



Friday, 25 January 1952, at 10.30 a.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.3, A/C.1/703 and A/C.1/708) (*continued*).. 255

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]*

1. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he would like to reply to the Greek representative's criticisms of the USSR contention that the attitude of Greece had prevented the admission of Albania to the United Nations.

2. The Greek representative had stated that his Government's attitude had been due to the activities of guerrillas in Greek territory. The fact was, however, that on 12 February 1946—that is the day before the question of the admission of Albania had been considered by the Security Council—a letter had been received from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Greece¹ in which it was stated that the admission of Albania, a country bordering on Greece, especially affected the interests of the latter country. It was that letter which had resulted in the adjournment of the consideration of the question; and that had been in February 1946, at which time Greece had not yet become the victim of civil war.

3. It was also appropriate to recall the letter dated 17 October 1946² addressed to the Secretary-General by the Albanian Government in which attention was drawn to the fact that the Security Council had decided to recommend the admission of Albania by 5 votes to 3. The Albanian Government had noted with profound regret that the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States had opposed the admission in spite of Albania's sacrifices in the struggle against fascism. The United Kingdom and the United States, both using their veto, had thus prevented the admission of Albania.

4. Subsequently, at the time of the consideration of the Greek question, it had become perfectly obvious that the main cause of the Greek Government's opposition to the admission of Albania had been Greece's illegal and unjustified claims to northern Epirus, a part of Albanian territory.

Those claims had been supported by the United Kingdom and the United States.

5. During the fifth session of the General Assembly, the USSR delegation had proposed the following measures : a general amnesty in Greece and the abolition of the concentration camps ; general elections based on democratic principle ; cessation of United Kingdom and United States interference in the domestic affairs of Greece ; the establishment of normal diplomatic relations between Greece on the one hand and Albania and Bulgaria on the other ; and, lastly, the dissolution of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans.³ The Governments of Albania and Bulgaria had declared themselves in favour of the proposals. The Greek Government, on the other hand, had rejected them and refused to abandon its annexationist aims.

6. The fact that relations between Albania and Greece were not normal was therefore due to the attitude of Greece. The representative of the United States, however, made use of the abnormal nature of the relations between Greece and Albania to justify his refusal to vote for the admission of Albania. That attitude, of course, was unjust, especially since Albania had stated its readiness to establish diplomatic relations with Greece at any time, provided, naturally, that Greece renounced its territorial ambitions and plans of aggression against Albania.

7. Mr. POLITIS (Greece) thought that, in accusing Greece of having prevented the admission of Albania to the United Nations, the USSR representative was raising a different question from that which had been the subject of his previous remarks. Those remarks had related to the charge that Greece had caused the failure of the Conciliation Committee.

8. To refute that charge, it was enough to recall the report by the Chairman of the Conciliation Committee, which gave the USSR delegation's reply to the Committee's proposals.⁴ That reply had been to the effect that the guerrillas should be given the status of belligerents, and it had asked for the participation of the guerrilla chiefs in the Government. Such demand constituted an interference in the domestic affairs of Greece and support for

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

¹ See document A/19.

² See document A/183.

³ See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Annexes, agenda item 22, document A/C.1/623.

⁴ See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session, First Committee, Annex, document A/C.1/506, appendices 1 and 2.

subversive activity directed from abroad, particularly by Powers acting under the aegis of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

9. For its part, the Albanian delegation had replied by putting forward proposals which had completely changed those advanced by the Conciliation Committee and deprived them of all meaning and value. Furthermore, the Albanian delegation had expressed its complete agreement with the USSR delegation's proposals. Thus the Soviet Union, on the one hand, had made proposals incompatible with a State's sovereign rights, and Albania, on the other hand, had made its acceptance of the proposals advanced by the Conciliation Committee conditional upon acceptance of the proposals advanced by the USSR delegation.

10. With regard to the argument that the letter from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Greece had prevented the admission of Albania in 1946, it was enough to point out that, if that was true, it only proved that the reasons adduced by the Greek Government had been of such importance that the United Nations had not considered it advisable to admit Albania to membership.

11. The aggressive policy of some of Greece's neighbours, such as Albania, was known to all. It was enough to recall the detention of thousands of children and hostages and the repeated refusal to accept the good offices of the International Red Cross and the League of Red Cross Societies.

12. Obviously, the United Nations could not give its consent to the admission of States which flagrantly violated all the rules and principles of the Organization. To gain admission, it would be enough for such States to respect the principles of the Charter and recognize the authority of all the organs of the United Nations.

13. The CHAIRMAN said that he considered the debate on the subject was concluded.

14. He pointed out that the Committee now had before it the Argentine representative's proposal for the establishment of a sub-committee. He asked representatives not to speak on the subject for more than five minutes.

15. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) asked that the Committee should vote on the Peruvian draft resolution before discussing the proposal to establish a sub-committee.

16. That would be in accordance with the rules of procedure and the dictates of common sense. Furthermore, the draft resolution had been considered by an unofficial working group composed of all the representatives who had submitted amendments or made suggestions during the discussion. He felt that, in the circumstances, a sub-committee was unnecessary.

17. Mr. C. MALIK (Lebanon) supported the Peruvian representative's request. If the proposal to establish a sub-committee was put to the vote, his delegation would vote against it.

18. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that there was no reason to establish a sub-committee since the Committee had studied in detail all the draft resolutions and all the amendments.

19. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) said that, after listening to the remarks of the representatives of Peru, Lebanon and the USSR, he had lost any hope he might have had that the Committee would agree on a single proposal, and consequently he withdrew his proposal for the establishment of a sub-committee.

20. As the majority of the members of the Committee had taken a negative attitude to the idea of convening a special session of the General Assembly, he also withdrew his amendment (A/C.1/704) to the Peruvian draft resolution.

VOTE ON THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY PERU (A/C.1/702/Rev.3)

21. The CHAIRMAN stated that the representative of Peru had accepted (500th meeting) an amendment calling for the deletion of paragraph 2 of the operative part of his draft resolution (A/C.1/703/Rev.3). Consequently, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the operative part became paragraphs 2 and 3. In addition, the words "and evidence" had been inserted after the word "facts" in the text of the new paragraph 2.

22. He invited the Committee to proceed to the vote.

23. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) proposed the deletion of the letter K after the figure 296 in the last paragraph of the preamble of the Peruvian draft resolution (A/C.1/702/Rev.3), so that the paragraph should refer to all the General Assembly resolutions which bore the number 296. He would, however, exclude resolution 296 J (V), which concerned the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.

24. He also proposed the addition of a reference to the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 7 December 1951 (A/L.2) concerning Italy's application for membership in the United Nations.

25. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) accepted the Argentine representative's amendment.

26. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that, as the Chairman had invited the Committee to proceed with the voting, the time-limit for the submission of amendments had expired and the Argentine amendment was therefore out of order.

27. Moreover, the amendment conflicted with paragraph 2 of the operative part of the Peruvian draft resolution, as it covered only the States referred to in the various parts of resolution 296, whereas paragraph 2 recommended that *all* pending applications for admission should be reconsidered.

28. The CHAIRMAN, on the basis of rule 127 of the rules of procedure, ruled the Argentine amendment out of order.

29. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina) challenged the Chairman's ruling.

30. He argued that, on the one hand, he had submitted his amendment at that point only because he had thought that a sub-committee might be set up in which he could submit his amendment, and, on the other, that the amendment itself merely recalled and reaffirmed previous resolutions of the General Assembly.

The Chairman's ruling was upheld by 38 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

31. The CHAIRMAN put successively to the vote the five paragraphs of the preamble of the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Peru (A/C.1/702/Rev.3).

The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 49 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

The second paragraph was adopted by 30 votes to 12, with 15 abstentions.

The third paragraph was adopted by 42 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

The fourth paragraph was adopted by 39 votes to 5, with 14 abstentions.

The fifth paragraph was adopted by 42 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions.

32. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 46 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

33. The CHAIRMAN stated that he would put to the vote paragraph 2 (former paragraph 3) of the operative part of the draft resolution.

34. Mr. SOHLMAN (Sweden) asked that that paragraph be put to the vote in two parts, the first part ending with the words "all pending applications for the admission of new Members".

35. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote successively the two parts of paragraph 2 of the operative part.

The first part of paragraph 2 was adopted by 51 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

The second part of paragraph 2 was adopted by 36 votes to 9, with 13 abstentions.

36. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 3 (former paragraph 4) of the operative of the draft resolution.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 51 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

37. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the whole draft resolution submitted by Peru (A/C.1/702/Rev.3), including the changes accepted by its sponsor.

The draft resolution was adopted by 36 votes to 9, with 12 abstentions.

VOTE ON THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE USSR (A/C.1/703)

38. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Argentine amendment (A/C.1/705) to the USSR draft resolution had been accepted by the representative of the USSR and that, consequently, the draft resolution consisted of two paragraphs. There would be a separate vote on the two paragraphs and on the last phrase of the operative part (A/C.1/705, point 2).

39. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the paragraph of the preamble (A/C.1/705, point 1).

The paragraph was adopted by 26 votes to one, with 30 abstentions.

40. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the operative paragraph of the draft resolution (A/C.1/703).

The paragraph was adopted by 21 votes to 10, with 26 abstentions.

41. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the last phrase of the operative part (A/C.1/705, point 2).

The phrase was rejected by 19 votes to 18, with 21 abstentions.

42. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote as a whole the draft resolution submitted by the USSR.

The draft resolution was adopted by 21 votes to 12, with 25 abstentions.

43. Mr. WILSON (New Zealand) said that he had abstained from voting on the USSR draft resolution because the States enumerated in that document did not include Korea. He hoped that that defect would be remedied in the Security Council. In any case, the USSR draft resolution meant merely what it said, that the Security Council was asked to reconsider certain candidatures. The Council would not be required to make a favourable recommendation in the case of the States referred to, nor to reconsider all the candidates "en bloc". Lastly, whatever recommendation the Security Council might make, the General Assembly would still have the right to the final decision.

44. His delegation had voted in favour of the Peruvian draft resolution because it provided that the Security Council should reconsider all candidatures exclusively on the basis of the conditions laid down in Article 4 of the Charter.

45. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) considered that the New Zealand representative's attempt to set the Security Council off against the General Assembly was uncalled for, because both the General Assembly and the Security Council were principal organs of the United Nations. Moreover, past experience showed that the General Assembly did not reject the Security Council's decisions.

PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED IN THE CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY COSTA RICA, EL SALVADOR, GUATEMALA, HONDURAS AND NICARAGUA (A/C.1/708)

46. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that several delegations had asked that the Committee should postpone consideration of the question raised by the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/708) until the next agenda item had been dealt with.

47. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) observed that the draft resolution in question had been submitted after the usual time-limit.

48. It raised a question of principle, since it provided for recourse to the International Court of Justice. It had, however, been recognized that the Court could only be asked for an advisory opinion on questions of an exclusively juridical nature. Inasmuch as grave doubts had been expressed about the juridical character of the conditions to be satisfied by candidates for admission to membership in the United Nations, the Committee would have carefully to consider whether the International Court of Justice was competent to give the advisory opinion formulated in the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/708).

49. For those two reasons, it would be appropriate to adjourn the question until the next session of the General Assembly.

50. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua (A/C.1/708) was in order. In the rules of procedure no time limit was specified for the submission of draft resolutions.

51. The question under consideration was procedural. The Committee had only to decide whether consideration of the draft resolution (A/C.1/708) would be deferred until item 8 of its agenda had been dealt with by the Committee.

52. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador), supported by Sir Keith OFFICER (Australia), Mr. COSTA DU RELS (Bolivia), Mr. CARIAS (Honduras), Mr. ESQUIVEL (Costa Rica) and Mr. ARGUELLO (Nicaragua) agreed with the Chairman's proposal to defer consideration of the draft resolution submitted by the five Central American States so as to enable some representatives to obtain instructions from their governments. It was understood that the draft resolution in question would be discussed immediately after consideration of item 8 of the Committee's agenda (A/C.1/666/Rev.1).

53. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee would accordingly pass to agenda item 8 of its agenda, after which it would revert to discussion of the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/708).

54. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, if the question of postponing consideration of the draft resolution were put to the vote, his delegation would abstain.

55. The CHAIRMAN announced that the next meeting would take place the next day at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.