

gation to help promote this kind of thing is all to the good. On many issues in the First Committee, however, we might seek to maintain our good reputation and help reduce tension by variations from standard patterns in our voting and by speaking somewhat more candidly and boldly in our interventions rather than by chasing after unanimity on any basis.

J.W. H[OLMES]

31. DEA/5475-DW-58-C-40

*Le représentant permanent auprès des Nations-Unis
au sous-secrétaire d'État aux Affaires extérieures*

*Permanent Representative to United Nations
to Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs*

LETTER NO. 266

New York, April 6, 1959

CONFIDENTIAL

THIRTEENTH SESSION GENERAL ASSEMBLY — GENERAL ASSESSMENT

Attached are 4 copies of a memorandum containing our general assessment of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly. This assessment is concerned primarily with the work of the political committees, but also deals briefly with the other committees.

2. Although it represents the views of this mission, rather than those of the Assembly delegation, this assessment also owes much to the first part of Mr. Holmes' most useful memorandum of January 27. As for the proposals for future policy contained in the second part of Mr. Holmes' memorandum, we hope to let you have our detailed comments before long.

C.S.A. RITCHIE

[PIÈCE JOINTE/ENCLOSURE]

Note

Memorandum

CONFIDENTIAL

GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF THE THIRTEENTH SESSION
OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

It seems to be the general consensus that the thirteenth session of the General Assembly was disagreeable, disturbing and unproductive. This impression was not shared equally by all delegations. The Soviet bloc professed to be quite satisfied with the outcome, and some of the so-called "uncommitted" countries were by no means disappointed with the direction in which they were able to influence the Assembly's deliberations. However, most of the friendly and like-minded delegations with whom we have habitually worked most closely were decidedly discouraged by this session. An analysis of the factors that contributed to this impression may be useful for future consideration of remedial measures.

2. There is no doubt that the session was disagreeable. This was the experience in every committee. Intransigence rather than moderation, propaganda rather than constructive action seemed to be the order of the day. Public postures were often extreme; real negotia-