



# Sameinuðu þjóðirnar og Þjóðabandalagið ma. Memorandum. Afstaða meðlima S. Þ. til hlutleysis

Bjarni Benediktsson – Stjórnsmál – Utanríkisráðherra – Utanríkismál – Sameinuðu þjóðirnar – Thor  
Thors – Hlutleysi - 1949

## Tekið af vef Borgarskjalasafnsins

[bjarnibenediktsson.is](http://bjarnibenediktsson.is)

Einkaskjalasafn nr. 360  
Stjórnsmálamaðurinn  
Askja 2-10, Örk 8

©Borgarskjalasafn Reykjavíkur

LEGATION OF ICELAND  
WASHINGTON 6. D. C.

8th October, 1949.

*Gæðvinnur,*

I am taking the opportunity to send you a few lines with Halldór Kjartansson, who leaves tomorrow morning, so that you should have this letter on Monday.

United Nations

You will know from the newspapers about the proceedings which have been rather uneventful up to now. The speeches in the General Debate were similar to those in previous years except that some thought that Vyshinsky was not as aggressive as he has been in previous sessions. However, he directly accused the United States and the United Kingdom of warmongering and wanted some measures to be taken to stop them. At the same time he proposed a special peace pact of the Big Five. I do not know how the United States will handle that proposal but their first comment was that a peace pact was contained in the Charter of the United Nations binding upon all the member nations.

Acheson's speech was a plain statement of facts and policy given in a firm tone.

The Big Four have been holding meetings regarding the Austrian Peace Treaty and have approached each other somewhat, leaving the detailed work for the deputies to report on the 24th of October.

As you may have heard, I intervened in a discussion some days ago in the Political Committee regarding the order in which the various items on the agenda should be handled. A special broadcast about this intervention was made by Daði Hjörvar and if you have not heard it, the manuscript is with the Ríkisútvarp.

I found it opportune to intervene because I felt that we had in the Committee made an agreement of compromise a couple of days before that the Russian proposal above mentioned should be treated immediately after the discussion of the Italian colonies. I knew that the Scandinavian delegations were in favour of keeping that agreement and I personally found it unfair to break it. I am told by many delegates that my speech had a definite influence on the voting and for the first time the United States and the United Kingdom lost the vote against the Russian block, as it was defeated with 22 votes against 22 to place the Chinese problem before the Russian proposal.



In the debate following my speech, the Polish delegate praised my speech and attitude so much that I felt rather badly, but after the voting Sweden and Norway came to congratulate me, as did many other delegates as well as a representative of Trygve Lie. I do not think the U.S. delegation resented my interference greatly as one of their leading advisers came to me afterwards and said, "Your statement was excellent and you were right".

I think Iceland gained by this speech because it is good for the U.S. delegation to know that we think independently and also because Iceland took the lead for the other Scandinavian delegations.

As my speech was improvised, I cannot send it to you now but I am enclosing the report from the Committee meeting.

Yesterday I made a statement in the Ad Hoc Political Committee about the violation of human rights in Bulgaria, Hungary and Roumania. Hans Andersen and I had worked out this statement together and Hans is writing you privately about this matter and including a speech by Sir Hartley Shawcross which was splendid and very aggressive, and which we thought you could use in some of your daily articles.

#### Yugoslavia

There is no meeting scheduled as yet in the General Assembly to vote on the three new members in the Security Council and I have been joining forces behind the scenes to have the meeting postponed the utmost possible. It is difficult to predict how the vote will be because the situation may change according to the behaviour of Yugoslavia and the Russians up to the date of voting.

As you know, the United States is keen on having Yugoslavia elected and Mr. Hickerson expressed the other day that he sincerely hoped we would vote for Yugoslavia. It is expected that 15 Latin countries will be for Yugoslavia. France, Canada and the Benelux countries are keeping their attitude secret but all these five countries will vote for Yugoslavia. There will be a meeting of the Scandinavian countries next Tuesday to discuss this matter but at this moment it seems that the three of them will be in favour of Yugoslavia and the two-thirds vote may well depend on the vote of the four Nordic countries.

I think all the delegations expect Iceland to be in favour of Yugoslavia and I must emphatically advise you against our voting in blank. As the voting is secret, it is rather absurd to deliver a blank vote. I think Czechoslovakia expects us to vote with the other Scandinavian countries and the United States and their delegation has in no way approached us to favour their candidacy.

On Tuesday evening, the 4th of October, U.S. Secretary of State Louis Johnson gave a dinner in the Pentagon for all the representatives. I attended that dinner because Mr. Johnson had expressed the



I shall probably telegraph you when I have more accurate information but I would appreciate that you explain to the Icelandic Government that it is most desirable that they give me a free hand to vote for Yugoslavia if I find that most opportune and if our friends desire us to do so.

There are even rumours that the U.K. Delegation, which has so far opposed Yugoslavia, may come out in their favour.

I understand that we have commercial interests in Czechoslovakia but I would feel ashamed if we had to sell our vote in the vague hope of gaining some commercial benefit. According to the information Johann Josefsson gave me yesterday over the telephone, the Czechs are not behaving so well with regard to their contract with us for the frozen fish, and in any case I do not feel it is in conformity with our prestige and national pride that our vote becomes a commercial commodity which is for sale on this international market. I am convinced that you all will agree with me that we should avoid such a conception arising in the mind of any delegation.

There is still a possibility that Yugoslavia may be asked to withdraw her candidacy in order to secure the co-operation of the Russians to solve the Greek problem and have their satellites discontinue their assistance to the guerillas. All this shows how important it is for me to have a free hand in the matter and I trust you can agree to that, in which case I would appreciate receiving your cable.

#### Italian Colonies

With regard to the disposition of the Italian colonies, I am hopeful that the United States and the U.K. will be able to secure a majority for a mutually satisfactory solution, giving independence to a united Libya within a period of about three years, satisfying Ethiopia with an access to the sea through Eritrea and giving the Italians trusteeship over Somaliland. We will favour such a solution but it is still too early to predict what the issue will be in its final stage.

You will have seen that Count Sforza announced a new Italian policy, renouncing Italian claims for Tripolitania and Eritrea and favouring immediate independence both for Libya and Eritrea. The Italian Government has found out now that it is hopeless for them to obtain trusteeship over Tripolitania and their only hope now is to get a controlling hand in Somaliland.

#### Defense Meeting

As you had requested, I went to Washington to attend the meeting of the Defense Ministers of the Atlantic Pact countries. On Tuesday evening, the 4th of October, U.S. Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson gave a dinner in the Pentagon for all the representatives. I attended that dinner because Mr. Johnson had expressed the



definite desire that Iceland be represented there.

The meeting of the Defense Ministers on October 5th, which lasted more than five hours, was in fact uneventful as the proposals submitted by a Working Group of the various countries, were approved practically without change. The documents from this meeting will be forwarded to you from the Legation and Magnus will write a letter about the meeting.

On October 7th there was a meeting of the Military Committee but Mr. Perkins, the Assistant Secretary of State, who came to me after the meeting of the Defense Ministers and thanked me personally for having attended, said that it was not expected that Iceland would have to attend the meetings of the Military Committee. We will, however, get the documents and in that way be able to follow what takes place in these meetings, as well as the meetings of the important Standing Group, where only the U.S., U.K., and France are members.

#### Frozen Fish

Before leaving Washington on October 6th, I had a meeting with Dr. FitzGerald and another representative of ECA, as well as a representative from the State Department. As explained in my cable of that date, ECA is still awaiting a reply from the U.S. High Commissioner in Germany but there are extremely doubtful prospects that they can do anything to help us this year as they cannot force the Germans to take our fish as they did last year. The Germans have stated that they do not need the fish and that several other countries are offering them fish at a lower price.

I have, of course, explained to them how extremely important their assistance this year is to our economy and what a tremendous political effect it could have in Iceland if it could be announced without delay that they had bought our surplus at a satisfactory price. However, I do not venture to have any hope but I shall let you know as soon as I hear again from ECA, which I expect will be sometime next week.

#### Cod Liver Oil

The prospects of ECA buying any cod liver oil are practically nil. I have, therefore, contacted E.R. Squibb & Sons but they may only need some two to three hundred tons until the end of this year. I am also in contact with the International Children's Fund, who may buy some two up to six hundred tons shortly and there are prospects that a representative of the Fund may visit Iceland. I will also inform you later about this matter.

*Meira Seinna  
Góðan Sigur,  
þinn  
Shelton*





# United Nations

LIMITED

A/C.1/SR.277  
30 September 1949

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

---

*See Page 11-13*

Fourth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York,  
on Friday, 30 September 1949, at 10.45 a.m.

CONTENTS:

Order of an additional agenda item

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. L. PEARSON	Canada
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. M. de DIEGO	Panama

Any corrections to this record should be submitted in triplicate in one of the working languages (English, French or Spanish), within two working days, to the Director, Official Records Division, Room F-520, Lake Success. Corrections should bear the appropriate symbol number and be enclosed in an envelope marked "URGENT". Corrections can be dealt with more speedily if delegations will be good enough to incorporate them in a mimeographed copy of the record.



ORDER OF AN ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEM

1. The CHAIRMAN drew attention, before proceeding to the next item on the agenda, to document A/C.1/486 containing a letter from the President of the General Assembly with regard to the decision of the General Assembly referring to the First Committee the additional item entitled "Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of China and to the peace of the Far East, resulting from Soviet violations of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Alliance of 14 August 1945, and from Soviet violations of the Charter of the United Nations." The Chairman invited the delegates to express their views as to the chronological order of that item.
2. Dr. TSIANG (China) recalled that the Committee had previously adopted a decision regarding the order of discussion of the six items which up to that moment had been referred to it. His delegation had then suggested that the Committee should only decide on the first item for debate, leaving the other items for later consideration. Moreover, the Chairman had stated that, should a new item be referred to the First Committee, the order of debate might be reconsidered. In view of that declaration, and since the First Committee would be soon discussing the question of the disposal of the former Italian colonies, he moved that the new item should be placed third on the agenda.
3. Mr. MANUILSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that there were considerations of a formal character militating against the motion of the representative of China. The First Committee had already discussed at length the order of its agenda and had adopted a decision regarding that order. Any change in the present order, therefore, would introduce some perturbation and there was no possibility of discussing the new item, since no documentation had been submitted.
4. Moreover, that item was dealt with in a number of documents which reflected adversely on the case of the representative of the Kuomintang Government, namely, the State Department White Paper, and General Stillwell's book. It would be unfortunate, and against the interests of the General Assembly to create, at the very outset, an unhealthy atmosphere by dragging the Committee into such a controversial issue.

/The President



The President of the General Assembly and certain representatives had endeavoured to christen the present General Assembly "the Assembly of Peace". If the General Assembly was to deserve such a name, discussions should be held in an atmosphere of serenity.

5. Dr. JESSUP (United States of America) agreed with the first part of the remarks made by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR to the effect that the Committee was only concerned with the formal question of the order of the items on the agenda. No debate on the substance of the items involved had yet taken place. With regard to the objection raised as to the absence of material on the item under discussion, that objection applied equally to the proposal of the Soviet Union. He recalled that Mr. Austin had already referred to a proposal that all items suggested for inclusion on the agenda should be supported by preliminary evidence and that the representatives of the USSR had opposed it. Therefore, the Committee was in the position of dealing with the placing of an item on its agenda without having any previous documentation pertaining to the case. His delegation believed that states were entitled to raise international questions for discussion by the General Assembly.

6. As to the order on the agenda of the Chinese motion, the representative of the Ukrainian SSR had alleged that such a motion might envenom the discussion. It should be recalled, in this connexion, that the first paragraph of the Soviet Union proposal might also be described as somewhat provocative and not conducive to an atmosphere of peaceful discussions. Finally, it should be noted that the item proposed by the Soviet Union referred to a peace pact to be concluded between the five permanent members of the Security Council and that the relations between two of those powers were pertinent to the discussion of that item. In view of the above considerations, his delegation favoured the motion presented by the representative of China.

7. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) noted that the First Committee had already considered seriously and in detail the order of the items on its agenda. Since a decision had been adopted with regard to the six items, it would logically follow, therefore, that the proposal of the Kuomintang representative should be the last one on the agenda.

/The representative



The representative of the Kuomintang Government, however, deemed it essential that the item be placed third on the agenda. That move had been correctly interpreted by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR as calculated to poison the atmosphere and increase the tension in the First Committee. If that was the intention of the First Committee, it should follow the lead of the Chinese representative of the Kuomintang regime and it should then be clear that that would not lead to an "Assembly of peace" but to an Assembly of war or preparation of war. If the representative of the United States was adopting such a position, his reasoning would be a very bad omen for the work of the Committee. Moreover, should the majority of the First Committee acquiesce to the request of the Chinese representative, his delegation would interpret the vote as intending a preparation for war, not for peace.

8. The First Committee was not short of items for discussion and there were very important items on the agenda. Such items as the disposal of the former Italian colonies, the conclusion of the five-Power pact for the strengthening of peace and the Palestine question were very important items indeed and those had to be solved before taking up the Chinese question. The representative of the Kuomintang Government found it appropriate to make his suggestion for provocational purposes. The Soviet Union was not to blame for the fact that a civil war was the natural consequence of the mismanagement of the Kuomintang Government. The First Committee should approach the question with calm and impartiality. For those reasons, his delegation favoured placing the item seventh rather than third.

9. The CHAIRMAN noted that there were two proposals before the Committee. The first was that the item should be put third on the agenda; the other that it be put at the end of the agenda.

10. Mr. MANUILSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) declared that he had been at a loss to understand the position taken by the representative of the United States, since the official documents of the State Department propounded a different position. He reminded the Committee that the Secretary of State of the United States had stated in his White Paper that the events in China were the result of internal forces. It was clear therefore that outside influences had not created the Chinese situation. He could not understand how the representative

/of the



of the United States could support the proposal of a regime which was described in the White Paper as a mere corrupt clique. It would have been more logical for Dr. Jessup to adopt a policy of calmness than to support the Chinese proposal.

11. With regard to Dr. Jessup's contention that the Soviet Union had not submitted any documents supporting its proposal, Mr. Manuilsky recalled that the representative of the USSR had already submitted a draft resolution calling for a five-power pact. That proposal met the aspirations of all the Members of the United Nations and of millions of people all over the world who had been watching with concern the events of the last few months. Dr. Jessup's contention that the Soviet Union delegation had submitted no documents was, therefore, incorrect. Besides, the representative of the Kuomintang Government had neither submitted documents nor suggested any course of action. It was obvious that the proposal and the support given to it by the United States representative were dictated only by bias. His delegation felt that it would be in the interest of the progress of the work of the First Committee and of the prestige of the United Nations to reject the Chinese proposal and to place the item as the last one on the agenda or the next to the last.

12. Mr. VAN PALLANDT (Netherlands) said that the discussion of the Soviet Union proposal should be held in an atmosphere of serenity. He believed therefore that such a controversial item as the Chinese proposal should be disposed of before entering into discussion of the Soviet proposal. He supported the suggestion of the Chinese representative.

13. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq) noted that the representative of China was justified in proposing previously to place the Greek question as first on the agenda, leaving the other items for later consideration. There were some urgent items before the Committee which should be dealt with immediately. To this end, he proposed that the Committee should reconsider the agenda and rearrange the items in the light of the addition of the Chinese proposal.

/14. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI



14. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) said that the representative of the Kuomintang Government wanted the Committee to consider his provocational complaint and deal with it hurriedly since time was working against his Government. The First Committee had already debated at length the order of its items and adopted a decision. The Chinese proposal could not be considered seriously since the Committee would be acting against logic if it decided to reopen the debate. He added that the support given by the representative of the United States to the Chinese proposal was designed to shift serious items into the background, to hold up the peaceful initiative of the Soviet Union, and to undermine the possibilities of peaceful and constructive decisions by the General Assembly. His delegation was opposed to the Chinese proposal.

15. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that the head of the Soviet delegation had proved with great clarity the absurdity of the Kuomintang accusations against the Soviet Union. His delegation therefore deemed the item submitted by the Chinese representative unworthy of any serious attention. The Committee had already adopted a course of action and his delegation would object to the reconsideration of that course. It was difficult to imagine that the Committee, instead of considering the Soviet proposal which was designed to establish peace all over the world, should consider the provocational accusations of the bankrupt Kuomintang Government against the Soviet Union. Accordingly, his delegation fully endorsed the suggestion of the Byelorussian, Polish and Ukrainian delegations to the effect that the items submitted by the Chinese delegation should be considered as the last item on the agenda.

16. Mr. ABDUL RAHIM BEY (Egypt) believed that, although in the opinion of his delegation, the Chinese item should be considered high on the agenda, there were other items equally urgent and important, such as the Palestinian question. The Committee had already decided to consider the question of Palestine as its fourth item. It was now proposed to shift it to the fifth place. Moreover, his delegation had already opposed the delaying of the discussion on this item, since millions of refugees were scattered all over the Middle East, contributing a great danger to the security of that area. The question of Jerusalem needed also an urgent solution. For those reasons, his delegation favoured

/the reconsideration



the reconsideration of the order of the agenda.

17. FAYEZ BAY EL-KHOURI (Syria) supported the views expressed by the Egyptian representative and remarked that the Chinese problem had been submitted only a few days ago, whereas the Palestinian question had been under consideration for a number of years.

18. MR. CLEMENTIS (Czechoslovakia) remarked that the interventions of the representatives of Egypt and Syria showed clearly the danger of reconsidering the agenda. The so-called urgency of the item introduced by the representative of the Kuomintang Government was probably dictated by the rumours that in the very near future a Government representing the real people of China would be established. Taking into account that the reconsideration of the agenda would stress the provocative side of the item in question, his delegation, therefore, supported the proposal that the item should be last on the agenda.

19. MR. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland), speaking on a point of order, questioned the validity of the debate by referring to Rule 112 of the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly. According to that rule, any proposal that had been adopted or rejected by the Committee, might not be reconsidered at the same session, unless the Committee, by a two-thirds majority, so decided. It was logical therefore that a modification of the order of the agenda should accordingly be adopted by a two-thirds majority.

20. The CHAIRMAN contested the interpretation given by the representative of Poland. He explained that the Committee was not reconsidering a resolution previously adopted, but a new item to be included in the agenda. He reminded the Committee that the Byelorussian representative had stated earlier that it was up to the First Committee to decide on the order of the items. The First Committee was making that decision now, and the discussion on that matter was therefore quite in order.

/21. Mr. EPAN



21. Mr. EBAN (Israel) believed that the considerations put forward by the representative of Egypt deserved the sympathetic attention of the Committee. His delegation deemed it necessary that some items of importance to the people of the Middle East should not be encroached upon in favour of an item submitted at a later stage.

22. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) could not acquiesce with the interpretation given by the Chairman to Rule 112. He insisted that any change in the order of the items on the agenda must be adopted by a two-thirds majority.

23. The CHAIRMAN recalled that there had been no objections to his earlier statement, during the previous discussion of the order of the agenda, to the effect that should new items be submitted to the Committee by the General Assembly, their order on the agenda would be decided upon subsequently. It was on that understanding that the Committee had taken its decision. It would follow logically, therefore, that Rule 112 was not applicable in that case. Should, however, the representative of Poland challenge his ruling, he would immediately put it to the vote.

24. Mr. MANUILSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) regretted that the Chinese proposal should be wasting the time of the Committee. The point of view of the representative of Poland was quite correct, and the Chairman's interpretation of Rule 112 was incorrect. Regardless of the fact that the Chairman had foreseen or had not foreseen that there would be reconsideration of the order of their agenda, Rule 112 was perfectly clear on the case in point. Mr. Manuilsky, invoking Rule 102 of the Rules of Procedure, appealed against the ruling of the Chairman.

The Chairman's ruling was upheld by 47 votes in favour, 5 against, with 3 abstentions.

25. Fayez Bey EL-ZHOURI (Syria) explained that in his previous intervention he had not intended to say that the Palestinian problem must come before the Chinese problem because he did not sympathise with the Chinese, and assured the Chinese delegation of his delegation's sympathy. However, that did not prevent him from repeating the urgency of the problem of Palestine.

/26. Mr. ALVAREZ



26. Mr. ALVAREZ (Cuba) stated that his delegation considered the item brought before them by the representative of China to be one of the most urgent items with which the Committee had to deal. The essential objective of the General Assembly was to maintain peace, and there could be no doubt as to the situation of war extant in China. He did not understand how they could discuss the peace pact proposed by the USSR without first considering the Chinese problem, as the latter was the one that at present gave rise to the greatest anxiety and fear in the world. For that reason and because of the sympathy given by his delegation to the consideration of the independence of China, he was in favour of placing the Chinese question among the first items to be discussed. However, he wished to preserve the present agenda so as to consider the Arab refugees before the Chinese question. He proposed replacing the present item 3 by the Palestinian question and putting the Chinese question in fourth place. The fifth item would then be the USSR proposal.

27. Mr. JAMALI (Iraq) withdrew his suggestion in favour of the proposal of the representative of Cuba.

28. Mr. LONDONO (Colombia) reminded the members of the Committee how hard they had worked to establish the order of the items on their agenda at the first meeting. He drew the attention of the Committee to the possibility, already mentioned by the representative of Czechoslovakia, of a re-opening of the general debate. While he did not share the views of the Ukrainian representative regarding the immutability of the present order of the agenda, and had therefore voted in favour of the Chairman's ruling on the point, he feared that a re-opening of a general debate on the matter might lead to the habit of presenting procedural questions at each meeting. Pointing out that the order decided upon represented a compromise solution, and that the case of China had already been known to the Committee at the time of that decision, he regretted that he was unable to support the representative of China. He preferred that the agenda should be maintained in the order originally decided by the Committee.

29. On the suggestion of EL-KHOURI Bey (Syria), Mr. ALVAREZ (Cuba) submitted his proposal as an amendment to the Chinese proposal.



30. Mr. PIPINELIS (Greece) stated that his delegation would vote in favour of the Chinese proposal. In doing so it did not wish to minimize the urgency of some of the other items, in particular that of Palestine. However, that urgency applied equally to all the items on the agenda, and the order of their consideration could be decided upon only on the basis of logic. He felt that items concerned with threats to the political and territorial integrity of any country deserved some priority and that such items should be granted precedence when examined by the First Committee.

31. Mr. KISSELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) considered that the Cuban proposal was not an amendment and regretted the suggestion made by the Syrian representative. The Committee had decided by an overwhelming majority on the order in which the items on the agenda should be taken up, and from the logical, legal and juridical points of view the Chinese proposal, which had been submitted last, should be the seventh item on the agenda. The proposal of the Cuban representative was incorrect and irresponsible, as it would amount to reconsidering the decision of the First Committee, a decision reached after some difficulty, and as a result of a compromise. Although his delegation did not agree with the Chinese proposal, at least that proposal could be defended, and he requested the Chairman to put it to a vote.

32. The CHAIRMAN stated that he intended to put to the Committee the proposals in respect of the inclusion of the Chinese item in the order in which they were submitted. If any proposals were made dealing with matters other than the mere inclusion of the Chinese item, the Committee would discuss them after deciding on where the Chinese item should be placed.

33. Mr. MANUILSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that there was no doubt that the proposal of the USSR, according to the Cuban representative's proposal, was now to be relegated to a spot where it could easily be sabotaged. The majority had of course the power to adopt such a decision, but he must remind the Committee, with a full consciousness of the responsibility implicit in every word that he was saying, that if such an operation was carried out against the background of a series of arbitrary acts, such as the elections to leading organs and the attitude of the First Committee to various important political questions, if an atmosphere was being created in which a bankrupt group was being opposed to the USSR, although no one  
/had ever



had ever spoken of USSR assistance to any group in that State, it showed where they were being led. Mr. Manuilsky warned that such manoeuvres and methods had a cumulative effect. The quantity acquired a qualitative character which was fraught with dire consequences.

34. Mr. VITERI-LAFRONTÉ (Ecuador), recalling his suggestion at a previous meeting to the effect that they should decide upon two items to be discussed first, and agree later on the order in which other items should be discussed, stated that his delegation would have to abstain in the voting on any proposal which might mean amending the agenda already adopted.

35. Mr. THORS (Iceland) considered the matter of the order in which the items on the agenda were taken up was of great importance, as it could to a great extent influence the atmosphere in which the Committee worked. Pointing out that the decision previously reached by the Committee on that order, and particularly the agreement to place the USSR proposal in the third position on the agenda, had been reached in a spirit of conciliation, he thought that they should be most careful before endeavouring to change that token of conciliation. The USSR proposal was certainly an important matter, and he was sure that all members, and not least the representatives of the smaller countries, were most anxious to see what was behind that proposal. The question of China was also important, but if the discussion of the USSR proposal was to lead to anything, it was evident that the question of China would be considered by the Committee in a different atmosphere than if it was treated before the USSR item. Mr. Thors thought that they should not change the agenda as agreed upon a few days previously, but in view of the fact that the report of the Security Council had previously been largely a formal matter, he suggested that the Chinese question should be in the sixth place on the agenda.

36. Mr. EBAN (Israel) stated that while his delegation saw no particular reason for further deferment of consideration of the Palestine item, there were strong reasons against advancing that item as proposed by the representative of Cuba. For one thing, adoption of the Cuban proposal would involve a procedural irregularity. In the second place, the factors alluded to previously by the Lebanese representative remained valid. The final consideration had been stated by the representative of Iceland. The sooner it became clear whether

/or not



or not there was a prospect of improvement in great-power relationships, the better it would be for the remaining work of the Committee and for the future of the United Nations. Those considerations led him to question the value of the Cuban proposal, which would disrupt decisions already reached.

37. Mr. CASTRO (El Salvador) considered the question of the order of a particular item to be almost immaterial if the Committee really entertained the purpose of dealing seriously with all the items on the agenda. He felt that the questions concerning Greece, the former Italian colonies and Palestine, which were urgent and had already been subject to study and consideration by the Committee, should not be put further back on the agenda. The item submitted by the USSR was interconnected with the Chinese problem, and a preliminary consideration of the latter might come as a result of the USSR proposal, which he felt should be maintained in the third place of the order of the agenda. In view of the negotiations being conducted between the Netherlands Government and the representatives of the Indonesian Republic, he thought that the Indonesian question might wait a little, and proposed that the Chinese question be placed before that of Indonesia. The Chinese proposal would then be fifth on the agenda, the question of Indonesia sixth, and the seventh item would be the Security Council report.

38. Mr. BEBLER (Yugoslavia) stated that he had abstained on the point raised by the Polish delegation because, while opposed to the addition of the item proposed by China, he considered that it was difficult to hold that the mere addition of a new item amounted to the reconsideration of a previous decision. However, he considered that rule 112 should be applied as soon as they went beyond the mere addition of a new item.

39. He thought that the Committee would be acting against its decision of a few days previously if it inserted the Chinese item before the USSR proposal. Moreover, the point raised by the representative of China would lead into the realm of ideological dispute, which would not augur well for solution of the third item, relating to the prevention of a new war. He therefore favoured any proposal which would insert the Chinese item as late as possible in the agenda.



40. Mr. HOOD (Australia) stated that his delegation would support the insertion of the Chinese item in the place of the present third item, but saw no necessity why the remainder of the order should be disturbed at that point. However, if the insertion of the Chinese item resulted in any undue detriment to the question of Palestine, he thought that there would be no objection to taking items 4 and 5, the USSR item and the Palestinian one, concurrently. He pointed out that there had been at least one precedent for such simultaneous discussion of two items by the Committee.

41. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) said that the question was not merely of the order of consideration of items on the agenda, but was much more far-reaching. That had been understood by one of the representatives, who had said that war was raging in China and that therefore they must hasten to the crystallisation of the United Nations point of view on the issue. In addition, there were political events occurring in China. The Kuomintang Government was being liquidated, although it was still represented in the United Nations. What was at stake therefore was the adoption, in time, of decisions that would hamper the constructive work of peace until the Kuomintang Government finally crashed and absconded to Formosa, or somewhere else. Mr. Wierblowski praised the sense of responsibility shown by the representative of Iceland and considered that the latter's proposal should be viewed as a compromise. There was no sense in the Australian proposal, which was likely to lead only to disorder and chaos in the Committee's debate. On the other hand, the proposal of Iceland would contribute to a calm and serene atmosphere, and he therefore supported it.

42. The CHAIRMAN, referring to a point of procedure raised by several representatives, in particular the representative of Yugoslavia, reiterated that in his view the Committee was competent to decide the position to be given to the Chinese proposal on the agenda, but that if any other matter was raised which affected the order of the other items on the agenda, not consequential upon the Chinese item, rule 112 did apply.

43. Mr. ALVAREZ (Cuba) said that in view of the Chairman's interpretation, he would withdraw his proposed amendment.

44. The CHAIRMAN



44. The CHAIRMAN stated that a vote would be taken on the Chinese proposal to the effect that the item should become item no. 3 on the agenda.

The Chinese proposal was not adopted, there being 22 votes in favour, 22 against and 9 abstentions.

45. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) withdrew his delegation's proposal in favour of that put forward by the representative of Iceland.

46. The CHAIRMAN stated that a vote would be taken on the proposal submitted by the representative of Iceland to the effect that the Chinese item be included in the agenda in the sixth position, immediately after the question of Indonesia.

The proposal was rejected by 30 votes to 14, with 12 abstentions.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that he would now put the proposal of El Salvador to the vote. That proposal, which had also been put forward by other delegations, including Egypt, was that the Chinese question be placed fifth on the agenda, immediately after the question of Palestine but before that of Indonesia.

The proposal was adopted by 41 votes to 3, with 13 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.