any power. Why should the fact that the United States is a permanent member of the Organisation debar a site otherwise suitable from being selected as the permanent seat of the Organization? If that fact was thought to be disqualifying, it would have been expressed in the Charter. There is no such disqualification.

San Francisco is a city which breathes the very spirit of freedom. Freedom of expression is guaranteed in the country to which San Francisco belongs, freedom of expression is enforced by the Courts, nowhere in the world is freedom more secure. It is a city of progress, it looks with courage and confidence to the future. That is the atmosphere which is required for the success of the new Organisation. In drawing up the Charter at the Conference in San Francisco we all recognised with gratitude and admiration the debt we owed to the city of San Francisco and its people. In fact, the Charter was worked out in the spirit of San Francisco - the spirit of progress and freedom and tolerance.

I realise that the question cannot be dealt with finally today but I am convinced that the claims of San Francisco are pre-eminent and are already proved by the great success of the San Francisco Conference which produced the Charter under which the new Organisation will have its being.

DELEGATE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM: Mr. Chairman, I am about to demonstrate one of the glories of the British Commonwealth of Nations: I am going to differ from my friend and colleague, Dr. Evatt.

I am going to start, if I may, with Mr Victor Hoo, whose speech I enjoyed as we all always enjoy his speeches. He started by the assertion that Document 54, to which we devoted three hours of debate on Saturday morning, did not help us; in other words, that our work had been lost and, throwing every line of Document 54 to the winds, he proposed San Francisco with, I venture to submit, a very thin fabric of argument to support what he said. He said at one moment that we ought perhaps to put it in San Francisco because the United States of America had rendered us all such immense services in winning the war. No-one could have greater cause than the people of my country to recognise the immense debt of gratitude we all owe to the United States, both before and after she became a belligerent in the war. But Sir, such an argument, if pressed, might lead to different conclusions. He said that San Francisco would be very suitable because it was the place where the Conference had been held.

Well, that would have led us last time to put the League of Nations in Paris -- and a very unfortunate decision that would have been. In reality, Mr. Victor Hoo brought us only one argument. He said that the memories of the League of Nations would so overshadow all that was done by the new organisation that, if it were in Geneva, it would be brought to failure; and he assumed that there was nowhere else except Geneva where the United Nations was likely to be placed. Well, Sir, I am going to add a word about that. But let me answer what he said about Geneva. On his basis, is it true that the spirit of Geneva came to mean the spirit of Munich? Not, in my belief. The spirit of Munich meant the spirit of Munich. The policies of Munich were conducted not in Geneva but elsewhere. We all said in 1938 (it was a common phrase in the mouths of everybody in the streets in London) that if Mr. Chamberlain had flown to Geneva instead of to Berchtesgaden we should not have had the war. Mr. Churchill made a campaign of speeches round the country in 1938 to say that we ought to stand by the League of Nations in order to stop the coming war. It was in Geneva that the representative of the Soviet Union made his repeated stands for collective security -- we have not forgotten it, and we believe that if the lead of the Soviet Union in Geneva in 1938 had been followed, we should not have had the war.

Sir, because you have failed in a place, do you not go there again? That, to my mind, is very like saying that because the British Parliament was obliged, in defence of parliamentary rights, to cut off the head of King Charles I and thereafter to suffer a dictatorship for a considerable number of years, we ought to have moved from Westminster Hall when we restarted parliamentary government in 1660. But we went back to Westminster Hall and we restarted a Parliament far stronger than it was before we cut off King Charles's head.

Now let us look at this theory that if you have a seat which looks out on the Pacific, you will be making a fresh start. Mr. Victor Hoo, this conflict began in Manchuria in 1931 and we have all said, on all our platforms around the world, that the New World and the Pacific countries, with the 9-power treaty at their disposal, did nothing to try to stop it. Now I do not want to press the argument about memories. I do not want to say anything that would be -- what word shall I use; désobligeant is the only one that comes into my mind - about the memories of the past. But my profound conviction is that this argument about memories is quite falsely conceived. The people will not think in those terms about the seat of the United Nations in Europe, even if that seat be in Geneva. The peoples recognise the difference between the machine and way in which governments use it. If they do not recognise it already, our vital, fundamentally important task is to make them recognise it, and to make them see that it was not the defects of the machinery last time that brought us to disaster; it was the fact that the governments did not carry out the pledges they had made. And we have to make them understand now that this new machinery in itself is not their salvation: it is the way it is used. And, Sir, I believe that that can best be done in the place where the first experiment was made and where the mistakes of the past can be wiped out.

I turn to the positive side of the argument that I want to make. I believe, with M. Massigli, that Document 54 does help us. I believe he is right when he says that the institutions of the United Nations must debate in an atmosphere of independence. I believe that his interpretation of the first paragraph of Document 54 is a right one -- that, however generous

and however liberal the government and people of a great power may be (and none could be so liberal and so generous as that of the United States; we fully recognise it, of course), the independence of the institutions in a small country where the politics are not significant, where the politics will never cut across the international field of action, must be greater than they can be in any great power, whichever it may be -- and I would say that of my own country quite as much as of any other.

Now let us come to another section of Document 54 -- I mean 3(b), which deals with the accessibility of the site to other nations. I have here a table of the number of capitals of other countries which are within certain distances of San Francisco and of the centre of Europe. Within 500 miles radius of San Francisco there are no capitals of other countries. There are 8 that are within 500 miles of the centre of Europe. Within a distance of 1,000 miles of San Francisco there are no capitals, and there are 20 from the centre of Europe. Within a distance of 2,000 miles of San Francisco there are no capitals, and there are 28 from the centre of Europe. Within a radius of 2,500 miles there are three from San Francisco and 30 from the centre of Europe. With regard to accessibility, geographical proximity, convenience for busy members of governments to get to the international centre, I think that table is really very difficult to answer. But it corresponds to another reality. Europe is in fact the centre of the most heavily populated area in the world. There are 403 million people in Europe plus 90 million people in European Russia, and with the populations of parts of Asia and of Africa, anything up to another 600 million or 700 million -- a very great deal nearer to the centre of Europe than they are to San Francisco. But all that corresponds to yet another reality which, although we have had Nazism in Europe, has not ceased to be true, namely, that Europe has been the mother of the civilisations of the New World, that Europe has been

the cradle and exporter of democratic government through parliamentary institutions. And Europe, in my profound conviction, having liberated itself from the forces which clamped down the true development of democracy, parliamentary and social, will ultimately have a power for leadership which Europe has never had before. I think those are powerful arguments. I think there are, in addition, all the arguments used by the French spokesman in his admirable speech, which I only do not repeat because I have already spoken so long and I do not want to weary the Committee.

But I end by saying this, that even if you were to determine that the long-term seat must be far from here, I believe it would be necessary to have a short-term seat -- a provisional preliminary seat -- somewhere in Europe. There are a number of factors of very great importance. The Peace Treaties, in spite of all the excitements of the last days, will some day be made, and they will be made in Europe: no-one doubts it. The men responsible for making them will not always be able constantly to make long journeys to a distant continent. In other words, either the seat must be somewhere near here, or the United Nations may be at times deprived of the services of those who control the governments of the world when they are most needed. In the second place, the factor of movement and expense, is going to be one of very great importance, both for the members of the United Nations, the governments, and for the Press, upon whom in the long run the success of our efforts will depend, because unless public opinion finds out what this is all about, we shall never make it succeed.

Now, in the old League of Nations, we all know what a trouble it was to collect contributions. It remains to this day one of the reproaches against the League of Nations that there are still some debtor States. How many countries are going to be able to pay their contributions in dollars without difficulty in the first few years

after the war? That is not an argument against a long-term decision in favour of the New World, but it is an argument of very great force for the first two or three years, and indeed I think it is true not only that we might have budgetary difficulties (I would be prepared to face those if the other arguments were all right), but I believe the effect of it would be enormously to hamper the actual work that was done because governments would send far smaller delegations than they ought to, the Press would not send proper people and in many many other ways the thing would be limited.

I want to end by making one more observation. Much of my argument has turned on the word "Geneva". But I reserve my position entirely on that and the position of my Government, which in fact is very clear. I say this, that I am in the fullest possible agreement with M. Massigli when he says that the first decision we want is in favour of Europe and then we will discuss the place that can be chosen.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken with the utmost candour, because it is no good conducting a discussion like this unless you say the things that are really in your mind. I hope I have not said anything that anybody would think désobligeant.

DELEGATE OF THE NETHERLANDS: Mr. Chairman, having listened this afternoon to the two very able and eloquent speeches which were made in favour of having the seat of the new international organisation in Europe, I can be very brief.

The Netherlands Delegation also is in favour of having the seat in Europe -- mostly, Mr. Chairman, for the reasons which have already been mentioned, and in particular for the reason which M. Massigli spoke of when he said that it was of the utmost importance that the countries of Europe should again get into the habit of collaborating towards international ideas. Besides this reason, which for us is the principal reason, there is also the extremely practical reason of distance. The delegate of the United Kingdom has shown us by his statistical data how extremely difficult it is to reach San Francisco in the same short time as it is to reach a point in the centre of Europe

I myself have had that experience when leaving San Francisco and being in a hurry to get back to my country; it took me, although I admit that there was a certain delay, 7 days. I think, if there had not been the undue and unaccustomed delay, it certainly would have taken 5 days. So that I cannot agree entirely with Dr. Evatt that the question of transportation in this day and age hardly plays a part in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard from the Delegate from China and also from the Delegate from Australia that there are certain psychological reasons which seem to militate against Geneva. I cannot say that we do not feel the force of these arguments. We certainly do. But, personally, I do not think that in our country we would be haunted by these ghosts of evil memories of the past. However, although being able to state now that the Netherlands Delegation would be in favour of Geneva, I should like to reserve our final point of view on this matter in case the Delegates from other countries are able to convince us that a large part of the public opinion of the world would indeed be haunted by these memories, and for that reason be opposed to Geneva.

Mr. Chairman, I can end now by summing up what I have just said: We of the Netherlands Delegation would be in favour of having the seat in Europe, but not so much for the reason that we would in principle be opposed to having the seat in the territory of a country having a permanent seat on the Council, but for the more idealistic reason that we wish to promote the



co-operation of the countries of Europe towards the ideal of international co-operation, and for the purely practical reason of the distance and the difficulty of travel in reaching a place like San Francisco.

CHAIRMAN: As the representative for the Soviet Union, I wish to say that the Soviet Government has a definite negative attitude towards Geneva as a possible place for the United Nations organisation. The Soviet Government considers that the United States would be the proper place for the United Nations Organisation. The United States is located conveniently between Asia and Europe. The old world has had it once, and it is time for the New World to have it. As to the particular place in the United States, for the time being I have no suggestions to make. This question may be considered and settled later. As to the idea of a temporary place -- an idea which has been expressed by Mr. Noel-Baker -- I personally do not favour such an idea. I think the question of the permanent seat for the International Organisation should be solved at once, at the beginning, and the Executive Committee, it seems to me, should make a recommendation not as to a temporary seat of the Organisation but as to the permanent seat of the Organisation, which is provided by the Interim Agreement on the establishment of the Preparatory Commission. I am not going to say anything about the past in connection with Geneva. It is well known to everybody. I am in agreement with what has been said by my colleagues from China and Australia on this subject. I am not going to add anything in connection with Geneva. That is all I have to say at this stage.

I want to end by making one more observation.  
Much of my argument has turned on the word "Geneva".  
But I reserve my position entirely on that and the  
position of my Government, which in fact is very clear.  
I say this, that I am in the fullest possible agreement  
with M. Massigli when he says that the first decision we  
want is in favour of Europe and then we will discuss  
the place that can be chosen.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken with the utmost candour,  
because it is no good conducting a discussion like this  
unless you say the things that are really in your mind.  
I hope I have not said anything that anybody would think  
desobligeant.

DELEGATE OF THE NETHERLANDS: Mr. Chairman, having  
listened this afternoon to the two very able and eloquent  
speeches which were made in favour of having the seat  
of the new international organisation in Europe, I can  
be very brief.

The Netherlands Delegation also is in favour of  
having the seat in Europe -- mostly, Mr. Chairman, for  
the reasons which have already been mentioned, and in  
particular for the reason which M. Massigli spoke of when  
he said that it was of the utmost importance that the  
countries of Europe should again get into the habit  
of collaborating towards international ideas. Besides  
this reason, which for us is the principal reason, there  
is also the extremely practical reason of distance. The  
delegate of the United Kingdom has shown us by his  
statistical data how extremely difficult it is to reach  
San Francisco in the same short time as it is to reach a  
point in the centre of Europe.

DELEGATE OF YUGOSLAVIA: Mr. Chairman, as a representative of a smaller European State, and being myself a good European, the Yugoslav delegation is nevertheless in favour of the seat being in the United States, and for the following reasons.

It was said that the seat should be in Europe because of European public opinion. I should like to reverse the picture and say that it would be a very good thing, to have the seat in America, from the point of view of American public opinion, and to have it more or less in the centre of the world, because America is so situated that Asia and Europe are almost an equal distance. It is true what the Representative of France and the Representative of Great Britain said, that many of the European questions have been handled in Europe, or that they should be handled in the future in Europe, and therefore it would be suitable if the seat of the United Nations Organisation were in Europe. I do not think the past has shown to us that having the seat in Europe you got a rapprochement between the European peoples. There was discord in Europe amongst the European peoples, and the spirit of Geneva did not help to eliminate it. It is also said that the seat of the United Nations Organisation should not be situated in the country of a great Power but if possible in a smaller country. I am not of this opinion, and for the reason that to have the seat of the United Nations in a smaller country would in no way eliminate the dangers that you would have in a great Power country -- just the opposite, because it has been shown that the smaller European countries have been invaded sometimes overnight and, The French representative will excuse me, just to cite as the future seat Denmark, with all respect and friendship to the valiant Danish people, is in my opinion not the best example. A less good example is Vienna, because especially we South European and Central European peoples have not the happiest memories of Vienna. I do not think

it will encourage and fortify the peoples of those countries in their belief in the United Nations Organization if the seat of such an important international body should be situated there. The Representative of Great Britain has pointed out how many Capitals are nearer to the European centre and how far away they are from San Francisco. I would only point out that those countries which are nearer to the European centre are all situated in Europe.

DELEGATE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM: Not at all. Many of the South American countries are nearer to Europe than they are to San Francisco.

DELEGATE OF YUGOSLAVIA: I think with the planes of today it would be nearer to go, for example, to the United States than to Europe.

DELEGATE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM: No. The measure is the miles.

DELEGATE OF YUGOSLAVIA: Then with regard to the suggestion for a temporary seat, I am not in favour of having a temporary seat for a short time. We have been instructed, as was already pointed out by the Delegate from the Soviet Union by the agreement establishing the Preparatory Commission, "to prepare recommendations concerning the location of the permanent headquarters of the organization."

To end my speech, I should like to point out the following advantages in having the seat in the United States: America was populated more or less from European peoples. They, I would say, fled from Europe, very many for political and economic reasons, to establish there a new home, building up also a new spirit. This new spirit has developed in such a way that we have (and I speak from my own experience) in America a democracy and a freedom such as I do not think you will find in any country in the world. The Report

we have from Committee 10 is so drawn up that all the points point just to America, where you have all the facilities, all the communication and all the freedom you need, and I am convinced that the American Government will give all the facilities and all the possibilities so that the United Nations can work in freedom and without restrictions.

I was listening one night while I was in Washington to the speech of the late President Roosevelt in which he said: "America should be the arsenal of democracy". I hope this idea of his was not confined only to wartime but that it would also apply in peacetime, and therefore I think that this "arsenal of democracy" which has given birth to the United Nations should work there also in peace.

For the reasons I have given, my Delegation is in favour of having the seat of the United Nations in the United States of America.

CHAIRMAN: We are sitting for two hours now. If the members of the Committee do not mind, we may have an intermission for fifteen minutes and have a cup of tea, and then we shall begin again strengthened and refreshed. Return at ten to five.

(Intermission. The Committee reconvened at 5:00 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN: I recognise the representative for the United States, Mr. Stettinius.

DELEGATE OF UNITED STATES: Well, Mr. Chairman, during the last two hours, I felt very much like someone who was being elected to a club and was asked to sit with the membership Committee while his character was being discussed.

I wish to make it very clear that the United States has nothing in mind in this connection other than the success of the United Nations Organization. We must reach the right decision, no matter what that decision is. And I feel that it is a very

important decision. I would hope that it would be possible during our deliberations this autumn to reach a definite decision, for a number of reasons. One of these is that the selection of the Secretariat would be made much more difficult if the decision is not made. I doubt whether there are many in this room who would feel they could take position with the United Nations not knowing where they and their families were to live eventually -- and with the prospect of moving perhaps from one temporary site to another.

I hope that it will be possible for us to reach a decision that will be acceptable to all in this matter. I think our frank discussion this afternoon has been extremely encouraging. Everyone has spoken exactly what was on his heart and mind on this subject. The last thing we would want is that it should ever be necessary for any considerable number of the United Nations to go to in a location with which they were not completely pleased.

Having said that, I wish to make clear the position of the United States. We are not seeking the site of the United Nations Organization within the boundaries of the United States. If it is the will of the majority of the United Nations to come to the United States and have the headquarters of the Organization within the United States, the United States Government stands ready to extend an invitation to the United Nations to come there.

The last point I wish to make, Mr. Chairman, is this: several delegates have spoken for and against San Francisco. We should all keep in mind that there are many possible sites within the United States.

That concludes my comment.

CHAIRMAN: I recognize the representative for Mexico.

DELEGATE OF MEXICO: Mr. President: I wish to state that the opinion of my Government in this respect is that the permanent headquarters should be chosen with a view to the best possible

success of the United Nations Organization. That is the only concern of my Government. We believe that one of the most important factors to achieve that end is the suitable atmosphere prevailing there where the headquarters of the Organization will be located. In deciding which is the most suitable atmosphere due account should be taken of the political as well as the social and moral aspects of it. It is important that the headquarters of the Organization should be located in a place free, as far as possible, from fear of undue interference, enjoying a feeling of security and where the population at large of the host state may be open to lofty ideas from all over the world and able to consider on its own merits and without prejudice the standards that every member of the United Nations respects.

In other words, I believe that the population at large in the host state should not be local-minded but rather international-minded.

My Government believes that the United Nations Organization owe to have the advantages of a fresh start in an atmosphere of faith and optimism, freedom and progress. And we believe, that at the present moment most of those conditions do prevail in the American Continent.

I dare to say that the arguments that have been expressed against a place in the American Continent are not very important arguments. It has been said that there is a great distance in miles between capitals of European states and the American Continent, but in modern times that is a question of relative importance which owe to be measured rather in function of the time needed for transportation than in terms of geographical distance. We have to keep always in mind the Charter of The United Nations and the functions and scope of the different organs. We know how the main decisions regarding the maintenance of peace and security will be taken, that is a function of the Security Council but the argument that the Security Council should not have its seat far from Europe is based on the presumption that Europe will be again in the future the place where a new crisis might arise; I believe that even in such an event the argument is answered by the fact that the Security Council may hold meetings at such places other than the seat of the organization as in its judgement will best facilitate its work.

It has been said that we should not make it very difficult for important men of the governments concerned and for the heads of states to meet at the headquarters of the Organization, as would be the case if the permanent seat of the United Nations is far away from the capitals of their respective states. I do not consider this a very strong argument either; in the first place the chiefs of states are not required to meet at the permanent headquarters of the Organization and as far as they are concerned we have seen how in the past chiefs of governments did travel to distant places, under very difficult situations, when they consider it necessary. We know how many meetings President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Marshall Stalin did hold at points far from the seat of their respective governments.



It has been pointed out also that a great part of the population of the world is in and around Europe and that the seat of the United Nations Organization should be therefore near those millions of people. I agree that we should endeavour to place the United Nations Organization very near the peoples of the World but that can only mean that we should endeavour to be near them in a moral sense so that they will be conscious of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Organisation. Those millions of people could not be said to be far or near the Organizations according to the number of miles that separates them from the physical place where the permanent headquarters are located. They can morally be near or far by other means; regardless of the physical distance they can be approached through the press and broadcasting, through newsreels and educational films and through preaching of certain ideals.

Emphasis has been also placed on the cost of travelling to a far distant place. This argument has two sides: a place near to some countries will be far from others; besides, the expenses involved in reaching a given place no matter how far it is from a given country would be very small if they are compared with the cost of a flying fortress, a battleship, or one atomic bomb. I firmly believe that countries which have been able to spend huge amounts for war can certainly afford to spend much smaller amounts for peace. We must keep in mind in this connection that the sessions of the General Assembly will normally take place only once a year and these will be the occasions that require transportation of large numbers of delegates. Another point that we should take into consideration as adding to the atmosphere to which I have referred is the importance and attitude of the press in the

host state. We need a press free, independent and important, of a circulation as wide as possible and able to reach millions of reading people. We believe that in America, and I mean the American Continent, the press is more concerned with everything that is happening in the world than the European press has generally been in the past of what was happening outside of Europe. I do not mean to say that the European press does not take into consideration what happens everywhere in the world, but the importance that it gives to many problems of countries outside of Europe does not compare with the attention given to all problems all over the world by the press in the American Continent.

It has been said that it is necessary to have the people of Europe more internationally minded. That is true, that is very necessary. But I doubt if that can be accomplished by the fact of having the seat of the Organization in Europe. It did not happen when Geneva was the seat of the League of Nations. We do not have anything to say against Geneva, but if we are to make a choice between the American Continent and the European Continent, for the reasons I have expressed before, which in the opinion of my Government are very important, we prefer the American Continent.

DELEGATE OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA: Mr Chairman I have listened with very keen interest to the discussion which has been going on on this very important matter. Practically we have two proposals before us: Europe or the United States. I confess that both of these proposals can be supported by very very important and strong reasons and arguments. For Europe, for instance, it is quite true, as has been pointed out, that Europe is sick, that Europe

is near despair, that European countries have lost their habit of international co-operation, and that they have not much hope and not much faith in international collaboration. . But all this could be remedied in a very large degree if the Organisation were situated somewhere here in Europe. This is an important argument. On the other hand, there is the argument of the local atmosphere and its influence, and, in the eyes of my Delegation, this is a very important argument. . All of us who have been in the United States at the San Francisco Conference have seen this wonderful atmosphere of the United States. The new Organisation will need an atmosphere of optimism, of hope, and of absolute faith in its own success. We think that such an atmosphere can be best found in the United States. We would hope that a unanimous solution can be found, but if there is no possibility of a unanimous decision and if we are obliged to vote, then my Delegation will vote for the United States. There is now the question where in the United States and there I have been very much impressed by the statistics of Mr. Noel-Baker. It is quite true that for more than 2,000 miles around San Francisco there is no Capital. This is a very serious inconvenience, and perhaps this could be remedied if the seat were located not on the Western Coast but on the Eastern Coast of the United States or near it. Of course, the climate of San Francisco is ideal, but I think in the Eastern part of the United States there are certainly places where the climate would be suitable. I hope, if there is not a unanimous decision, we shall give preference to the United States, if possible to an Eastern city of the United States.

DELEGATE OF CHILI (speaking in French; English version as delivered by interpreter follows): Mr. Chairman, very strong arguments have been adduced on both sides of this debate. The question is an important one -- perhaps one of the most important ones with which we have to deal. I would like to say that we, for our part, have nothing against Geneva -- far from it; but in view of the fact that some Delegations have raised strong and definite objections to Geneva we have to recognise that you cannot force matters. I think in the circumstances, therefore, this being so, we should turn with an open mind and willingly in a new direction. That is why we, for our part, would agree to having the seat in the United States. I would also say that this Committee should endeavour to lend to its decision that degree of unanimity which will make its decision sufficiently strong later on to carry the other Governments with it. In these circumstances, my suggestion is that such differences as have occurred among us should remain among us and that the final decision on this subject should be taken unanimously.

DELEGATE OF BRAZIL: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to give the impression that American Republics are more united than European countries. I shall tell you that between Geneva and San Francisco the vote of my Delegation would be, of course, for San Francisco. We have had a very interesting debate, and many things have been said which would give force to the proposal to have the seat of the Organisation in Europe. On the other hand, if I may say so, arguments have been put forward which apply both ways. Something has

been said about the Press. Some think it is better to have the American Press and some think the European Press. So it is a little bit difficult to find out where the truth is. Our very distinguished colleague from Chili asked us to try to arrive at a common solution. I think that is important, because our decision will not be the last decision, since we have to face the Preparatory Commission, when fifty-one people may have different points of view to recommend to the Assembly. I would like to say that I am a little afraid of having the seat in San Francisco for one reason, and that is the question of accessibility. There might be, perhaps, some movement to have the seat in Philadelphia. I am impressed by the arguments of Mr. Noel-Baker on accessibility. San Francisco is very far away from any place, and it is a danger that if the seat is so far away the Security Council will meet not at the seat of the Organization but in Europe, where three of the Permanent Members always are. Three out of the five members are from Europe. It might perhaps take away the importance of the Security Council if Delegates of not very high grade were the Permanent Members of the Security Council. I hope we shall be in favour of having the seat in the United States but on the Atlantic coast.

CHAIRMAN: Are there any other observations or suggestions?

DELEGATE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM: If no other Delegate desires to speak, I feel it incumbent upon me to do so, because a number of our colleagues who said that they are not against Geneva, or, rather, a seat in Europe, but nevertheless would vote the other way, have appealed to us for unanimity.

I do not want to try to reply to all the speeches which have been

made this afternoon against the thesis which, with the Representatives of France and Holland, I have sustained. But I must make some observations about some of the arguments which have been used.

I ventured to say that it might be necessary to have a short-term decision for a temporary seat on the Continent of Europe, and I gave, as I thought, powerful arguments, which have not at all been answered. Among those arguments I spoke of the trouble about dollars. No one can deny that it is real. Our Mexican colleague, in his very able, moderate and friendly speech, said that after all it was very little money and we ought to be able to spend some money for peace, as we have spent it for war. Well, we have spent it for war. Our Continent has spent it for war. Our Continent has paid a great part of the price of destroying Nazism, and the cost has been far greater because, for a long time, we were left alone. Of course, the general argument that "you must spend money as freely for peace as you do for war" is one which I not only support but use on every platform I ever go on. But Europe is in a catastrophic condition from the financial point of view and will be so for the next few years. That will not last. We have great capacity for production. We have immense genius for invention, organisation and development, and I believe that we are going to use it now not so much as we did in the past, for militarism and war, but for making a new Europe which will play a great part in leading the new world. But in the next short period, believe me, it is no good pretending that the thing will not hamper the activities of the United Nations: if we have to pay for it all in dollars, it will; and I am only stating a fact.

Now with regard to distance: I do not think we can cite the meetings of Mr. Churchill, Marshal Stalin and President Roosevelt to make decisions about the war. It is not that kind of meeting that we intend to have in future. Of course, if the argument is that important men can travel long distances -- certainly, of course they can; and they will have to do it sometimes. But the question is: How many important men? Did our great leaders travel as frequently as they should? There was every wartime facility at their command, and they could turn out their whole Air Forces to assist their journeys, but they did not travel very often, and sometimes vital questions were left altogether for long periods and there was no decision. And it is that I am afraid of. It is not that it will not sometimes happen, when it is overwhelmingly important, that the men will come, but not enough of them will come, and not often enough, when their help is really required.

Can we have a temporary seat? The Agreement says that we must "make studies and prepare recommendations concerning the location of the Permanent Headquarters of the Organisation", but it is fully open to us to say that you cannot now decide, that you ought not now to decide, on a permanent seat, and that for a short time you ought to have a temporary seat and that you will make a decision in two years' time from now as to where the permanent seat will be. No one could argue on legal or any other grounds that the Agreement would not fully enable us to do that.

Now, it has been argued -- and here we touch something more important -- that the people did not become internationally-minded when the seat was in Geneva. Well, with great respect, they did, up till 1930 or 1931. Why was that move towards international-mindedness which began in Europe and spread from Europe around the

world, arrested? It was arrested by the world economic crisis which, among other things, brought Hitler to power for without it I do not believe he would ever have been able to come to power -- a world economic crisis for which Europe bore its share of responsibility, but which in fact began in the New World. And the effect of the world economic crisis was reinforced by the disaster over Manchuria, which was not European, and as to the action of the New World with regard to it I have already spoken. I want to say this (and this is the last thing I am going to say), that my Government is a world Power; it is not a European Power. It is a world Power. I do not believe that it has ever had such moral strength as it has in the world today. But we might find it more difficult to play the part we have to play in Europe if in fact in these early years the seat were outside Europe. I think it is inevitable. What I am afraid of is that, in trying to do that, we might possibly compromise the tremendously important international reconstructive work of a very ambitious kind which I think the European Governments may now be able to carry through. We might on the one hand compromise that, while on the other hand we should go some distance towards making the United Nations Organization at San Francisco not the kind of thing we intended it to be, but much more a party of diplomats en poste. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to argue the case further now, but I am going to say that we cannot accept this decision at this stage. I hope there will not be a vote today, but if there is it will not be a unanimous vote. The question, therefore, will be taken to public discussion in the Preparatory Commission.



CHAIRMAN: I recognise the Ambassador for France.

DELEGATE FOR FRANCE (speaking in French; English version as delivered by interpreter follows): Mr. Chairman, I would put the whole matter on not quite as high a level as did Mr. Noel Baker, but as several members of the Committee have made a plea for unanimity I feel it my duty to explain why I cannot agree to the proposal which seems to have been so far the opinion of the Committee. My explanation will be the following: I am convinced that my American colleagues will not for a single moment believe that my position is one against the United States. The position I have taken is against the fact that the seat of the Organisation should be situated in the territory of one of the States which is a permanent member of the Security Council, and the reasons which I have spoken remain. So far as I can remember, no arguments of any real validity have been brought against them. We have in front of us our report, and we must say that the arguments which have been put in there have their strength, and I have not been convinced to the contrary by anything that has been said. We have listened to speakers talking of the atmosphere of San Francisco, but may I say that there is a very great difference between a case when the future peace of the world is being discussed and in a case where it is a matter of settling a threat to international peace. And if, as God may forbid, we came to the case in which such an international conflict might arise, in which the United States itself might be concerned, I believe that if the American Press would not exercise a certain pressure on public opinion I would then have to conclude that the American Press is led by angels and by saints. Therefore if the Committee expresses its opinion in favour of the seat of the Organisation being in the United States, and there I must recall there are already two tendencies - one for the Atlantic and one for the Pacific coast - I must here state that I have definite instructions from my Government to remain faithful to the arguments which I have brought before you today. The whole matter will come up before the Preparatory Commission, and I should feel it my duty, exactly as my British colleague, to defend the case for Europe in front of the Preparatory Commission,

however unreasonable this thesis might seem to some of my colleagues. And I also insist that the French position should be stated in the report on this matter.

The situation is quite clear. We make a recommendation to the Preparatory Commission. In turn it makes a recommendation to the Assembly. Our recommendation might not be adopted by the Assembly. It is difficult at this stage of the investigation to secure unanimity. Therefore, I think the attempt to get it should not be pressed.

At the same time a stage will be reached in which a very distinct majority will express its view, and that is the stage at which the minority might reasonably be expected to yield. Today at any rate there is a substantial majority of this Committee against the headquarters being situated in Europe. I regret that the reaction of one or two of the delegates suggests asking them to go to San Francisco for meetings is almost like asking them to go into exile. In my opinion that approach is quite wrong. Indeed it contributed to the first breakdown of the League which occurred in the Far East. If going to San Francisco leads to a greater interest in Pacific problems, that will be all to the good.

I also urge strongly that we should not recommend a temporary or provisional headquarters of the Organisation. The Charter and the constitution of the Preparatory Commission require us to make recommendations concerning a permanent headquarters of the United Nations. It is quite contrary to that requirement to select a temporary headquarters. In Australia, we had a temporary capital until Canberra was finally selected. But the temporary capital remained temporary for a quarter of a century! If we established a temporary headquarters vested interests would grow up tending to prevent any subsequent change while year by year the proceedings of the Assembly would be convulsed by this contentious issue. Therefore let us abandon the idea of a provisional headquarters and proceed in an orderly way forward to the selection of

a permanent site. That is what we are required to do by our Charter.

CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, for four hours and a half, we have discussed this important question, and all members of the Executive Committee have had the opportunity to express their opinion on this subject. Now I think the time has come to take a vote on this question. If we put aside certain modifications, we have two main proposals. The first one, to have the permanent seat of the United Nations in the United States. The other is to have the permanent seat of the United Nations in Europe. I would like, if those who mentioned particular places, particular cities either in the United States or Europe do not insist, to take a vote on this modified separate proposal. If those supporting such special places as San Francisco or Philadelphia will agree, we have only the two proposals, one for the United States and one for Europe.

If there is no objection, then I am going to ask the Executive Committee to take a vote in the following order: First to take a vote on the first proposal to have the seat in the United States. On this question, the Delegate of China spoke first. And then we will have to take a vote on the second proposal to have the permanent seat of the Organisation in Europe. If the suggestion is acceptable, if there is no objection, then we are going to follow this suggestion.

I wish to make myself clear. When I say it would not be desirable to take a vote now on the separate proposals such as San Francisco or Philadelphia, but to take a vote on the general proposal of the United States, I do not mean that we should not consider the particular place within the United States. But this is a separate question. We may decide this separately. I would like to know whether my suggestion regarding the two main proposals as I formulated them and the order of the vote is accepted or not.

I recognise the Delegate for Canada;

DELEGATE OF CANADA: Mr. Chairman, if it is still in order, and not too late, I would propose that no vote be taken now. The reason for it is this: I have been listening with the greatest benefit to myself, I am

sure, to all that has been said here this afternoon by speakers on both sides of this question. Now by the count I have taken, there is no doubt that the majority, in fact at least nine of the Delegations here are in favour of the permanent seat of the Organisation being located on the American continent. Would it not be sufficient, would it not be better simply to report that? That the majority of this Executive Committee makes that recommendation? And then you can go on to the other recommendations which you yourself have proposed. Mr. Chairman, rather than taking a vote and compelling the Committee to line up so many on one side and so many on the other.

Now, if we make that simple report that the majority is in favour of such a course, we could still go on and give satisfaction to the wishes expressed for instance by the French representative that the decision of his country be made known in that report. There is no objection to that being done. But I would strongly urge that no vote be taken now on general grounds. But there is a more particular reason in my case because of this: It is quite evident from all the speeches I have heard here that every speaker has been able to speak for his own Government, that is to say, that while this is a question which in the last resort must and can only be decided probably by the Assembly, which will be composed of 50 nations, there are some Governments which have already made up their minds now as to what course they intend to take. They are prepared to take it here; they are prepared to carry it on into the Preparatory Commission, and again into the General Assembly. Well, my Government is not in that position yet, and therefore, if a vote is taken - one of the speakers said he hoped a vote would not be taken - but if it is, he said it would not be unanimous. My decision must be that if a vote is forced now, we shall have to abstain on the part of Canada. I would far rather, and I think too it would have a better effect, if we simply made the general report which I have outlined that the majority of the Committee, the undoubted majority, is in favour of a certain course.

CHAIRMAN: My opinion is that the taking of a vote is a form of determining the opinion of members of a body, and to take a vote in the Executive Committee means determining how many members of the Executive Committee are in favour of a certain proposal and how many are not in favour of a certain proposal. If we agreed with the suggestion of the delegate for Canada, would that affect the substance of the matter? It is a question of form. As far as form is concerned in this case, I think it would be better to follow exactly the provision of the Interim Agreement which says that the Preparatory Commission should "make studies and prepare recommendations concerning the location of the permanent headquarters of the Organisation".

If we do not take a vote, we shall not be able to answer the question, how many governments represented in the Executive Committee are in favour of the proposal and how many are not in favour of the proposal. So I think it is quite natural to take a vote on this question, as well as on any question when there is a divergence of view on the Executive Committee. It is absolutely necessary. If there is no objection to my proposal, then we may consider it as accepted. There are no objections. Then we are going to take a vote.

DELEGATE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM: The representative of Canada, if I understood him, has made objection.

CHAIRMAN: Since the representative for Canada has made objection, then I, as Chairman, am obliged to ask the Executive Committee to take a vote on the question whether or not we should take a vote.

DELEGATE OF IRAN: (Speaking in French; English version as delivered by interpreter follows): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it entirely clear. If I understand the situation rightly, what you wish to do now is to decide by a vote on which continent the seat will be, and in the very near future we shall have occasion to discuss the exact location.

DELEGATE OF THE NETHERLANDS: Mr. Chairman, I wish in the first place to support the suggestion made by the representative of Canada. In the second place I should like to make the point that, whether or no the proposition of the representative of Canada is adopted, I would propose that a minority report be submitted to the Preparatory Commission.

CHAIRMAN: In the records of the Executive Committee, That is absolutely right. I think there is not the slightest doubt about that.

DELEGATE OF THE NETHERLANDS: A minority report setting forth the arguments which were used by those who were in favour of Europe as the seat for the Organisation.

CHAIRMAN: I would agree.

SECRETARY: I think the best thing would be to arrive at an agreed record of this meeting, setting forth fully the views of either side and for that record to be made public.

DELEGATE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM: It is a great pity we did not have the Press present.

DELEGATE OF AUSTRALIA: The question of a minority report depends upon a vote being taken. The question is now as to whether a vote should be taken and on that I would like to point out that it is our duty to make a recommendation.

The Delegate of Canada did not object to your proposal, but suggested a course of procedure which would permit of a recommendation, or rather of a report of the majority without apparently a specific recommendation. We are the Executive Committee responsible to the Preparatory Commission. We can only make our recommendations by a resolution. We can only deal with the resolution by a vote. It is open to any delegate to abstain from voting. Does not that meet the case? Surely the Preparatory Commission will want to know what countries supported this proposal and that proposal, and I think they are entitled to know because we are trustees for them.

CHAIRMAN: I would like to know whether the representative for Canada considers that his suggestion still stands, in which case I am going to ask the Committee to take a vote on the question of procedure.

DELEGATE OF CANADA: Yes, I think I would ask for that vote to be taken.

CHAIRMAN: Then I would like to take a vote on my suggestion as to whether we should take a vote or should not take a vote on the question of substance, and I would like to ask the members of the Executive Committee to signify their approval of such a suggestion by saying "Yes".

DELEGATE OF CHINA: Mr. Chairman, I did not speak for a second time because I thought a vote would be taken and everything would be finished. I now understand that after the vote is taken there will be a minority report containing the arguments against the majority report.

If there are to be such reports, I beg to ask permission to bring forward two new arguments which I discovered after hearing other representatives, to reinforce the majority report.

DELEGATE OF AUSTRALIA: There are a lot more which were never used.

CHAIRMAN: As I understand it, the Preparatory Commission will have at its disposal the full records of the Executive Committee. When the representative for the Netherlands asks that the report of the minority should be submitted, as I understand it the submission of such a report would mean the submission of records, of statements made here at the Executive Committee by those who supported this proposal, but not a special document, or otherwise the opposite side of the Executive Committee would have the same right to prepare a special report on their proposal.

DELEGATE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM: I do not at all object to the publication of the records. Certainly I greatly regret that the Press was not here today, and I think nothing can be so undesirable as having a debate in private and then publishing the record afterwards. It frequently happens, but it is a very bad plan. It is much better to have the press there.

CHAIRMAN: I think what has been said by Mr. Noel Baker does not affect the substance of my proposal of a procedural character, and I ask the members of the Executive Committee to shorten the discussion on this procedural matter if there are no other really important questions in this connection.



I ask those members of the executive Committee who are going to approve of my suggestion on procedure to say "Yes" after Mr. Jebb reads out the names of the country; that is on my suggestion to take a vote at this meeting on the question of substance.

Vote taken. Those in favour, Australia, Brazil, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Iran, Mexico, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

Those against, Canada, France, Netherlands, United Kingdom.

Abstention, United States of America.

SECRETARY: It is carried by 9 to 4, with one abstention, and as the simple majority applies to questions of procedure, it is carried.

CHAIRMAN: Then the two suggestions remain. The order I have proposed already. The first proposal is that the permanent seat of the Organisation should be in the United States and I ask Mr. Jebb to read out in alphabetical order the names of countries, and those who approve I ask to say "Yes".

SECRETARY: The question put is: Should the permanent headquarters of the United Nations be situated in the United States of America?

DELEGATE OF AUSTRALIA: You propose to put another question subsequently about Europe, do you?

CHAIRMAN: Yes. If those who made such a proposal do not withdraw the proposal, I shall be obliged to take a vote.

DELEGATE OF AUSTRALIA: Yes, I think you will.

CHAIRMAN: The votes do not necessarily coincide.

DELEGATE OF AUSTRALIA: That is right. Somebody might vote against both.

Vote taken. Those in favour, Australia, Brazil, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Iran, Mexico, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

Those against, France, Netherlands, United Kingdom. Canada and United States of America abstained.

SECRETARY: The voting is 9 to 3, with two abstentions. It is carried. It is carried by a two-thirds majority.

CHAIRMAN: The second proposal is to have the permanent headquarters of the United Nations Organisation in Europe.

SECRETARY: The question is, should the permanent headquarters of the United Nations be situated in Europe?

Vote taken. Those in favour, France, Netherlands, United Kingdom.

Those against, Australia, Brazil, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

Canada, Iran, Mexico, United States of America, abstained.

SECRETARY: That is 7 votes to 3. It is rejected by 7 votes out of 10 voting - - a two-thirds majority of those present and voting.

CHAIRMAN: It is more than two-thirds.

SECRETARY: Anyhow, it is rejected by 7 votes to 3.

CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that now it would be better to adjourn and consider later the question of a particular place in the United States. When I spoke on this matter today, I said that I did not have in my mind any concrete suggestion on the subject. I personally would like to study this question, to exchange opinions with other delegations, and if my opinion coincides with the opinion of the majority of the Executive Committee, then we shall continue discussion on this subject some time later.

SECRETARY: May I raise the question of what happens to the records of this meeting? Do I understand it to be the opinion of the Committee that the verbatim records should be circulated to all members of the Committee rather than the usual summary record?

CHAIRMAN: On the question of the agenda, the question of the Secretary-General was included as a separate question by mistake. This was not agreed with me. Having decided that the permanent seat of the Organisation shall be in the United States, then the Executive Committee may express the opinion (it would be absolutely right, it seems to me) that the Secretary-General should not be a national of the United States. The selection of the Secretary-General should be made regardless of where the seat of the organisation should be. But I think it would not be wise at a meeting of the Executive Committee to discuss the personalities of the Secretary-General. I am going

to explain why. According to the Charter, the Security Council should make a recommendation on the Secretary-General, and the Security Council should submit such recommendation to the General Assembly for its approval. Of course it would be natural, and I think the only correct way, that the Security Council should take the initiative in this respect. It does not mean that any member of the United Nations cannot make a proposal on the personality of the Secretary-General. Of course, each member of the Organisation has a right to do this, but from the point of view of taking the initiative on such a question, as far as personality is concerned, it is natural that such a question should be taken up by the Security Council as is provided by the Charter. There is an angle from which we may consider this question, whether the Secretary-General should be chosen regardless of whether his country is the permanent seat of the Organisation or not, or whether the Secretary-General should not be a citizen of the country where the permanent seat of the Organisation is. A discussion from such an angle I think is natural. It seems to me the two questions are connected.

CHAIRMAN: I recognize the representative for France. I would like to ask the Executive Committee to agree that after the Ambassador has spoken we will adjourn. We shall decide when we are to have the next meeting.

DELEGATE OF FRANCE (Speaking in French; English version as delivered by interpreter follows): I don't see how we are obliged to make any recommendation as to the nationality even of the Secretary-General.

DELEGATE OF AUSTRALIA: We can discuss that at the next meeting.

DELEGATE OF UNITED KINGDOM: I understand there is a paper coming to us from Committee 6 on general principles concerning the status and personality and qualifications of the Secretary-General, similar to paper 54 which we had on the seat of the United Nations. I propose that that should be taken in public session, and that we discuss it as we discussed paper 54. Then we can see whether we can go beyond that or not. But certainly that is the first step.

CHAIRMAN: I ask the members of the Committee to close the discussion of this meeting, and you will be notified by the Executive Secretary about the next meeting of the Executive Committee. It will take place either on Friday, which is our regular meeting day or before. But not before unless there is some urgent matter tomorrow.

I ask Mr. Jebb, the Executive Secretary to say a few words.

SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, there are two points to be raised. The first - what do we tell the Press this evening, because this vote is bound to leak, I should say. Do we get out a brief statement just recording the broad lines of the discussion? Or do we do otherwise? What does the Committee want me to do?

CHAIRMAN: As to me, I would agree with any decision which would be in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the Committee.

DELEGATE OF UNITED KINGDOM: As this has been a private meeting, Mr. Chairman, I think we had better go on the principle that it is private until we publish our records. If something reaches the Press, of course it will be what always happens in this kind of meeting. It is one of the very great objections to this kind of meeting. But I think we cannot depart from that principle.

DELEGATE OF UNITED STATES: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to have to dissent from Mr. Noel-Baker's suggestion, but I am confident from our experience in previous meetings of this kind that what has happened here is certain to leak to the Press. Now, we can either let it leak in such fashion as it chooses to leak, or we can issue a communique of some kind. I would certainly feel we should issue a communique of some kind, or if need be, summarize most briefly the arguments. But something should be issued. That is entirely consistent with the theory of Executive Sessions. At the conclusion of an Executive Session, something is disclosed. I don't believe it inconsistent with our practice in the past to announce something at the conclusion of such a meeting.

DELEGATE OF UNITED KINGDOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, I haven't explained myself properly. Of course, you have private meetings and issue a communique. But if you decide to issue your records, then the difficulty of making a communique which summarizes that record becomes almost insuperable, and rather than entrust to our unhappy Executive Secretary anything of that kind, I think we should do better to take our chance on the leak and then put the thing right with what we ultimately publish. They will have everything afterward, and it won't be many hours later. I should have thought the advantage of that plan was considerable. I don't want to be difficult about it if the members of the Committee wish, only I don't want any summary of my arguments made by anybody else.

SECRETARY: Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't attempt to summarize....

CHAIRMAN: It seems to me the representative for the United States has good reasons for his suggestion. I think I am becoming more convinced that the Press will get such information anyway. I came to such conclusion partly on the basis of my experience, and

maybe it would be better to prepare a brief communique and to give it to the press this evening, or tomorrow. We may authorise Mr. Jebb to prepare such communique, a brief communique of formal character, with the substance of the question, and if you would authorize me to approve this communique in the name of the Executive Committee this evening or tomorrow morning, I would be glad to do this together with the Executive Secretary.

DELEGATE OF UNITED KINGDOM: I would like to be certain on this point. The communique should state the two votes and who voted, and what the vote was, who voted and the abstentions and the rest. Then there would be a statement that a record would be published.

CHAIRMAN: In due time. Published in due time, I think. If this is agreeable, then we may consider this proposal as approved.

SECRETARY: One other point....

CHAIRMAN: Is it possible to have it prepared in draft form this evening?

SECRETARY: I suggest you and I go to my room, and in two minutes we can dictate it.

CHAIRMAN: All right.

SECRETARY: But one other point, Mr. Chairman. The next meeting. I am not quite certain what it is proposed to discuss, but as I understood you, we are supposed to discuss the Secretary General - was it in relation to the seat of the Organisation?

CHAIRMAN: I personally would prefer to discuss this question only under a certain angle, when we have the question of the particular place of the Organization on the agenda, so that we may have it together and not devote a meeting to that.

But we may not discuss this question of the Secretary General at all. I don't see any necessity. We were not authorized to discuss this question as such by the Agreement.

SECRETARY: Well, then the next meeting will be an open meeting and we will discuss the exact site of the Organization? The permanent headquarters.

CHAIRMAN: I personally would not mind, subject to the determining of the date of such discussion - not necessarily on Friday. Maybe later.

SECRETARY: Later if you like. It would be better from my point of view to put it later.

DELEGATE OF IRAN (Speaking in French; English version as delivered by interpreter follows): We could fill up Friday very well with current business. We have lots of reports to consider. We could take those first, deal with them Friday, and take the other matters later.

SECRETARY: Sometime next week.

CHAIRMAN: Sometime next week. Better not to fix a time now.

(The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.)

Later in the same evening a communique was issued to the Press as follows:-

The Executive Committee met this afternoon for four-and-a-half hours in executive session in order to discuss the question of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations.

Various views were expressed and finally two votes were taken.

The first was on the question whether the permanent headquarters of the United Nations should be situated in the United States of America. This was approved by nine votes to three with two abstentions. Those who voted in favour were :



Australia, Brazil, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, Iran, Mexico, the U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia.

Those who voted against were :

France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

Canada and United States of America abstained.

The Chairman then put a second question, namely, should the permanent headquarters of the United Nations be situated in Europe?

This proposal was rejected by seven votes to three, with four abstentions.

France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom voted in favour.

Australia, Brazil, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, the U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia voted against: and Canada, Iran, Mexico and the United States of America abstained.

A full record of the discussion will be issued to the Press in due time.

---