



Thursday, 24 January 1952, at 3 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot. Paris

CONTENTS

Page

Admission of new Members, including the right of candidate States to present proof of the conditions required under Article 4 of the Charter (A/1887/Rev.1, A/1899, A/1907, A/C.1/702/Rev.1, A/C.1/703 and A/C.1/708) (continued).....	247
--	-----

Chairman: Mr. Finn Moe (Norway)

**Admission of new Members, including the right of candidate States to present proof of the conditions required under Article 4 of the Charter (A/1887/Rev.1, A/1899, A/1907, A/C.1/702/Rev.3, A/C.1/703 and A/C.1/708) (continued)**

[Item 60]\*

**CONSIDERATIONS OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.1/702/REV.3 AND A/C.1/703) AND AMENDMENTS THERETO (concluded).**

1. The CHAIRMAN stated that the procedure he intended to follow with respect to the draft resolution submitted by Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua (A/C.1/708) was to postpone its consideration until after the debate upon the earlier resolutions and their amendments, the explanations of votes, and the voting had been completed.

2. The representatives of EL SALVADOR, ARGENTINA, the UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS and the UNITED KINGDOM took part in a procedural discussion.

3. The CHAIRMAN declared that if there were no objections, the Committee would discuss the procedure to be followed in connexion with the new draft resolution (A/C.1/708).

4. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) stated that, since the revised draft resolution of Peru (A/C.1/702/Rev.3) took into account a number of changes which had been submitted, his delegation would be in favour of parts of it. However, they could not support the paragraph which would invite States applying for admission to give evidence of their qualifications. On the other hand, they could not support the other proposals which were opposed to the Peruvian draft resolution, namely the Soviet Union draft resolution and amendments submitted by other delegations.

5. However, Mr. Urquia wished to point out that the new draft resolution of which his delegation was a joint sponsor (A/C.1/708) had the same objectives as the Peruvian draft resolution.

6. Mr. AL-GAYLANI (Iraq) said that the debate had shown that the principle of universality was of paramount

importance and was gaining every day more and more supporters but it had also shown that the Committee had not made any advance towards solving the question of the admission of new Members.

7. Since the delegation of Iraq favoured the principle of universality, it would support those parts of the Peruvian draft resolution which endorsed that principle and also the amendments submitted jointly by Lebanon and Syria (A/C.1/707) and the joint amendment submitted by Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras (A/C.1/706). It would also support the amendment of Argentina (A/C.1/705) to the Soviet Union draft resolution. The Iraqi delegation, however, believed that rigid juridical rules might tend to complicate the procedure for the admission of new Members.

8. Mr. Al-Gaylani appealed to the great Powers to compose their differences and take note of what had been said in the Committee with respect to the admission of new Members.

9. Mr. BATLLE BERRES (Uruguay) said his delegation would abstain from voting as it believed that none of the proposals submitted would solve the problem of the admission of new Members.

10. It believed that better understanding between the Members of the United Nations would eventually allow application of the principle of universality. Further study of the problem might bring forward a better way of reaching decisions on that question. Therefore, the representative of Uruguay would vote in favour of the new draft resolution (A/C.1/708).

11. Mr. MACAPAGAL (Philippines) stated that his delegation had always supported the principle of universality subject to the conditions contained in the Charter. The criteria set forth in Article 4 might be applied either loosely or strictly—it was unfortunate that the political situation had led to a stringent interpretation. That situation was not likely to be changed without a general modification of the international atmosphere.

12. The basic principle of the Peruvian draft resolution was that the qualifications of applicants should be examined objectively. It was unfortunate that States were being denied admission for reasons connected with power politics. That situation was mainly due to the Soviet Union's

\* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

disregard for the provisions of Article 4 of the Charter and its insistence on the admission of unqualified States.

13. As a supporter of the principle of universality, the Philippines took a liberal view of Article 4 and believed that the application of a State for membership should be considered as proof of its willingness to accept the obligations of the Charter, unless there was evidence to the contrary.

14. Accordingly, the Philippine delegation was in favour of the revised Peruvian draft resolution. Although that draft resolution, if adopted, might not aid any States to gain admission, it would elaborate a procedure for the future examination of applications. Moreover, as revised, the text would ensure that the submission of evidence would be purely optional, and that the Security Council should consider all pending applications.

15. The Soviet Union draft resolution (A/C.1/703) would restrict the consideration of the Security Council to those applications which it listed. As that list omitted the Republic of Korea and included Hungary, which was engaged in a serious dispute with a Member of the United Nations, the Philippine delegation would vote against the Soviet Union draft resolution.

16. Mr. LIU (China) said his delegation had supported the Peruvian draft resolution from the outset because it believed that it would afford a new approach to the problem arising from the abuse of the veto. The Chinese delegation would vote for the revised text of the draft resolution.

17. The Soviet Union draft resolution was unacceptable because it omitted any reference to the Republic of Korea, whose application was supported by nine members of the Security Council and had been recommended in 1949 by the General Assembly [*resolution 296 G (IV)*]. The Soviet Union proposal, moreover, sought the admission of Mongolia and Albania. Mongolia had none of the attributes of statehood, quite apart from the other necessary qualifications. The recent actions of Albania had only served to confirm the doubts entertained by the Chinese delegation when its application had first been submitted. While the Soviet Union proposal asked for the consideration of the application of Libya, which China supported, it was to be feared that that State would be denied admission by the author of the draft resolution. It had been indicated by the Soviet Union representative that that proposal was intended to have all the list of applicants dealt with together, which was contrary to the principles of the United Nations.

18. The Chinese delegation would vote against the Soviet Union draft resolution and therefore could not vote for the Argentine amendment thereto.

19. The Chinese delegation could see little point in establishing a time limit. Therefore it would abstain on the Argentine amendment to the Peruvian draft resolution. With regard to the amendments proposed by the five Latin American States (A/C.1/706) and by Lebanon and Syria (A/C.1/707), the Chinese delegation would abstain as many of the points of those amendments had been included in the revised text.

20. While universality of membership was desirable, it was not so necessary as unity of purpose in the United Nations. The Organization, however, needed the co-operation of qualified States and especially that of Italy. It was to be hoped that the Peruvian draft resolution would pave the way for remedying the situation.

21. Mr. ANDERSEN (Denmark) said his delegation reserved the right to give a supplementary explanation of its vote after it had examined the new revision of the Peruvian

draft resolution, and when it was clear which amendments would continue to stand.

22. Denmark favoured the principle of universality and would vote for such proposals as would contribute to that end. Denmark agreed that the right of veto involved above all an obligation to seek agreement and appreciated the declarations made by France, the United Kingdom and the United States, that if an applicant received seven votes in the Security Council, they would not invoke the rule of unanimity. In the interest of the Organization, it was to be hoped that all permanent members would assume the same attitude.

23. The Peruvian delegation had made an important attempt to break the deadlock, but it was doubtful whether it would lead to the desired goal. Although the submission of evidence was not made mandatory, some States might not regard it as in accordance with their sovereign status to give as detailed information as others and so new conflicts might arise.

24. The Danish delegation would vote against the Peruvian draft resolution, unless it incorporated the amendment submitted jointly by Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras. Accordingly, the Danish delegation would vote for that amendment.

25. The adoption of the amendment submitted by Lebanon and Syria (A/C.1/707) would improve the draft resolution, but not to the extent that the Danish delegation could vote for it. It could not support the Argentine amendment (A/C.1/704) as it would be unrealistic to convene a special session if, by the suggested date, the necessary majority had not been obtained so that the Security Council could make a recommendation to the General Assembly.

26. It might be said that the Soviet Union draft resolution would be superfluous if the Peruvian proposal was adopted. The Danish delegation would, however, vote for it, but dissociated itself from the arguments of the Soviet Union representative. Having a different approach, the Danish delegation would vote for the preamble proposed in the Argentine amendment (A/C.1/705). Moreover, in voting for the Soviet Union draft resolution, the Danish delegation would not intend the Security Council to limit its consideration to the applicants listed in the draft resolution. It did not forget the Republic of Korea and hoped that an armistice would create a realistic basis for the admission of Korea to membership.

27. A deadlock which blocked the applications of States to which there were no real objections was unjustified. It was unfair to bar a number of European States, for Europe was under-represented in the United Nations and a more comprehensive representation would strengthen world peace.

28. Mr. H. S. MALIK (India) said that the position of his Government was that no irrelevant considerations should exclude qualified applicants. It was sure that the admission of such States would assist in carrying out the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. Accordingly, it was in favour of the revised Peruvian draft resolution.

29. The Soviet Union draft resolution would also be helpful and India could see no objection to the Security Council considering that list of applicants. It would therefore vote in favour of the Soviet Union draft resolution.

30. Mr. Malik appealed to all to co-operate for the admission of all independent, sovereign States which met the conditions of Article 4. It was commonly understood that applicants were being rejected merely because the permanent members of the Security Council were unable to reach agreement for wholly irrelevant reasons.

31. Mr. VON BALLUSECK (Netherlands) said that the representative of Peru had made a constructive contribution to the debate by producing the third revision of his draft resolution which tried to meet the suggestions of other delegations. It no longer attempted to solve the problem of the veto, but rather clarified the responsibilities and duties arising under Article 4.

32. The Netherlands delegation had some reservations to the thesis that the positions of States should be taken on a purely juridical basis. However, it was pleased to note that it had been made clear that the submission of evidence would be optional. The new formulation would leave the members of the Security Council greater freedom of judgment.

33. The Netherlands delegation would therefore vote in favour of the revised draft resolution and would abstain on the amendments not incorporated in the text.

34. It would also abstain from voting on the Soviet Union draft resolution which was incomplete, inasmuch as it omitted the Republic of Korea and was superfluous, since the Peruvian proposal dealt with all applicants. If, however, the intention of the Soviet Union draft resolution was to have the Security Council consider favourably the applications listed, the Netherlands delegation would vote against it.

35. Mr. CORDOVA (Mexico) said that his delegation was in favour of the Peruvian draft resolution as amended by the incorporation of the amendment submitted by Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and by point 4 of the amendment of Lebanon and Syria.

36. Mexico had always understood the principle of universality to mean that the United Nations should embrace all States which conformed to certain standards. The peace-loving nature of a State was not a matter of evidence: it should be regarded as existing, unless it was otherwise proven. In arriving at a judgment, the Security Council and the General Assembly should examine the real motives of a State for seeking admission.

37. The delegation of Mexico therefore was unable to vote in favour of the second, third and fourth paragraphs of the preamble and paragraphs 1 and 2 of the operative part of the Peruvian draft resolution (A/C.1/702/Rev.3). It proposed that the suppression of those paragraphs, as proposed in point 1 of the amendment submitted by five Latin American States (A/C.1/706/Rev.1), corresponded more closely with its view.

38. The attempts to argue that the Charter did not require the unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council on the question of the admission of new Members had not convinced Mexico. In that, as in other important matters, it was necessary to have a harmonious understanding between the great Powers. The smaller nations could contribute to such an understanding by lending serenity to the proceedings.

39. The Mexican delegation accordingly looked with favour upon the amendment of Lebanon and Syria (A/C.1/707) which would request the permanent members to consult together on the question of applications for membership. Without such joint action, the matter could not have a satisfactory solution, and the Powers which had the right of veto, also had the obligation to seek agreement.

40. If the Security Council was unable to take action upon the outstanding applications, there would be no use in convening a special session of the General Assembly

which could not legally solve the problem alone. Mexico therefore did not consider the Argentine amendment (A/C.1/704) to be acceptable.

41. The Soviet Union draft resolution (A/C.1/703) would receive the support of the Mexican delegation if the list it contained was not to be regarded as exhaustive. However, as the Peruvian draft resolution would contain the same recommendation, there was no need to vote on the Soviet Union draft resolution or the Argentine amendment thereto (A/C.1/705).

42. The Argentine proposal at the 498th meeting for the creation of a sub-committee which would attempt to conciliate the various points of view, was in accordance with the ideals of the Mexican delegation, namely, that the smaller Powers should try to achieve a better understanding among the permanent members.

43. Mr. COOPER (Liberia) said that though the arguments advanced in favour of the Peruvian draft resolution were convincing, its adoption, judging by experience, was unlikely to change the attitude of the USSR. The fact remained that the Charter called for the unanimity of the permanent members in decisions of the Security Council, and that a recommendation from the Security Council was necessary for the General Assembly to decide upon the admission of new Members. Unless a compromise could be found, no resolution not supported by the "Soviet bloc" had much chance of success.

44. Moreover, he felt that it would be humiliating for any State to have to submit evidence in face of the fact that its application would be rejected unless the USSR attitude changed.

45. He could not support any resolution foredoomed to failure and therefore would abstain from voting on all the draft resolutions and amendments before the Committee.

46. Mr. DE PIMENTEL BRANDAO (Brazil) supported the Peruvian draft resolution which would represent a step forward even if it did not permit a final solution.

47. He opposed the Argentine amendment to it since he did not agree that the General Assembly could make a decision admitting a new Member without a recommendation from the Security Council.

48. Stating that he favoured liberal interpretation of the principle of universality, he suggested that though the USSR proposal was not likely to receive support, it might be reconsidered in the future.

49. In that connexion, he appealed to the Members of the Organization to take whatever measures would be necessary to permit the admission of Spain and to add that country to the list in the USSR draft resolution.

50. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had intended, in submitting its draft resolution, that the Security Council should reconsider favourably the applications listed. There was a precedent for the USSR proposal to admit all fourteen States: the United States had proposed the simultaneous admission of eight States in the Security Council in 1946.<sup>1</sup>

51. The USSR proposal provided a great opportunity to make the United Nations a fully universal Organization and to foster friendship among States. Dealing with criticism of the USSR proposal on the grounds that the South Korean puppet régime was not listed in it, Mr. Malik said that the attitude of the USSR towards that régime, which had been

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, Second Series*, No. 4, 54th meeting.

set up by United States military forces, was well known. Moreover, the Committee had decided at its 486th meeting to postpone consideration of the question of the independence of Korea *sine die* on the grounds that discussion of it would hinder the negotiations in Panmunjom. The question of the application for membership certainly formed part of the question of the independence of Korea. Nevertheless, the representative of the United States had tried to raise the Korean question again in order to prevent the adoption of the Soviet draft resolution for the admission of the fourteen applicant States.

52. The USSR accepted the Argentine amendment (A/C.1/705) to its draft resolution. The modified text, which offered a way to solve the entire question, should be supported by the delegations interested in expanding the Organization and making it universal.

53. Noting that the United States representative had referred to the response of the Italian people to the question of the admission of Italy and to the entire discussion of the admission of new Members in the Committee, Mr. Malik quoted a recent report in *The Times* to the effect that Italian observers were deeply disappointed by the strong United States opposition to the USSR draft resolution and that there was a growing feeling that a solution could be reached only along the lines of that proposal. The same article ascribed American objections to the omission of South Korea from the text of the USSR draft resolution.

54. Turning to the revised Peruvian draft resolution (A/C.1/702/Rcv.3), Mr. Malik noted that it was clearly designed to deal another blow to the principle of unanimity. The effort had proved ineffective: criticism and amendments had forced such modification of that proposal as to make it virtually useless.

55. Though he had no objection to the paraphrasing of Article 4 of the Charter, the first paragraph was superfluous and he would abstain from voting on it.

56. As for the second paragraph, no one was entitled to demand that candidates should submit such evidence as was called for. It was implicit in the Charter and under the rules of procedure of the Security Council that States could submit such evidence if they wished to.

57. Paragraph 2 of the operative part, corresponding to the second paragraph, would amount to interference with the sovereignty of candidate States. The reference to the rules of procedure was irregular, since neither the rules of procedure of the General Assembly nor those of the Security Council provided for the submission of evidence. Asking why it had suddenly been discovered that evidence was needed, Mr. Malik said that the purpose of the original form of the Peruvian draft resolution had been to provide foundations for the illegal and unconstructive position of the United States, which could then have argued that the States whose admission it opposed had not submitted sufficient evidence.

58. The third paragraph of the Peruvian draft resolution was unacceptable to the USSR since it made reference to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice which was not entitled to interpret the Charter.

59. As for the fourth paragraph no one had ever objected to States submitting evidence.

60. Paragraph 1 of the operative part was also superfluous, and he would abstain from voting on it.

61. The last paragraph of the preamble made reference to General Assembly resolutions to which the USSR had objected, and was unacceptable.

62. Presumably, in paragraph 3 of the operative part, "all pending applications for admission" would include

the South Korean puppet régime whose admission his Government would not accept. Mr. Malik would, therefore, vote against that paragraph.

63. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics accepted paragraph 4 of the operative part which reproduced an amendment submitted by Lebanon and Syria, and which might, if applied, lead to a solution.

64. If the amendment submitted by Chile, Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras (A/C.1/706) to the Peruvian draft resolution were maintained, Mr. Malik would vote against it because, in point 1, there was reference to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and to resolutions which the USSR could not accept, while point 2 called for the inclusion of South Korea among the countries whose applications for admission were to be considered.

65. The representative of the Soviet Union would vote against the amendment submitted by Argentina (A/C.1/704) to the Peruvian draft resolution, since the modified text of the USSR draft resolution would allow the Security Council to report to the General Assembly at its current session and there would be no need to convene a special session.

66. Mr. SALAH-UD-DIN (Pakistan) would support the joint amendment of Lebanon and Syria (A/C.1/707, point 2) to delete paragraph 2 of the operative part of the revised Peruvian draft resolution, since that paragraph was unlikely to solve the question of the admission of new Members and might lead to further complication. If it were deleted he would support the Peruvian proposal as a whole, but he would abstain if the paragraph were maintained.

67. He would vote against the Argentine amendment to the Peruvian draft resolution.

68. He would abstain from voting on the USSR draft resolution as he would have preferred that the recommendation of the General Assembly, in the present circumstances, should cover all pending applications.

69. Sir Keith OFFICER (Australia) repeated that he would support the Peruvian draft resolution, especially since his main doubts had been removed by the modifications which had been made.

70. He also maintained his intention to abstain from voting on the USSR draft resolution, the wording of which did no more than recommend reconsideration by the Security Council. Had it gone further, he would have had to vote against it, since his delegation considered that each case should be dealt with on its merits. Moreover, all pending applications should be reconsidered. However, he did not wish to oppose any draft resolution for reconsideration by the Security Council of the applications for membership.

71. Mahmoud FAWZI Bey (Egypt) considered that the issue had become increasingly confused and that the debate had perhaps even detracted from what had already been accomplished with regard to the question of the admission of new Members.

72. That was a question on which the Charter had always been perfectly clear. Further definition had been made by various resolutions of the General Assembly and the two advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice. The main obstacle to a solution was due to the political conflict between the two "sides" in the current struggle, which prevented achievement of universality. One side included countries which had supported the admission of States no more peace-loving than those which were at present



excluded. The other flagrantly distorted the intention of the Charter by putting the question of admission on a *quid pro quo* basis. No precedent whatever regarding the question of membership could change or revise the Charter.

73. There was one valuable aspect of the discussion, namely, the opportunity to express the concern of the Organization in connexion with the important question of membership.

74. The revised Peruvian draft resolution (A/C.1/702/Rev.3) was acceptable except for the second paragraph and paragraph 2 of the operative part. The second paragraph of the preamble was superfluous, and he would abstain from voting on it. Paragraph 2 of the operative part would represent a retrogression from what had already been accomplished by the United Nations on the question of the admission of new Members, and he would vote against it. The vote of Egypt on the proposal as a whole would depend on the fate of those two paragraphs.

75. The delegation of Egypt would support the USSR draft resolution, which tended towards the application of universality.

76. As long as there was no progress, the Argentine amendment to the Peruvian draft resolution calling for a special session of the General Assembly would be useless, and he would vote against the amendment, especially since he did not agree with the Argentine doctrine as to the relative competence of the General Assembly and the Security Council on the question of the admission of new Members.

77. Mr. ARGUELLO (Nicaragua) was sure that those who had laid the foundations of the United Nations and had signed the Charter had not intended to exclude from the Organization any State which fulfilled the conditions of Article 4. For six years, however, the abuse of the right of veto, which had been applied for reasons other than those contained in Article 4, had excluded such States.

78. The Charter must be interpreted as a multilateral treaty, and therefore only legal interpretations of it were valid. Though it was clear that the Security Council could make a recommendation to the General Assembly regarding applications for membership, the General Assembly had the power to decide on admission, and could either accept or reject such recommendations whether they were favourable or unfavourable. To link the right of veto to the question of the admission of new Members was to distort the principles of the Charter.

79. The veto had been accepted at San Francisco as a great sacrifice and on the basis that it would be applicable to measures of a coercive nature. Citing the four-Power statement made at San Francisco on the voting procedure in the Security Council<sup>2</sup>, Mr. Arguello said that it had been perfectly clear that the veto was not to be applied to decisions which did not imply the adoption of direct measures relating to the settlement of disputes, the adjustment of situations which might lead to disputes, the removal of threats to the peace, and of violations of the peace.

80. The best resolution which the Committee could adopt would be one making it clear that, according to Articles 4 and 27 of the Charter, the General Assembly had the right to decide on applications for membership, regardless of whether the recommendation of the Security Council was favourable or unfavourable, and that the voting procedure contained in Article 27 could not apply to the admission of new Members. Since such a proposal would not be accepted, however, he would support the revised Peruvian

draft resolution. That draft resolution in no way conflicted with the draft resolution submitted by Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua (A/C.1/708).

81. As the USSR draft resolution recommended the admission to membership of 14 nations he would vote against it, because his delegation could not agree to the admission of certain States which had not carried out the obligations contained in Article 4.

82. In conclusion, he stressed the special position of Italy, which deserved to be a Member of the Organization.

83. Mr. GROSS (United States of America) would vote in favour of the revised Peruvian draft resolution.

84. In view of the explanation of the representative of the USSR, who had stated that the USSR draft resolution was intended to secure favourable consideration by the Security Council of the applications listed, there was no doubt as to the legal effect of that proposal should it be adopted by the General Assembly. As had been said, the law of Article 4 of the Charter must be applied. He regretted that the USSR representative had referred to certain proceedings in 1946 in a way which did not accurately reproduce the position in the Security Council at that time.

85. In that connexion, he quoted from a statement made by the USSR representative on 28 August 1946<sup>3</sup>, when Mr. Gromyko had been unable to agree to "wholesale" admission and had called for separate consideration of each application. It was true that the United States had suggested the admission of eight States, as an extreme measure and with great misgivings as to the eligibility of Outer Mongolia, at a time when rule 60 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council was not yet in existence and when the International Court of Justice had not yet submitted its advisory opinion of 28 May 1948.

86. As for the USSR representative's reference to the Republic of Korea, Mr. Gross said that the aggression against the Republic of Korea could not be advanced as an excuse for excluding it from membership. No other interpretation of the USSR statement concerning a State for which the United Nations had a special responsibility seemed possible.

87. There was a basic fallacy in the USSR reasoning, since it was the USSR which had been thwarting the will of the majority. Pointing out that none of the States whose applications were supported by the USSR had received a majority of votes in the Security Council nor in the General Assembly, Mr. Gross stated that the United States had never vetoed an application for admission and would never do so.

88. He added that the repetitious charges of a subservient relationship between self-respecting States had never been taken seriously.

89. The United States representatives could not support the Argentine amendment to the Peruvian draft resolution, since that amendment appeared to be based on the assumption that the General Assembly was empowered to decide on applications for admission regardless of whether or not there was a recommendation from the Security Council.

90. Mr. C. MALIK (Lebanon) asked if the representative of Peru would agree to delete paragraph 2 of the operative part of the revised text of the Peruvian draft resolution if the words "and evidence" were inserted after the word "facts" in paragraph 3 of the operative part.

<sup>2</sup> See Documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, San Francisco 1945, volume XI, document 852 III/1/37.

<sup>3</sup> See Official Records of the Security Council, First Year, Second Series, No. 4, 55th meeting.

91. Mr. TINE (France) welcomed the modifications in the Peruvian draft resolution, particularly those in the second paragraph of the preamble and in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the operative part.

92. In view of his delegation's reservations concerning resolution 296 K (IV) adopted on 22 November 1949 by the General Assembly, Mr. Tine would abstain from voting on the last paragraph of the preamble. His delegation would also abstain from voting on paragraph 4 of the operative part, since it would be best in that respect to abide by the will of the General Assembly. His delegation had no objection to the principle of consultation among the members of the Security Council.

93. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) said that in view of the statements made by the representatives of Syria and Lebanon, he accepted the suggestion that paragraph 2 of the operative part be deleted. That paragraph would become redundant with the addition suggested by the representative of Lebanon.

94. Stating that the USSR representative would not have attacked the Peruvian draft resolution if it had been without significance, he said that the USSR erred in separating its decision from its judgment, and in opposing the admission of certain States which it recognized to be peace-loving. That was why it was important to stress, as the Peruvian draft resolution did, the nature of the judgment of the Organization on States applying for membership. The first paragraph of the Peruvian draft resolution did not merely paraphrase Article 4: it stressed the fact that all States wishing to become Members of the Organization must fulfill the obligations contained in the Charter.

95. Mr. HRSEL (Czechoslovakia) would vote in favour of the USSR draft resolution, including the Argentine amendment. Adoption of that proposal would guarantee a fair solution of the problem of the admission of new Members.

96. He observed that those who cited the opinions of the International Court of Justice should not lose sight of the fact that that body held that no State could be admitted to membership of the United Nations without the recommendation of the Security Council. The question of the admission of new Members, which was first of all a political matter, must be settled by agreement between the Powers.

97. The debate showed that the United States was responsible for the deadlock which existed. The United States representative had shown that he was interested only in using the Organization for the aggressive purposes of the United States, and was not interested in the peaceful co-operation of nations. That was why the applications of the peoples' democracies, who had given ample proof of their peace-loving policies, and whose fitness for membership could not be questioned, had been rebuffed. The question could be resolved only on the basis of the USSR draft resolution.

98. He would vote in favour of paragraph 4 of the operative part of the Peruvian draft resolution; he would abstain from voting on the first paragraph and on paragraph 1 of the operative part. He would vote against the draft resolution as a whole.

99. Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland) said that the reason for his delegation's opposition to the Peruvian draft resolution had been given previously. The changes which had been incorporated in the revision did not alter its basic character which was contrary to the spirit and letter of the Charter.

100. On the other hand, the Polish delegation regarded the Soviet Union draft resolution as being in accordance

with the Charter and the interests of the Organization. The acceptance by the Soviet Union of the Argentine amendment again demonstrated the desire of the Soviet Union to have all applicants admitted and refuted the accusations of the United States about the use of the veto. The Soviet Union draft was designed to prevent discrimination and represented the only realistic way of solving the problem of membership. Only by such means could they ensure the admission of all States regardless of their political structure and without any discrimination. The Polish delegation would vote in favour of the Soviet Union draft resolution and the Argentine amendment to it.

101. Mr. MAZA (Chile) stated that the third revision of the Peruvian draft resolution after the deletion of paragraph 2 of the operative part contained the ideas presented by his delegation and the delegations of Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras. Although different terms had been used, the principles were acceptable.

102. Mr. Maza, therefore, wished to withdraw the joint amendment (A/C.1/706) to the Peruvian draft resolution.

103. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) drew attention to the admission by the representative of the United States that in 1946, the United States had proposed that eight applicants be admitted *en bloc* and had not then regarded the procedure as contrary to the Charter. The matter was of great importance because the United States representative in his first statement (497th meeting) had attacked the Soviet Union proposal on those very grounds. It was a reflection of the inconsistency of the United States.

104. With regard to the references to a statement by Mr. Gromyko, Mr. Malik said that at the time it had been correct because up till that stage, the Security Council had not considered any of those eight applications individually. However, at the present time, all thirteen applications had been given individual consideration on a number of occasions. It was therefore clear that a proposal to admit fourteen States *en bloc* was better founded and more appropriate than had been the similar proposal for the admission of eight applicants in 1946.

105. The argument that the Soviet Union should not prevent the entry of nine applicants because it had not raised any objections to them was not valid, for if the Soviet Union were to act in the manner of the United States, it would raise many objections. However, the Soviet Union believed that the best way would be to admit all fourteen States together.

106. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) stated that he wished to clarify the question of the interpretation of the word "recommendation" in Article 4 of the Charter. The minutes of the meeting of 18 June 1945 of Committee I of Commission II (San Francisco Conference on International Organization) referred to the opinion of the Advisory Committee of Jurists that the General Assembly might accept or reject a recommendation for the admission of a new Member or accept or reject a recommendation to the effect that a given State should not be admitted to the United Nations. It was stated in a further passage in the same minutes that the Chairman of Committee I, replying to a question from the delegate of Greece as to whether the jurists' interpretation would be authoritative for the future functions of the General Assembly, had decided to insert that interpretation in the minutes.

107. Apart from that proof of the competence of the General Assembly to accept or reject a recommendation to the effect that a given State should not be admitted, it was also evident that the "recommendation" of Article 4

did not necessarily imply a recommendation in favour of admission.

108. The Argentine amendment to the Soviet Union proposal was based on the fact that it was the unanimous opinion of the Members of the United Nations that the General Assembly was free to admit or reject applications which had been favourably recommended for admission by the Security Council. In his view that was the only basis for a solution of the problem of admission of new Members during the present session of the Assembly.

109. With regard to the suggestion which it had made at the 498th meeting for a sub-committee to reconcile conflicting views, the Argentine delegation desired to make a formal proposal to that effect in the light of the various remarks which had been made. The sub-committee might

consist of those delegations which had made proposals on the question and might find a compromise formula.

110. Mr. C. MALIK (Lebanon) moved the adjournment of the debate.

*The motion was adopted by 36 votes to 7, with 14 abstentions.*

111. The CHAIRMAN stated that consideration of the draft resolutions and the amendments thereto was completed, as well as the explanations of vote.

112. He announced that at the next meeting, the representatives of Greece and the Soviet Union would be given the floor and then the debate would be confined to the Argentine proposal.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.