



Friday, 20 October 1950, at 10.45 a.m.

Lake Success, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
United action for peace (<i>continued</i>)	167

Chairman: Mr. Roberto URDANETA ARBELÁEZ (Colombia).

United action for peace (*continued*)

[Item 68]*

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS AND AMENDMENTS (*continued*)

Revised Iraqi-Syrian draft resolution (A/C.1/585/Rev.1)

1. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) introduced the revised Iraqi-Syrian draft resolution (A/C.1/585/Rev.1).

2. In the first place, the revised text referred to all the permanent members of the Security Council, whereas the original text had named only four of them. Mr. Al-Jamali explained that the sponsors had not intended to exclude China from the discussions or meetings but that they thought that, in the initial stages, China might itself provide one of the items of discussion and agreement. Secondly, the method of meetings was changed to provide more flexibility so that the permanent members could meet individually or collectively. Thirdly, the revised text provided that the permanent members should consult other nations in regard to problems which concerned them. Lastly, the time-limit for the permanent members of the Security Council to report back to the fifth session of the General Assembly had been eliminated.

3. Mr. Al-Jamali hoped that, as a result of those changes in the original text, the Committee would approve the draft resolution by an overwhelming majority.

4. Faris EL-KHOURI Bey (Syria) stated that it was generally agreed that the guarantee for international peace and security depended primarily upon the permanent members of the Security Council. That principle had been established at San Francisco, and the Charter of the United Nations was based upon it.

5. Agreement and collaboration among the great Powers was essential for world peace. However, the experience of the past five years clearly established that

that agreement did not exist, and that tension among the great Powers was growing from day to day. Similarly, no one could deny that the failure of the United Nations to realize its principles, purposes and objectives was due to this disagreement.

6. This failure had led, El-Khoury Bey felt, to despair; the resolution approved at the 369th meeting was its manifestation. He did not, however, share that despair and felt that there still remained ways and means for establishing agreement among the great Powers. It was for that reason that his delegation had abstained from voting in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution. He hoped that it would not be hard for the great Powers to achieve unanimity on the basis of good will. Enumerating the outstanding problems, the representative of Syria concluded that peace treaties with Germany and Japan and the question of China appeared to be the main differences left unsolved. Those, he thought, should not be difficult to settle amicably, if the great Powers would act in good faith and in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

7. Mr. LOURIE (Israel), supporting the revised joint text, suggested that its third paragraph be changed to conform with the language of the Charter, which vested the primary responsibility for maintaining world peace in the Security Council as a whole, and not on the permanent members of the Security Council alone, as the present draft implied.

8. Mr. TSIANG (China) recalled that the world suffered both from the lack of agreement and from the wrong kind of agreements. The problem of Korea started out with a wrong agreement on the 38th parallel; similarly, Mr. Tsiang considered that most of the problems in the Far East today were due to another wrong agreement, the Yalta Agreement. Therefore, while he was not opposing the revised text of the joint draft resolution, he would insist that any agreement had to be made in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

9. Mr. DULLES (United States of America) said that, while his delegation was in entire sympathy with

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

the purposes of the joint draft resolution, he thought that there was a tendency to under-estimate the complexities and difficulties of the problems. In that connexion, he recalled that thousands of meetings, either of the Council of Foreign Ministers or of their deputies or of sub-committees, had taken place, yet little had been achieved. However, there was no reason to despair. He declared that the United States Government, for its part, would always be ready to consider any method and any suggestion that might lead to a settlement of existing differences.

10. Mr. Dulles added that the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.1/585/Rev.1) was preferable, in many respects, to the original text (A/C.1/585). He suggested, however, that its first paragraph should contain a reference to the fact that the main purpose of the United Nations was to maintain international peace and security but in conformity with the principles of justice. The present draft contained no reference to justice. In that respect, he recalled the controversy that had taken place at San Francisco and the contribution made by the United States Senator Vandenberg, who insisted that the concept of justice should be introduced into the Dumbarton Oaks proposals.

11. Mr. Dulles also supported the idea that the third paragraph of the revised text should be redrafted to conform with the Charter. That paragraph should refer not only to the permanent members, but to the Security Council as a whole as being charged with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security.

12. He added that the recommendations contained in the fourth paragraph of the draft resolution were acceptable to his delegation. However, personally he could not say that he entertained great hopes concerning the result of the proposed conversations, but he added that one could never tell, and his government was prepared to accept the recommendations.

13. Mr. Dulles stated that his delegation was glad to see that the revised text recommended that the States concerned with a given issue would be consulted, and that no settlement should be reached behind the back of interested States.

14. The United States representative considered that the word "paralyse" in the fourth paragraph was too strong and did not reflect reality, considering the vitality and vigour shown by the United Nations recently. He felt that a word such as "hindered" would be preferable. He also suggested the insertion in the last paragraph, after the words "Requests that they report to the General Assembly", of the following phrase: "in so far as they may deem it compatible with the success of their conversations". That change was necessary, Mr. Dulles thought, because it could be unwise to report publicly on conversations which were in progress. Such an action might destroy the possibilities of successful conclusion of the negotiations and raise false hopes.

15. Mr. BEBLER (Yugoslavia) stated that his delegation supported the spirit motivating the sponsors and would vote in favour of the draft resolution. He would not deal with the minor amendments which the Committee might consider but drew attention to the fourth paragraph, which referred to the permanent members

of the Security Council. One of the permanent members, namely, China, was represented by a delegation which many Members did not recognize. Mr. Bebler believed that views should be exchanged in the Committee on that matter since the People's Republic of China was an important factor in international relations and especially in any conversations regarding Asia. Some formula should be found which would satisfy the delegations recognizing each of the two Chinese Governments. Mr. Bebler asked whether the sponsors of the draft resolution would accept as an amendment, which he put forward for the time being only as a suggestion, the insertion after the words "Security Council" in the fourth paragraph of the words "including the People's Republic of China".

16. Mr. Maurice SCHUMANN (France) stated that his delegation was in sympathy with the principles and intentions of the draft resolution, although the text clearly needed to be adjusted and given precision. France had always believed that all paths, without exception, towards the organization and restoration of peace should be explored. All such efforts should be made within the framework of collective security, that is to say, of the United Nations, since peace was the responsibility of all and was indivisible. The authors of the draft resolution had explicitly recognized that fact.

17. Mr. SULTAN (Egypt) stated that, although preferring the original text because it had a greater sense of urgency and called for an earlier report to the General Assembly, his delegation would vote for the revised draft resolution as a compromise which ought to be acceptable. No delegation could seriously object to the draft resolution since it was in the interests of peace and humanity. It was to be hoped that it would aid in dissipating misunderstandings between the great Powers and in quieting the fears of other nations.

18. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) had listened with attention to the comments on the draft resolution, in particular to those of the representative of the United States about which he would speak later. With regard to the suggestion of the representative of Yugoslavia, the representative of Iraq stated that his delegation had wished to avoid a debate on the difficult question of the representation of China at that juncture and hoped that the matter would not be pressed.

19. Mr. VON BALLUSECK (Netherlands) declared that his delegation endorsed the general principles of the draft resolution. It was not the first time and, unfortunately, probably would not be the last time that the General Assembly had expressed the desire that the great Powers would consult together. There was no objection to a re-affirmation of the General Assembly's hopes along the lines proposed, subject to some re-drafting. On the previous day (369th meeting) in accepting the seven-Power draft resolution, the Committee had urged the permanent members to strive for unanimity, and had recognized that it was lack of unanimity which had led to the failure of the Security Council to exercise its primary responsibility for international peace and security. The Committee had also recommended that steps be taken for the implementation of Articles 43, 45, 46 and 47 of the Charter which amounted to much the same thing. Even longer ago, the General Assembly had been driven to similar conclu-

sions; at its third session the Assembly had adopted resolution 190 (III), which was an appeal to the great Powers to compose their differences and establish a lasting peace. Now it was necessary to repeat the appeal and it might be proper to maintain continuity by using the same phraseology. That might be one way of disposing of the third paragraph, which in its present form did not conform to Article 24 of the Charter. If appropriate wording were substituted for the present wording of that paragraph, the Netherlands delegation would find no difficulty in accepting the revised draft resolution.

20. Mr. SARPER (Turkey) said that his delegation was glad to note that a draft resolution had been presented which was directed towards bringing about a general agreement among the great Powers. The draft could be improved in the various ways which had been suggested, after which the delegation of Turkey hoped to be able to vote in favour of it.

21. Faris EL-KHOURI Bey (Syria) stated that the suggestions made by the representative of the United States appeared to be acceptable to him. It was satisfactory to refer to the Security Council as a whole instead of only to the permanent members, in the third paragraph. With regard to the need for any solution being based on just principles, the delegation of Syria had never thought of seeking agreement among the great Powers at the expense of other nations. Indeed, in the original draft resolution the Iraqi and Syrian delegations had referred to "reaching agreement in accordance with the spirit of the Charter". Reference had also been made during the discussion to various agreements which could not be considered just, and those were the kind which they wished to avoid. El Khouri Bey therefore agreed that the principle of justice should be emphasized. With regard to the use of the word "paralyse" in the fourth paragraph, it would be satisfactory to substitute the word "impede" or some similar word.

22. The representative of Syria doubted that it would be possible to accept the suggestion of the representative of Yugoslavia. Reference to China had been omitted in the original draft (A/C.1/585) in order to avoid a possible obstacle. Evidently there might be some difficulty over the new formulation. However, the matter was under discussion in the Sixth Committee and in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. The First Committee ought not to prejudge the question, but should rather wait to see what decision the General Assembly came to. If that were done, the present formulation would be satisfactory.

23. Mr. DE SOUZA GOMES (Brazil) stated that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution. Since adjustments were being made for its improvement, the delegation of Brazil proposed that the word "international" be inserted before the words "peace and security" in the first paragraph. That formulation would be more in keeping with the Charter, since the maintenance of peace within each nation was an internal and domestic question. There was also a matter of ensuring that the French and English texts corresponded. Perhaps it would be better to follow the language of the Charter and use the words "maintain"

and *maintenir* rather than "promote" and *défendre* in that first paragraph.

24. Mr. CASTRO (El Salvador) drew attention to an amendment (A/C.1/594) to the draft resolution which his delegation had submitted. That amendment was designed to meet the objections raised to the third paragraph in connexion with the reference to the responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council. In fact, the responsibility for peace and security rested with the United Nations as a whole, as was stated in the first paragraph of the joint text. If the suggestion of the representative of the United States were followed and the third paragraph referred only to the Security Council, the result would be that the draft resolution would have no logical development. It would first affirm that the Security Council had the primary responsibility for peace and then would invite only the permanent members to consult. The delegation of El Salvador proposed, therefore, a text which would emphasize the need of unanimity among the permanent members for substantive decisions in the Security Council. Such a text in place of the present third paragraph would make the fourth paragraph logical. The delegation of El Salvador therefore proposed in its amendment that the third paragraph of the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.1/585/Rev.1) be replaced by the following paragraph (A/C.1/594):

"Recognizing that full unanimity of the vote of the permanent members of the Security Council is required by the Charter for the adoption of decisions which do not refer to procedural matters".

25. Mr. POLITIS (Greece) stated that his delegation agreed with the principles of the draft resolution and would accept it provided that the word "paralyse" was deleted from the fourth paragraph. The delegation of Greece believed that such wording was not in accordance with reality in view of the recent effective action of the United Nations. A change should also be made in the third paragraph to ensure that it conformed with the Charter.

26. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) declared that his delegation would accept the amendment proposed by the representative of El Salvador. He proposed, however, that it should be inserted as the fourth paragraph, and that the third paragraph should be retained except for the deletion of the reference to the permanent members.

27. Mr. PEON DEL VALLE (Mexico) stated that his delegation supported the spirit of the draft resolution and would vote for it after its text had been finalized. It would be recalled that, at the third session of the General Assembly, Mexico had submitted a proposal which ultimately became resolution 190 (III). The Mexican delegation agreed that the idea of justice should be incorporated in the draft resolution. Since other suggestions of a drafting nature were being made, the Committee might consider the advisability of changing the last part of the first paragraph to read "to promote and maintain peace and security among all nations".

28. Mr. YOUNGER (United Kingdom) observed that there appeared to be general agreement in the Committee upon the principles of the draft resolution, although the final form of the text was not yet clear.

The United Kingdom delegation was grateful to the sponsors for their reconsideration of the original draft, which might have caused some difficulty, and the delegation hoped that it would be able to support the draft resolution in its final form. The United Kingdom Government had always been ready to join in such consultations, and the draft resolution would add the persuasive weight of the General Assembly. Some of the difficulties which would confront the Powers in their consultations had been mentioned by the representative of the United States, and it should be remembered that the present crisis did not arise from a lack of meetings in recent years but rather from basic divergencies of attitude. The United Kingdom delegation had tried during the discussion to draw some indication from those delegations which had hitherto been in the minority as to whether there was any prospect of their views changing. There had, however, been no sign of progress. The United Kingdom delegation would not, for that reason, oppose the draft resolution, but its attitude was a cautious one.

29. The United Kingdom representative was doubtful whether it would be wise to suggest that a useful report could be presented by the permanent members of the Security Council to the General Assembly during its current session. That could raise false hopes. The representative of the United States had made a proposal in that connexion, and the United Kingdom delegation suggested to the sponsors that the final paragraph of the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/585/Rev.1) might be revised to read as follows:

“Requests that in so far as they deem it compatible with the success of their conversations, they advise the General Assembly whenever there appears a prospect of progress which might be of interest to the Assembly or might contribute to world peace and security”.

30. That change was not insisted upon, but the United Kingdom representative considered that it would not be proper to suggest that one could deal in so short a time with the very large problems and fundamental differences which it was proposed that the permanent members should discuss. No doubt the Assembly would be impatient; but it might be wiser to leave to the consultants the decision as to when the report should be made.

31. Subject to the foregoing and various other amendments which had been proposed, the United Kingdom delegation hoped to be able to vote for the draft resolu-

tion. At the same time, that delegation realized that discussions among the great Powers were no substitute for the normal United Nations procedures.

32. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) stated that his delegation was fully in sympathy with the draft resolution but failed to see what it would achieve. There was not even agreement as to which were the five permanent members; perhaps the matter ought to be postponed until there was a decision upon the representation of China. It should be recalled that, on previous occasions, the permanent members had been called upon to consult together and, in the draft resolution approved on the previous day (369th meeting), the permanent members had been informed that, if they could not settle matters, the General Assembly itself would act. It was hard to see how the draft resolution before the Committee could add anything further, but the Liberian delegation would support it.

33. Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia) remarked that so many suggestions had been made that discussion was becoming difficult. He proposed the appointment of a drafting committee consisting of the sponsors and any delegations having suggestions to make, so that a new text might be submitted.

34. Mr. VITTONI (Argentina) stated that his delegation agreed with the draft resolution, and also endorsed those amendments which would serve to make it an expression of the General Assembly's desire for peace. The Argentine delegation particularly agreed with the suggestions of the representatives of Brazil, El Salvador, the United Kingdom, and the United States and would support a draft including the amendments they had suggested.

35. After a discussion in which Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia), Mr. BARANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. SARPEN (Turkey) and Mr. JOOSTE (Union of South Africa) participated, the CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee would postpone its next meeting until the following morning, in order to allow the sponsors of the draft resolution to produce a revised text after consulting with any delegations which had suggestions to make.

36. Faris EL-KHOURI Bey (Syria) invited any delegations wishing to assist in the redrafting process to meet with himself and the representative of Iraq that afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.