

they would prefer, and this the Arabs in particular preferred, that the second and third operative paragraphs be revised to read as follows:

“(a) Takes note of the offer of good offices made by His Majesty the King of Morocco and His Excellency [the President] of the Republic of Tunisia (that is deleting the phrase about constructive possibilities which the Arabs interpreted as referring to the Loi Cadre);

(b) Expresses the hope that in a spirit of effective cooperation, pourparlers will be entered into, and other appropriate means utilized, with a view to a solution, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the UN.”

2. Once the African-Asian group had reached agreement about the text, the task remained to persuade the French to accept the changes. In addition, the African-Asians, and more particularly the Arabs, were anxious that Canada, Ireland and Norway should co-sponsor the revised text. The Japanese also desired this. We and the other two were reluctant to do so unless the text should prove to be acceptable to both sides. This we ascertained in consultations with representatives of both sides. In particular Engen learned from Pineau that the changes would be acceptable to France. In the end we agreed to co-sponsor.

3. Once these consultations had been completed the outcome of the Assembly consideration was quickly reached. The President read the revised text to the Assembly and mentioned the list of co-sponsors: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Cuba, Dominican Republic, India, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Norway, Peru, Spain and Thailand. The President then put the draft resolution to the vote and it was adopted unanimously, 80-0-0 with South Africa absent and France not participating in the vote.

4. It is a bit difficult to understand why this relatively weaker text should have proven more acceptable to the African-Asians than the amended draft resolution which faced the Committee last Friday. It is also curious that the French should have given in on such points as the offer of good offices and their previous insistence that initially discussions should be concerned only with ceasefire. We gathered that some of the Arabs consider that the new text is stronger than the previous one but we can only assume that this arises from a misunderstanding of what the previous text implied. As regards the French attitude, we understand that the French press gave Pineau most of the credit for the developments of Friday last and that perhaps in the current state of public opinion in France, Pineau was satisfied that he could take the new text, particularly since it was to be co-sponsored by a widely representative group of UN members but without the Arabs. Whatever the reasons, the current view here is that the Assembly has been able to dispose of the Algerian item much more effectively than at previous sessions. There is also a sense of relief that this outcome was accomplished well before the target date for the end of the session.