

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS  
TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Organization and Procedure of the Committee . . . . .	1
II. Discussion of the General Principles Concerning the Admission of New Members . . . . .	1
III. Re-examination of Applications . . . . .	3
1. Applications Received . . . . .	3
2. Decision of the Security Council concerning Re-examination of Applications . . . . .	3
3. Discussion of the Applications of the People's Republic of Albania, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Hashemite Kingdom of Transjordan, Ireland and Portugal . . . . .	3
(1) People's Republic of Albania . . . . .	3
(a) Summary of the Discussion . . . . .	3
(b) Attitude of Delegations . . . . .	8
(2) The Mongolian People's Republic . . . . .	8
(a) Summary of the Discussion . . . . .	8
(b) Attitude of Delegations . . . . .	12
(3) The Hashemite Kingdom of Transjordan . . . . .	13
(a) Summary of the Discussion . . . . .	13
(b) Attitude of Delegations . . . . .	14
(4) Ireland . . . . .	14
(a) Summary of the Discussion . . . . .	14
(b) Attitude of Delegations . . . . .	15
(5) Portugal . . . . .	15
(a) Summary of the Discussion . . . . .	15
(b) Attitude of Delegations . . . . .	17
IV. Examination of New Applications . . . . .	17
1. Applications Received . . . . .	17
2. Action of the Security Council Concerning the Examination of New Applications . . . . .	17
3. Discussion of the Applications of Hungary, Italy, Austria, Roumania and Yemen . . . . .	18
(1) General Discussion of the Applications of Hungary, Italy, Roumania and Austria . . . . .	18
(2) Hungary . . . . .	20
(a) Summary of the Discussion . . . . .	20
(b) Attitude of Delegations . . . . .	21

	Page
(3) Italy . . . . .	21
(a) Summary of the Discussion. . . . .	21
(b) Attitude of Delegations. . . . .	23
(4) Austria . . . . .	23
(a) Summary of the Discussion. . . . .	23
(b) Attitude of Delegations. . . . .	23
(5) Roumania. . . . .	24
(a) Summary of the Discussion. . . . .	24
(b) Attitude of Delegations. . . . .	24
(6) Yemen . . . . .	25
(a) Summary of the Discussion. . . . .	25
(b) Attitude of Delegations. . . . .	25
(7) Bulgaria. . . . .	25
(a) Summary of the Discussion. . . . .	25
(b) Attitude of Delegations. . . . .	26
(8) Statement by the Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Applications of Hungary, Italy, Austria, Roumania and Bulgaria. . . . .	26
V. Proposal by the Representative of Syria Concerning all Applications . . . . .	27

ANNEX I

Statement by the Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the 16th Meeting on 21 July 1947, Concerning the Application of Albania. . . . .	29
--	----

ANNEX II

Statement by the Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the 17th Meeting on 23 July 1947, Concerning the Application of Albania. . . . .	31
--	----

ANNEX III

Statement by the Representative of the United States at the 17th Meeting on 23 July 1947, Concerning the Application of Albania . . . . .	37
---	----

ANNEX IV

Statement by the Representative of China at the 18th Meeting on 28 July 1947, Concerning the Application of the Mongolian People's Republic . . . . .	39
---	----

ANNEX V

Statement by the Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the 18th Meeting on 28 July 1947, Concerning the Application of the Mongolian People's Republic. . . . .	41
---	----

ANNEX VI

Statement by the Representative of China at the 19th Meeting on 28 July 1947, Concerning the Application of the Mongolian People's Republic . . . . .	45
---	----

ANNEX VII

Statement by the Representative of the United States at the 20th Meeting on 4 August 1947, Concerning the Applications of ex-Enemy States and Austria. . . . .	47
--	----

	Page
ANNEX VIII	
Statement by the Representative of the United States at the 20th Meeting on 4 August 1947, Concerning the Application of Hungary . . . . .	50
ANNEX IX	
Statement by the Representative of the United States at the 20th Meeting on 4 August 1947, Concerning the Application of Italy . . . . .	51
ANNEX X	
Statement by the Representative of Brazil at the 20th Meeting on 4 August 1947, Concerning the Application of Italy . . . . .	53
ANNEX XI	
Statement by the Representative of the United States at the 20th Meeting on 4 August 1947, Concerning the Application of Austria . . . . .	57
ANNEX XII	
Statement by the Representative of the United States at the 20th Meeting on 4 August 1947, Concerning the Application of Roumania. . . . .	59
ANNEX XIII	
Statement by the Representative of the United States at the 22nd Meeting on 8 August 1947, Concerning the Application of Bulgaria. . . . .	60
ANNEX XIV	
Statement by the Representative of Australia at the 22nd Meeting on 8 August 1947, Concerning the Applications of Hungary, Italy, Austria, Roumania and Bulgaria . . . . .	61
ANNEX XV	
Statement by the Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the 22nd Meeting on 8 August 1947, Concerning the Applications of Hungary, Italy, Austria, Roumania and Bulgaria . . .	62

## REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

The Committee re-examined the applications of the People's Republic of Albania, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Hashemite Kingdom of Transjordan, Ireland and Portugal, and examined the new applications received from Hungary, Italy, Austria, Roumania, Yemen, and Bulgaria.

### I. ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE

#### 1. Chairmanship

The Committee decided to follow the practice of rotating chairmanship in conformity with the procedure of the Security Council. The Delegate of Poland therefore acted as Chairman from 15 July to 31 July and was succeeded by the Delegate of Syria.

#### 2. Publicity

The Committee decided that the meetings of the Committee would be open unless otherwise decided.

#### 3. Record of Meetings

The Committee agreed that, as in 1946, summary records be kept. Any delegate would have the right to request that the full text of any statement be included as annex.

#### 4. The Chronological Order of the Discussions

The Committee agreed to examine all applications in the order of their receipt.

### II. DISCUSSION OF THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES CONCERNING THE ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

The Chairman pointed out that the Committee had to examine whether these applications were in order from a formal point of view and also whether they fulfilled the requirements laid down in Article 4 of the Charter: i.e.

(1) whether the applicant State was peace-loving; and (2) whether it accepted the obligations contained in the Charter; (3) whether the State was able to carry out these obligations; and (4) whether the State was willing to do so.

The representative of Syria was of the opinion that unless the examination proved that the applicant States did not fulfill the requirements of Article 4 of the Charter, they should be admitted. With regard to the ability of applicant States to carry out the obligations under the Charter, he specifically referred to Article 43 and the obligations arising from that Article. He held that "peace-loving" referred to the future and not to the past.

The representative of Australia stated that his Government could not agree to the blanket approval or disapproval of applications for membership. Applications had to be carefully examined on their merits individually.

He could not agree that participation in the last World War should be

/accepted

accepted as a necessary condition for admission to the United Nations.

The argument used last year that a State could not be admitted to the United Nations because of lack of diplomatic relations with one or more of the Members of the United Nations was a direct violation of the Charter and, had such a condition been required, would have greatly limited the present membership of the United Nations.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that in the view of his Government, a fifth basic principle had to be added to the four principles already mentioned. The attitude and behaviour of the applicant States towards the Nazi aggressors during World War II had to be taken into account. To consider the behaviour of an applicant State during World War II did not mean to investigate the past of a nation. The last World War was brought to a successful end only two years ago. The peace treaties had not yet been concluded and great parts of the world were still in ruins as a result of that war.

The principles which led the democratic nations to fight the Nazi aggressors had constituted the basis of the Charter; therefore, it was impossible to ignore the behaviour of the applicant States towards the Nazi aggressors when examining the applications for membership in the United Nations.

The representative of the United States stated that his Government maintained the same position as in Sub-Committee I of the First Committee during the last General Assembly, namely that participation in World War II was not laid down in the Charter as a condition for membership in the United Nations.

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that the position of his Government was that each application should be examined on its merits in accordance with Article 4 of the Charter. He was in agreement with the statement made by the representative of the United States and was opposed to any extraneous new criteria.

The representative of Brazil stated that his Government had not changed its position since the meeting of the Committee last year. It favoured the admission of all countries which had applied for membership in the United Nations. The applications should be examined separately but the only criteria which should be taken into account were those laid down in Article 4 of the Charter.

The representative of Colombia expressed his view that the only criteria was that of the principle of universality and those laid down in Article 4 of the Charter.

### III. RE-EXAMINATION OF APPLICATIONS

1. Applications received:

- (1) People's Republic of Albania, 25 January 1946.
- (2) Mongolian People's Republic, 24 June 1946.
- (3) The Hashemite Kingdom of Transjordan, 8 July 1946.
- (4) Ireland, 2 August 1946.
- (5) Portugal, 2 August 1946.

2. Decision of the Security Council Concerning Re-examination of Applications

(a) The General Assembly at its forty-ninth meeting on 19 November 1946 adopted the following resolution:

"Applications for membership in the United Nations were submitted by the People's Republic of Albania, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Hashemite Kingdom of Transjordan, Ireland and Portugal. The Security Council, which examined these applications, has not made any recommendations.

"Since membership in the United Nations is open to all peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the Charter and which in the judgement of the organization are able and willing to carry out these obligations, as stated in Article 4:

"THEREFORE:

"THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY RECOMMENDS that the Security Council re-examine applications for membership in the United Nations of the above-mentioned States on their respective merits as measured by the yardstick of the Charter, in accordance with Article 4.

(b) The Security Council at its eighty-first meeting accepted the above-mentioned recommendation of the General Assembly communicated in a letter of the Secretary-General dated 25 November 1946.

(c) The Security Council at its one hundred and fifty-second meeting on 8 July 1947 decided, in accordance with Rule 59 of its Provisional Rules of Procedure, to instruct the Committee on Admission of New Members to re-examine the applications for membership in the United Nations of the People's Republic of Albania, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Hashemite Kingdom of Transjordan, Ireland and Portugal, and to present its report on 10 August or earlier if possible.

3. Discussion of the Applications of the People's Republic of Albania, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Hashemite Kingdom of Transjordan, Ireland and Portugal

(1) People's Republic of Albania

(a) Summary of the Discussion

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics made the statements attached as Annexes I and II. In these statements he referred to the arguments and documentary evidence submitted to the Security Council and to the Committee in 1946, proving the substantial

/contribution

contribution made by Albania to the Allied struggle against the Italian and German aggressors. This struggle had been praised by the highest military authorities and statesmen of the United Kingdom, the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In reply to doubts which had been expressed concerning Albanian participation in the Italian invasion of Greece, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics referred to a letter from Mussolini to Hitler set forth on page 87 of document S/123/Corr.1. This letter explained the reasons for the failure of the campaign against Greece and referred to the treachery of almost all of the Albanian troops which had revolted against Italian units. In one division alone, it had been necessary to disarm 6,000 Albanians and send them to the rear. He maintained that the charges against Albania were unfounded. No part of the Charter obliged the present Albanian regime to recognize agreements concluded by the pre-war Albanian regime. The Albanian Government considered, with some reason, that some of these pre-war agreements were inconsistent with the sovereign rights and interests of the Albanian people. The Albanian representative had informed the Committee in 1946 that Albania was prepared to revise pre-war agreements and to conclude new ones on the basis of reciprocal respect for the sovereign rights and mutual advantages of both parties. During the Security Council's discussion the Albanian representative had convincingly and factually demonstrated the lack of basis and tendentious character of the charges concerning the shelling of British warships by Albanian shore batteries and the incidents in the Corfu Channel. These charges were merely links in the general chain of efforts to cripple the young republic. The incidents in the territorial waters of Albania merely proved how highly the Albanian people prized their newly won independence. Respect for the territorial integrity and sovereign rights of all peoples was completely consonant with the Charter and action in defense of those rights was no bar to admission to membership.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics summarized the charges that Albania had provoked incidents on the Greek frontier. He stated that the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Security Council and the representative of three Balkan countries had proved by official data and evidence that these frontier incidents were being provoked by Greek governmental circles. He analyzed the motives of the Greek Government for these provocations. Concerning the allegations of an international brigade  
/on the Greco-Albanian

on the Greco-Albanian frontier, he pointed out that high Greek officials had denied these rumours and that the Subsidiary Group had reported that it had not discovered any tangible traces of the alleged international brigade. Certain representatives had criticized the behaviour of the Albanian representative of the recent Security Council meetings. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics analyzed the position taken by the Albanian representative in the Council and concluded that it was quite proper. It had also been objected that Albania had delayed in complying with the Council's recommendation that the question of the Corfu incidents be referred to the International Court of Justice. However, the United Kingdom had allowed six weeks to pass between the Council's recommendation and reference to the Court, and it was unnecessary to make inquiry as to the intention of the Albanian Government. The Albanian people wished to maintain friendly relations with all nations on the basis of mutual respect for sovereign rights. The democratic government of Albania had pledged itself on behalf of the Albanian people to fulfill all the obligations of a Member of the United Nations and was capable of doing so. Albania was a peace-loving nation, and the Soviet Delegation favoured its admission.

The representative of Brazil noted that the Albanian Government had not referred the question of the Corfu incidents to the International Court, pursuant to the Security Council's decision. Without in any way prejudging any final decisions by the Council or the Court, he considered that the Committee should formally inquire from the Albanian Government whether it intended to accept the Council's recommendation. Pending a reply, consideration of the application should be postponed.

The representative of Colombia fully supported this proposal.

The representative of Poland noted that Article 4 stated that membership "is open..." This phrase necessarily implied that membership was open to any State fulfilling the requirements of Article 4 and it must be assumed that these requirements were fulfilled unless otherwise proved. The Corfu incidents had not yet been investigated by the International Court of Justice and therefore they could not be advanced as a reason against the admission of Albania. As to the Greek allegations that a state of war existed with Albania, and the Greek claims for Albanian territory, he felt that the present tense situation would improve if Greece and Albania could meet on an equal footing as Members of the United Nations. Although participation in the last war was not a necessary condition of admission, favourable consideration should be given to Albania's heroic struggle and to the fact that her people had liberated themselves almost without outside help. The Commander-in-Chief of the Middle East had expressed his admiration that the Albanian National Army had achieved by its own efforts the liberation of its country. He had no objection to the proposed inquiry to the Albanian Government. His Government supported the application of Albania.

/The representative of Australia

The representative of Australia also noted that three months had passed without the Albanian Government complying with the Council's recommendation concerning the Corfu incidents. The behaviour of the Albanian Government towards the Subsidiary Group of the Commission of Investigation concerning Greek Frontier Incidents caused his Government to have grave doubts with regard to the peace-loving nature of the Albanian Government. That Government had challenged the legality of the Council resolution establishing the Subsidiary Group although it had, by letter to the Secretary-General, accepted the obligations of the Charter in that case. Before stating its opinion on the admission of Albania, his Government wished a satisfactory answer from the Albanian Government that it would comply with the resolution of the Council concerning the Corfu incidents and in the Greek question. It had been contended that Albania should be regarded as an Ally, but he pointed out that she had not been admitted as such to the Paris Peace Conference. He could not agree that the Albanian people had liberated themselves almost without outside help.

The representative of the United States made the statement attached as Annex III. He said that, as in 1946, his Government had grave doubt as to the ability and willingness of Albania to carry out international obligations including the obligations under the Charter. These doubts were based on the following incontestable facts. The Albanian Government had failed to reaffirm the pre-1939 bi-lateral treaties, although they were not of a sinister character, and included an arbitration treaty, a conciliation pact, a money order convention and a most-favoured nation agreement. The United States Government had made it clear that, following reaffirmation, it would be more than willing to consider any revisions in those agreements which the Albanian authorities might desire. Seven members of the Security Council had found that the mines in the Corfu Channel could not have been laid without the knowledge of the Albanian authorities. In this case, the Albanian Government had accepted the obligations of pacific settlement under Article 35 of the Charter, but as yet had not referred the matter to the Court as recommended by the Council. A majority of the members of the Commission of Investigation had found that Albania had rendered assistance to the guerilla bands operating in northern Greece, and the Albanian Government had failed to co-operate with the Subsidiary Group. The representative of the United States supported the proposal that inquiry should be made whether the Albanian Government intended to comply with the Council's recommendation concerning the Corfu Channel incidents.

The representative of France recalled that, in 1946, his Government

had supported the application of Albania because of the struggle of the Albanian people against the Axis powers and because his Government had established friendly diplomatic relations with Albania. However, the incidents in the Corfu Channel and other new facts must be taken into consideration, and he felt the Committee should exercise great care in dealing with the Albanian application. He agreed that an inquiry should be made whether the Albanian Government intended to implement the Council's resolution concerning the Corfu incidents.

The representative of China recalled that his Government had abstained from voting on the Albanian application in 1946 because it had doubts concerning Albania's ability and willingness to carry out her obligations under the Charter. Pending the proposed inquiry, he reserved his position.

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that his Government still had its doubts, expressed in 1946, regarding the ability and willingness of the Albanian Government, to carry out its obligations under the Charter. He referred to the incidents in the Corfu Channel and to the arguments advanced by his Government in the Security Council. He drew attention to the fact that, according to information in the possession of his Government, the Albanian Government had adopted a rather unco-operative and discouraging attitude towards the Subsidiary Group. His Government had nothing against the Albanian people, but in connection with the application it was necessary to examine the behaviour of the Albanian Government.

After the above debate, the Assistant Secretary-General read a cable (document S/453) received from the Registrar of the International Court of Justice stating that the Albanian Government had, on 23 July, stated its willingness to appear before the Court pursuant to the Council's resolution. It was agreed that this information made it unnecessary to address the previously proposed inquiry to the Albanian Government.

The representative of Brazil pointed out that the telegram did not clarify all points on which doubts existed and could not prejudge the Committee's opinion concerning Albania's admission.

The representative of the United States took the same position and noted that this was only one of five questions he had cited as giving rise to his Government's doubts as to the qualification of Albania for membership.

The representative of the United Kingdom said that his Government would oppose the application of Albania owing primarily to her unco-operative attitude toward the Commission of Investigation concerning Greek Frontier Incidents.

The representative of Belgium considered that Albania's acceptance  
/of the

of the Court's jurisdiction was an important element, but it was not the only one and should not prejudice her admission. The application required further study.

The representative of China stated that, in view of the new situation, his Government would maintain the same attitude towards Albania's application as in 1946 (set out above).

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could not agree that only one of the objections to Albania's admission had been removed. The Committee could take into account only formal decisions of the Security Council condemning actions by the Albanian Government. Since no such decision had been taken, no grounds existed for denying Albania's application.

The representative of Poland felt that the above telegram demonstrated that the Government of Albania was able and willing to fulfill its obligations under the Charter. It was encouraging that the telegram had been sent before the Committee made any inquiry.

(b) Attitudes of Delegations

The representatives of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Poland supported the application of Albania.

The representatives of Australia, Belgium, Brazil, China, Colombia, France, and the United States expressed doubts regarding Albania's qualifications for admission.

The representative of the United Kingdom opposed the application.

(2) The Mongolian People's Republic

(a) Summary of the discussion

The representative of China made the statement attached as Annex IV. In this statement he noted that the Mongolian People's Republic maintained active relations with only one country and had promised to exchange envoys with only one other. As a result, the world had insufficient information whether she was a peace-loving State and above and willing to carry out the obligations of the Charter. Apart from this consideration, the Chinese Government did not attach primary significance to the exchange of envoys, as had been shown by its attitude towards the application in 1946.

The representative of China then stated that Mongolia had, by armed invasion, attempted to seize territory in the Peitashan region of the Province of Sinkiang. It had been alleged that the Peitashan region was Mongolian territory, but as far as the Chinese Government knew, the claim of the Mongolian People's Republic to the Peitashan region had no other basis than the mere assertion made after the conflict of 5 June 1947. Peitashan lay on the Sinkiang side of a boundary which had been established in 1915 when Outer Mongolia was made an autonomous unit and which had remained unchallenged until 5 June 1947. That boundary was found on all official maps of China, of which Outer Mongolia had been an integral part until granted independence. During that same period, Peitashan had been under Chinese civil administration and guarded by Chinese armed forces sufficient

/to maintain

to maintain peace and order, although insufficient to repel a full-dress invasion with the paraphernalia of modern war. If the Mongolian People's Republic had a claim to the Peitashan region, there was no reason to resort to war-like methods. The Mongolian People's Republic had never attempted negotiation or mediation or conciliation. There had been no suggestion for an inquiry or arbitration or judicial settlement. On the contrary, Mongolia had started an invasion with a forty-eight-hour ultimatum to the local authorities. When the Chinese Government had protested and demanded suspension of hostilities and retirement from the invaded territory pending investigation, the Mongolian Government had replied by asserting that the territory concerned was hers. These acts demonstrated that the Mongolian People's Republic was not a peace-loving State, that she had acted contrary to the obligations of the Charter and would not be able or willing to carry out those obligations after admission. For this reason, it was impossible for the Chinese Government to support the application by the Mongolian People's Republic.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics made the statement attached as Annex V. In this statement he stressed the contribution made by the Mongolian People's Republic to the recent struggle against Axis aggression, including its successful resistance to Japanese invasion before the beginning of the Second World War. This contribution had been adequately documented during the Committee's meetings in 1946. If there were any doubts concerning the war contribution of Mongolia, these could be resolved by reference to the official documents submitted by the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at that time. Since the first consideration of the application, the Mongolian People's Republic had continued the reconstruction of its national economy with great success, and the material and cultural level of its people was rising yearly.

In reply to the representative of China he quoted a special communique issued by the Mongolian Government stating that the allegations by the Chinese "Central News" Agency and by a representative of the Chinese Foreign Ministry, regarding penetration into China by Mongolian military units under cover of aircraft with identifying signs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were false and had been fabricated for obviously provocative purposes. The falsity and unlikelihood of these statements were evident from the fact that the Peitashan region was in Mongolian territory. The communique went on to describe the circumstances in which Chinese troops had entrenched themselves in Mongolian territory and made sorties against Mongolian frontier guards. These guards had sent a spokesman to the Chinese troops to request that they leave Mongolian territory. The spokesman had been arrested and the Mongolian guards had taken action to expel the intruders, but they had not entered Chinese territory. The guards had recovered the body of the spokesman and four frontier guards who had been tortured and mutilated.

/Having

Having made this statement, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said the facts might indicate a hope that these frontier incidents would distract attention from the internal situation of China. The Committee could not act on the basis of the one-sided statement by the representative of China which had been disputed by official communiqués of the Mongolian Government.

It had been argued that members of the Committee did not have sufficient information concerning the Mongolian People's Republic. However, in 1946 the Mongolian Government had supplied answers to the Committee's questionnaire and had sent an official representative to answer all questions. The Mongolian People's Republic wished to expand its diplomatic relations and had never refused to establish diplomatic relations with any country.

In conclusion the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submitted that the Mongolian People's Republic possessed all the qualifications for membership in the United Nations and stated that his delegation supported its application.

The representative of the United States recalled that, in 1946, his Government had expressed doubt about the application of the Mongolian People's Republic because insufficient information was available. The replies to the Committee's questionnaire had not contained sufficient information to change that feeling. As far as his Government knew, the Mongolian People's Republic was recognized only by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and China, had diplomatic relations only with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and had no social or economic relations with any third power. The United States Government had yet to receive information which convinced it that the Mongolian People's Republic was in fact an independent State.

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that, as in 1946, his Government had hardly any information regarding the Mongolian People's Republic apart from that supplied by the representatives of China and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Evidence that the Mongolian Government was peace-loving and able and willing to carry out the obligations contained in the Charter was more to the point than evidence about Mongolian contributions in the Second World War. The representative of the United Kingdom opposed the application, in view of the scant information available and since the recent information on border clashes established a prima facie doubt as to Mongolia's qualifications.

The representative of Australia thought that the accusations and counter-accusations set out above were of a very grave nature, and that

/the Committee

the Committee should have all the facts concerning the situation before passing any final judgment on the application. He understood that the Legal Department of the Secretariat had expressed the opinion that a criterion of sovereignty was that the government of a State should be solely responsible for its foreign affairs. The Australian Government had no evidence that the Mongolian Government fulfilled that condition, since it had established diplomatic relations only with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Participation in the Second World War was desirable, but was neither necessary nor sufficient under the Charter. As to the information supplied concerning the Mongolian war effort, he did not challenge the alleged facts, but thought it extraordinary that a nomadic community with less than one million inhabitants could organize a modern tank brigade.

The representative of Poland noted that the Mongolian People's Republic had been officially recognized as an independent State by the two neighbouring countries, and did not think there could be any real doubt as to its sovereignty. Diplomatic relations had already been established with one State and others might follow. The answers to the Committee's questionnaire in 1946 had been satisfactory regarding the Republic's Constitution. As regards the Chinese accusations, he inquired how it was possible that a large-scale invasion should take place in secret and without being brought to the attention of the Security Council. These facts would seem to indicate that the recent events were merely minor frontier incidents. He inquired from the representative of China why the Protocol of February 1946 providing for establishment of diplomatic relations between the Governments of China and the Mongolian People's Republic had not been put into effect. In conclusion, he stated on behalf of his Government that it supported the application.

The representative of China said that it could not be assumed that the invasion was a minor incident merely because China had not referred the question to the Security Council. China was a very large country as compared with the Mongolian People's Republic, and she had not exhausted the ordinary diplomatic means of settlement. He stated that he would make the necessary inquiries concerning the implementation of the Protocol of February 1946.

The representatives of Brazil and Colombia stated that their Governments were in a difficult position since they had no evidence concerning the present situation other than the statements by the representatives of China and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The representative of Belgium stated that, under Article 4, the Committee had first to ascertain whether the applicant was really an independent State. The Committee had insufficient evidence on this point, and the existence of a state was not to be presumed: only two of the fifty-five Members of the United Nations had recognized Mongolia as an independent State. It was also necessary to take into account the situation prevailing on the Chinese-Mongolian border, and  
his delegation

delegation was not yet prepared to express any opinion regarding the admission of the Mongolian People's Republic. He did not consider that absence of diplomatic intercourse could of itself bar admission, since States were under no international obligation to exchange diplomatic envoys.

The representative of China made the statement attached as Annex VI. As regards the charge that China had invaded Outer Mongolia to divert world attention, he replied that the facts proved that China had been the victim of an invasion and that the Chinese Government was engaged in a grave struggle with rebels in north-east China. The invasion of Sinkiang, if it were a diversion, would more naturally be a diversion for the rebels in north-east China and a second front against the Chinese Government. As regards the suggestion that the events in question were mere frontier incidents, he pointed out that aircraft were being used, that there was a penetration of over 200 kilometres and that the attacks had been repeated in spite of protests. The representative of China said that incidents had begun in the autumn of 1945 and that Mongolian Forces had attacked Chinese troops on nine occasions within the twenty-five days following 5 June 1947.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics noted that the representative of China had not denied that Chinese border troops had invaded the Peitashan region, but had simply stated that the territory in question belonged to China. If this was the case, it was unjustifiable that the Chinese authorities should allow armed conflict and barbaric acts to take place on its territory. Mongolian troops had been in the region for more than a year and a half, ever since the population of the region had, by plebiscite, expressed their will to be free. In 1946, when the Committee examined the application, the Mongolian People's Republic had the same boundaries as at present, including the territory of Peitashan. At that time, the Chinese Government had been silent on the question and had supported the Mongolian application. It was apparent that the dispute had been created at the present time because the civil war in China had reached its peak. Incidents had occurred just before the arrival in China of a so-called fact-finding mission from a foreign country. The authorities of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had officially denied the allegations that planes with Soviet identifying marks had taken part in the conflict.

The representative of China said that no credence could be attached to the completely false official announcements by the Mongolian People's Republic. Local authorities in Sinkiang had categorically denied the allegations of barbarity by Chinese soldiers, and detention and slaying of messengers. He was surprised to see that the question of Soviet identifying marks was raised once again. He had certainly not been aware that Mongolian troops had been in Peitashan before 5 June 1947. There could be no relationship between the Mongolian invasion and the arrival of a fact-finding commission, since the invasion had taken place long before.

(b) Attitude of Delegations

The representatives of Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics supported the application of the Mongolian People's Republic.

*(The representative of China)*

The representative of China and the United Kingdom opposed the application.

The representatives of Belgium, Brazil and Colombia stressed the insufficiency of available information.

The representative of Australia stated that because of the lack of information, his delegation could not support the application at this time.

The representative of the United States shared the view on the insufficiency of information and expressed doubt as to the eligibility of the applicant.

(3) The Hashemite Kingdom of Transjordan

(a) Summary of the Discussion

The representatives of Syria, the United Kingdom, Brazil, the United States, China, France, Belgium, Colombia and Australia were in favour of the admission of Transjordan. The representative of Syria added that his Government considered Transjordan to be a peace-loving state which had made valuable contributions to the war effort and had made considerable progress during recent years.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics recalled that his Government had not been able to support the application of Transjordan in 1946 and that he did not consider that circumstances had changed since then. One of the arguments put forward by his Government was that Transjordan did not maintain diplomatic relations with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The Soviet Government attached great significance to its argument about the lack of diplomatic relations between a country and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. He emphasized that in every case that the Soviet representative submitted arguments regarding the lack of diplomatic relations he had in mind a very broad meaning for these arguments. They should not be considered as formal arguments but rather as statements which had very important reasons which touched upon the qualities of a nation applying for membership.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics maintained that Transjordan was originally part of the territory under mandate to the United Kingdom. There were certain legal rules established for the termination of mandates but these rules had not been followed by the Mandatory Power in this case. The Mandatory Power had by unilateral action declared Transjordan to be independent. Last year it had been said that the special treaty of 22 March 1945 which the Mandatory Power had imposed on Transjordan was contrary to the Charter of the United Nations. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Security Council last year stated that there were many questions which remained to be clarified in the matter of how

/Transjordan

Transjordan became an independent state and what kind of "independence" it was. The past year has not brought the necessary clarification on this matter. He stated that the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics still had serious doubts as to whether independence exists in reality in Transjordan and could therefore not support the application for membership.

The representative of the United Kingdom said that for reasons advanced in the Committee last year his Government did not admit the objections of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. He categorically denied that any treaty had been "imposed" on Transjordan.

(b) Attitude of Delegations

The representatives of Syria, the United Kingdom, Brazil, the United States, China, France, Belgium, Colombia and Australia supported the application of Transjordan.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declared that he could not support the application because his Government still had serious doubts regarding the independence of Transjordan.

The representative of Poland reserved his right to make his comments regarding the application at a later date.

(4) Ireland

(a) Summary of the Discussion

The representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States, China, Brazil, France, Belgium, Colombia, Syria and Australia stated that on behalf of their Governments they supported the application of Ireland.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics recalled that his Government had not been able to support the application of Ireland. Circumstances had not changed since then and the reasons for the Soviet rejection of this application still existed. Ireland did not maintain diplomatic relations with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and he emphasized once again that this fact was of great significance to his Government as to the qualities of the applicant state. The people of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had made enormous contributions during the last war, they had carried the main burden and thereby saved the world from the Fascist aggressors. It was well-known that the struggle had been fought for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and therefore the lack of diplomatic relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Ireland had a particular significance and importance in the consideration of the qualities which a Government requesting admission to the United Nations should have.

Another important factor was the behaviour of Ireland during the last world war. Ireland did not help the Allies at all and had not helped to found the Organization which now she wanted to join. He recalled that Ireland, even in the most critical stages

/of the war

of the war, had expressed sympathy with the Axis Powers and Franco Spain. This could not be ignored during the examination of the application of Ireland. Two years and a half had passed since the end of the world war and no justification had been brought to light regarding the behaviour of Ireland during the war. In these circumstances the Soviet Delegation could not support the application of Ireland.

The representative of the United States pointed out that it was not laid down as a condition in the Charter of the United Nations that applicant states had to maintain diplomatic relations with all the Member States. He also rejected the argument that behaviour in the last world war should be laid down as a criterion since it was not specified in the Charter.

The representative of the United Kingdom recalled the reasons advanced by his delegation last year for supporting the application.

(b) Attitude of Delegations

The representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States, China, Brazil, France, Belgium, Colombia, Syria, and Australia supported the application of Ireland.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declared that the Soviet Delegation could not support the application for the reasons mentioned in his statements at the meetings of the Committee.

The representative of Poland reserved his right to make his comments regarding the application at a later date.

(5) Portugal

(a) Summary of the Discussion

The representatives of Brazil, Colombia, the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, China, Syria, the United States, and Australia expressed their support of the application of Portugal. The representative of Brazil stated that his Government had no doubt whatsoever with regard to the peace-loving nature of the Government of Portugal and its willingness and ability to fulfil its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. His Government considered that Portugal had the right to be admitted to the United Nations and that the Organization would benefit greatly from the participation of Portugal.

The representative of the United States emphasized that Portugal had a long record as a peace-loving State and in the opinion of his Government was entirely able and willing to carry out the obligations of the Charter. Portugal had taken an active part in recent months in two of the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations, namely, the International Civil Aviation Organization and the International Postal

/Union,

Union, both Organizations having expressed confidence in Portugal by electing Portugal to their respective governing boards. He concluded his remarks by reiterating the position the United States had taken last year - warm support of the application of Portugal.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that his Government maintained the same attitude towards the application of Portugal as towards the application of Ireland. The only difference was that it considered the behaviour of Portugal during the last world war still worse than that of Ireland. The peace-loving nature of the Government of Portugal and its ability to fulfil the obligations of the Charter was not proved by the fact that it had put a number of ships and bases at the disposal of certain Allied Powers. Portugal did not help the cause of the Allied Powers, in fact, it aided the Axis Powers and was a second home for Fascist prisoners of war. The ties between the Government of Portugal and Franco Spain were well-known. The deeds and behaviour of the Portuguese Government after the last war did not prove that Portugal was worthy of admission to the United Nations.

The representative of Poland drew the attention of the Committee to the close association which had existed between Franco Spain and Portugal and the aid that Portugal had given to the rebellion against the legal Government of Spain during the civil war. He proposed that the consideration of the application of Portugal be deferred until a future date when the situation in Spain and Portugal might have changed. At present he could not support the application of Portugal.

The representative of the United States stated that from the military point of view Portugal did not aid the Axis Powers in any way whatsoever. On the contrary, she had extended valuable aid to the Allies by putting air bases in the Azores at the disposal of the United Kingdom and the United States. These bases had been of vital importance to the winning of the war in Europe not only on the Western front but on the Eastern front as well, and in the re-development of the Allied Forces after VE-day these bases had been an important contributing factor in shortening the war against Japan.

On the economic side, Portugal behaved as a neutral country under the international law. He could not understand what it was to which the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics took exception and enquired on that point. He thought the relations between Portugal and Spain were not relevant. - the question was whether Portugal would live up to the obligations under the Charter and his Government had no doubts on that score.

/(b) Attitude

(b) Attitude of Delegations

The representatives of Brazil, Colombia, the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, China, Syria, the United States and Australia supported the application of Portugal.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declared that his Government could not support the application for the reasons mentioned in his statements at the meetings of the Committee.

The representative of Poland stated that his Government would at present oppose the application.

IV. EXAMINATION OF NEW APPLICATIONS

1. Applications Received

- (1) Hungary, dated 22 April 1947.
- (2) Italy, dated 7 May 1947.
- (3) Austria, dated 2 July 1947.
- (4) Roumania, dated 10 July 1947.
- (5) Yemen, dated 21 July 1947.
- (6) Bulgaria, dated 26 July 1947.

2. Action by the Security Council Concerning the Examination of the New Applications

(a) The Security Council at its one hundred and thirty-second meeting on 30 April 1947 "resolved that the application of Hungary for admission into membership in the United Nations, dated 22 April 1947, should be referred to the Membership Committee for studying and reporting to the Security Council at the appropriate time."

(b) The Security Council at its one hundred and thirty-seventh meeting on 22 May 1947 resolved that the application of Italy for membership in the United Nations be referred to the Committee on Admission of New Members for study and report to the Security Council.

(c) At the Security Council's one hundred and fifty-fourth meeting, on 10 July 1947, in accordance with Rule 59 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Security Council, the President referred the application of Austria for membership in the United Nations to the Committee on Admission of New Members.

(d) At the Security Council's one hundred and sixty-first meeting on 18 July 1947, in accordance with Rule 59 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Security Council, the President referred the application of Roumania for membership in the United Nations to the Committee on Admission of New Members.

/(e) At the Security

(e) At the Security Council's one hundred and sixty-eighth meeting on 28 July 1947, in accordance with Rule 59 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Security Council, the President referred the application of Yemen for membership in the United Nations to the Committee on Admission of New Members.

(f) At the Security Council's one hundred and seventy-eighth meeting on 7 August 1947, in accordance with Rule 59 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Security Council, the President referred the application of Bulgaria for Membership in the United Nations to the Committee on Admission of New Members.

3. Discussion of the Applications of Hungary, Italy, Austria, Roumania and Yemen  
(1) General Discussion of the Applications of Hungary, Italy, Roumania and Austria

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics proposed that the Committee postpone consideration of these applications until the peace treaties with the ex-enemy countries had entered into force and the Treaty with Austria had been concluded and entered into force.

The representative of the United States made the statement attached as Annex VII. He favoured the examination of these applications individually and at once, since the facts and merits of the several applications varied considerably. Nothing in the Charter or in the preamble of the treaties imposed an obligation to postpone consideration of membership applications from ex-enemy states until the completion of ratification and the entry into force of the peace treaties, and earlier admission was not precluded. He rejected the blind application in all cases of the thesis that restrictions in armistice agreements or other control arrangements were of such a nature as to impair sovereignty and thus make a State ineligible for membership. This question and that of military occupation should be resolved by the facts in each individual instance. In Italy, for instance, practically no controls existed and these were only a token military occupation. Austria was not an ex-enemy State and no possible objection could be found to justify the postponement of consideration of her application or her admission.

The representative of Brazil thought the applications should be considered individually and only in the light of the applicants behaviour since the war, for under Article 4 of the Charter the applications could not be opposed simply because the treaties had not entered into force.

The representative of Belgium agreed that judgement should be made strictly on the provisions of the Charter which made no reference to the entry into force of the treaties, and thought that each application should be considered individually.

/The representative of

The representative of Colombia supported the view that the applications should be considered individually. He argued that the Charter made universality of membership imperative, and that the admission of non-Members would assist the settlement of any difficulties with present Members.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the terms of the treaty preambles, together with Chapter IX of the Potsdam Declaration left no doubt that the four Powers concerned had agreed that the Allied and Associated Powers would support the application of the ex-enemy States only after the conclusion of the treaties of peace, including their ratification. These four Powers had also unanimously agreed on a preamble to the Austrian Treaty, which read as follows:

"Whereas the Allied and Associated Powers and Austria desire for these purposes to conclude the present treaty, which shall constitute the basis of friendly relations between them, thereby enabling the Allied and Associated Powers to support Austria's application for admission to membership of the United Nations."

There was, therefore, no justification for support of the Austrian application until the Treaty had been concluded and entered into force.

The representative of Australia recalled his objection to placing these applications on the agenda for the reason that these States could not be regarded as sovereign or independent when they were occupied by foreign troops and subject to armistice agreements. He did not see how the Committee or the Council could entertain these applications and supported the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics proposal for deferment. He subsequently withdrew his objection to immediate consideration and while maintaining his previous attitude on the legal difficulty of admission prior to ratification of the treaties, suggested that the Council might make a provisional or conditional recommendation for admission of a State otherwise eligible. (See Annex XIV for full statement.)

The representative of China thought a motion to postpone the consideration of an application should have been made in the Security Council and considered the Committee's duty was to examine all applications individually.

The representative of Poland doubted whether it was technically possible to consider these applications in time for the report to the Council. He thought discussion on them should be postponed until the report on the other applications had been completed, since the Council had asked the Committee to report on these applications at the appropriate time.

At a later meeting he stated the opinion that, from a legal point of view, the Security Council was not yet in the position to accept or reject these applications. Apart from these legal considerations, the war participation of Hungary, Roumania, and Bulgaria gave them the full right to apply for membership. The Polish Delegation did not find any reason to object to the

acceptance of these States which were attempting to build a new people's democracy, and he stressed that no Member of the United Nations had the right to use the internal affairs of a country as a reason for refusing membership. In due time, the Polish Delegation would support the application of Italy for membership.

The representative of France stated that his Government was satisfied with what was agreed upon during the Peace Conference. The French Delegation was of the opinion that any decision on the applications presented by ex-enemy States should be postponed until the treaties of peace come into force as a consequence of an exchange of ratifications. Ratification procedure was actually in process and the French Delegation saw no reason why it should not be completed rapidly.

The Committee voted on the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' proposal in two parts as follows:

"The Committee on the Admission of New Members recommends a postponement of the taking of the decision on the applications of the ex-enemy countries until the peace treaties with them come into force."

Affirmative: Australia, Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Negative: Belgium, Brazil, China, Colombia, United Kingdom and United States

Abstention: Syria

"The Committee on the Admission of New Members recommends a postponement on the application of Austria until the treaty with it comes into force."

Affirmative: Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Negative: Belgium, Brazil, China, Colombia and United States

Abstention: Australia, Syria and United Kingdom

The Chairman ruled that since the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' proposal was rejected, the Committee would discuss the remaining applications individually in the order of their receipt.

(2) Hungary

(a) Summary of the Discussion

The representative of the United States made the statement attached as Annex VIII. He stated that events in Hungary since the end of May 1947 raised doubts on the part of his Government that the reorganized Hungarian Government would be able or willing to carry out the obligations of the United Nations Charter.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the statement of the United States representative was unfounded and contained no proof of his accusations.

The representative of Brazil shared the doubts of the United States representative as to whether Hungary was willing or able to undertake its obligations of the Charter and he was therefore not able to support the application.

The representative of the United Kingdom

The representative of the United Kingdom regretted the conduct of the present regime in Hungary, particularly its record in respect of basic human liberties. The United Kingdom would oppose Hungary's application in the Security Council irrespective of the question of entry into force of the peace treaty; unless the present Hungarian regime had shown by that time that they would abide by the guarantees for human rights as set forth in the peace treaties.

(b) Attitude of Delegations

The representatives of Brazil and the United Kingdom opposed the application of Hungary.

The representative of the United States expressed doubts as to the eligibility of the applicant.

The representative of Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics did not consider it the proper time to consider the application.

The representative of France stated that he was not able to take a decision on the application before the ratification of the peace treaty.

(3) Italy

(a) Summary of the Discussion

The representative of the United States made the statement attached as Annex IX. In his statement he said that the United States warmly supported the application of Italy and believed that Italy well merited admission to the United Nations at this time for the following reasons:

1. Italy was declared to be a co-belligerent in the war against Germany, the only country to be so recognized.
2. The Allied Commission was terminated on 31 January 1947. For all practical purposes this ended Allied Control in Italy.
3. There is only a token military occupation force now stationed on the northeastern frontier for the purpose of ensuring a peaceful solution to that frontier question, not for the purpose of controlling Italy.
4. The Italian peace treaty had been ratified by all of the Great Powers except the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It would be patently unjust to deny the Italian people, who have done so much since becoming a co-belligerent, membership in the United Nations simply because the peace treaty had not been ratified by one Great Power.

The representative of Brazil made the statement attached as Annex X. In his statement he declared that as a representative of a country which fought against the former Italian regime, he was very happy to support the application of a democratically governed Italy.

/He stated

He stated that Italy had declared her intention of fulfilling the obligations of the Charter; as she was a sovereign State, fully capable of fulfilling her international obligations; she had normal international relations with several States Members of the United Nations; she had a democratic Government which had given proof of an international behaviour in full conformity with the aims of the United Nations.

He pointed out that the Great Powers made a certain minimum promise to the conquered country at Potsdam. They intended to support the admission of these countries to the United Nations as soon as they had set up democratic regimes and as soon as these democratic Governments had declared themselves responsible for the acts of war perpetrated by their predecessors. The Italian Government had assumed responsibility to the Allies by the very fact of having signed and ratified a peace treaty.

He also stressed Italy's contribution to the Allied war effort since she had been recognized as a co-belligerent state.

The representative of Australia pointed out that the Committee should note the fourth paragraph of the preamble and Article 90 of the Italian peace treaty. Without considering the merits of the application, he thought the attention of the Committee should be drawn to the definite obligation to ratify this treaty in the shortest time possible.

The representative of France stated that while France had suffered most directly from Italian participation in the war, his Government was ready to forget the past and support Italy's application. He stressed the importance of Italian culture and its close connection with French culture. In a sense, the United Nations would not be complete until Italy was a Member. His Government had entertained certain doubts on the legal position since the Italian peace treaty had not been ratified but he had been impressed by the statements of the United States and Brazilian representatives. As far back as 1943 Italy had obtained the status of co-belligerent. Was it not then possible to make, on this assumption, an exception to the rule of ratification? The French Delegation agreed then, with great pleasure, to join the majority in the Committee in favour of the Italian application.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that he did not consider it the proper time to consider the application of Italy.

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that in view of Italy's record as a co-belligerent, her contribution to civilization,  
and her

and her friendship with the United Kingdom, his Government would like to support the application of Italy. He expressed the hope that the peace treaty would be ratified in time for Italy's admission.

(b) Attitude of Delegations

The representatives of the United States, Brazil, Colombia, China, Belgium, France and the United Kingdom supported the application of Italy.

The representatives of Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics did not consider it the proper time to examine the application of Italy.

(4) Austria

(a) Summary of the Discussion

The representative of the United States made the statement attached as Annex XI. In his statement he urged the Committee to recommend to the Security Council the admission of Austria to the United Nations and stated that the absence of the treaty, in spite of certain remaining impairments of Austria's freedom, did not disqualify Austria from membership in the United Nations. He was strongly opposed to any conclusion that the failure to complete a treaty should lead to postponing the consideration of the application of Austria. The people of Austria should not be penalized because of disagreements between the Great Powers.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that he did not consider it the proper time to examine the application of Austria.

The representative of Brazil shared the views of the United States representative that the lack of a treaty should not prevent Austria's admission to the United Nations.

The representative of the United Kingdom considered the Austrian application was premature since the Austrian treaty had not been completed and the end of military occupation was not in sight. His Government sympathized with Austria's desire to achieve liberation and become a member of the United Nations; but they were obliged for the time being regretfully to abstain from pronouncing themselves on her application.

(b) Attitude of Delegations

The representatives of the United States, Brazil, China, Colombia and Belgium supported the application of Austria.

The representatives of Poland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom did not consider it the proper time to examine the application.

/The representative

The representative of France stated that he was not able to take a decision on the application before the ratification of the peace treaty.

(5) Roumania

(a) Summary of the Discussion

The representative of the United States made the statement attached as Annex XII. In his statement he pointed to the grave suppression of human rights and liberties in Roumania and he expressed his doubts as to the ability and the willingness of the present Roumanian regime to carry out international obligations and declared he had doubts therefore as to the application of Roumania.

The representative of Brazil shared the doubts expressed by the United States representative and regretted that he could not support the application of Roumania at this time.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that the statement of the United States representative was unsubstantiated and the Roumanian Government had repeatedly replied to these charges. It was very difficult to understand the objections of the representative of Brazil since he joined in the accusation of the United States representative without presenting any proof. The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics also pointed out that it was not the proper time to examine the application of Roumania.

The representative of the United Kingdom regretted the conduct of the present regime in Roumania, particularly its record in respect of basic human liberties. Apart from the question of entry into force of the peace treaty the United Kingdom would oppose Roumania's application in the Council unless the Roumanian Government had indicated by that time that it would abide by the guarantees for human rights as set forth in the peace treaties.

(b) Attitude of Delegations

The representatives of Brazil and the United Kingdom opposed the application of Roumania.

The representative of the United States expressed doubts as to the eligibility of the applicant.

The representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics did not consider it the proper time to examine the application.

The representative of France stated that he was not able to take a decision on the application before the ratification of the peace treaty.

(6) Yemen

(a) Summary of the Discussion

The representative of Syria stated that since Yemen, one of the oldest Kingdoms in the world, fulfilled the requirements of Article 4 of the Charter and was a peace-loving State, he proposed that the Committee advise the Security Council to recommend the admission of Yemen to membership in the United Nations.

(b) Attitude of Delegations

The application was supported by Syria, the United States, China, Colombia, Brazil, the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, France, Belgium, Australia and Poland.

The application of the Kingdom of Yemen having met no objection in the Committee, the Committee considers that the Security Council may recommend to the General Assembly the admission of Yemen to the Membership of the United Nations.

(7) Bulgaria

(a) Summary of the Discussion

The representative of the United States made the statement attached as Annex XIII. He said the United States had serious doubts with respect to the ability and willingness of the present Bulgarian regime to carry out international obligations and with respect to its peace-loving character and therefore had doubts as to the eligibility of Bulgaria for admission to the United Nations at this time.

The representative of the United Kingdom supported the point of view of the United States representative. He pointed out that, according to the information of his Government, a joint communique issued by the Bulgarian and Yugoslav Governments on 2 August referred to agreed action between the two Governments "with regard to the United Nations Subsidiary Group of Enquiry, in view of its heretofore biased activity". He added that the United Kingdom Government were unable to look with favour on the candidature of Bulgaria if her Government had entered into an agreement in which a United Nations Commission was specifically criticized as biased.

The representative of Brazil regretted that he must also share the doubts on Bulgaria's eligibility for admission and would be happy to change his view if this government gave evidence of a different conduct in the future.

The representative of France wished to know if Bulgaria had ratified the peace treaty with the Allied Powers and reserved his Government's position on the Bulgarian application.

The representative of Colombia said he was not sure of whether

/Bulgaria

Bulgaria had ratified the peace treaty, and would like to reserve his Government's position on the Bulgarian application.

The representative of Poland said he did not understand the United States statement that Bulgaria had violated clauses of the peace treaty since the treaty had not entered into force. He noted that certain claims on Bulgarian territory had been rejected by the Paris Peace Conference and that the preamble of the peace treaty referred to Bulgaria's active participation in the war against Germany. Furthermore none of the resolutions on the Greek question had placed blame on Bulgaria. He favoured deferment of the application until the peace treaty had entered into force.

(b) Attitude of Delegations

Representatives of the United Kingdom and Brazil opposed the application of Bulgaria.

The representative of the United States expressed doubts as to the eligibility of the applicant.

The representatives of Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics did not consider it the proper time to examine the application.

The representative of France stated that he was not able to take a decision on the application before the ratification of the peace treaty.

(8) Statement by the Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Applications of Hungary, Italy, Austria, Roumania and Bulgaria

At the twenty-second meeting the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics representative made a general statement on the application of Hungary, Italy, Austria, Roumania and Bulgaria, which is attached to Annex XV. He said that since the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics proposal to defer these applications had been unjustifiably rejected, he must condemn the unjust statements by certain representatives who had divided the applications into two groups in order to make unfounded charges against Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria. These Governments had already rejected these charges and in reply had given documentary evidence explaining the conduct of certain reactionary circles which were supported by certain foreign powers. He quoted the declaration of 31 July 1947, made by the Hungarian National Front of Liberation which consists of four democratic peoples of describing the attempts to split this democratic coalition and re-establish reactionary rule, adding that this statement showed the tendentious nature of the United States representative. He also quoted a communique of the Roumanian Council of Ministers published on 30 July concerning the attempts of leaders of the National Peasant Party to undermine the present Roumanian Government, and the statement by the Bulgarian Prime Minister at the end of June that the

/Bulgarian

Bulgarian Government had consistently carried out its international obligations and requesting those who accused Bulgaria of suppressing individual liberties and human rights to await the documentary evidence to be submitted in the forthcoming trial of those circles which would have liked to see a Bulgarian regime similar to the present reactionary Greek regime. He asked the United States and Brazilian representatives how their Governments would reply if other Governments protested matters of their domestic concern and he gave examples of such charges. Independent of the wish of certain foreign circles the Governments of Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria had already entered the road to true democracy and the charges against them could be considered only in this light.

The representative of the United Kingdom thought it would be a waste of time to reply to these remarks.

The representative of Brazil thought that if the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics representative had been better informed he would not have made the charge concerning Brazilian elections. He wished it clear that his Government had taken its attitude on the applications with complete independence.

The representative of Colombia supported the remarks of the representative of Brazil and stated that his Government had always acted independently in the United Nations with the sole objective of conciliation.

The representative of the United States said he would not reply in detail to the statement of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as this would cause a very lengthy debate indeed, as he would find it necessary to disagree with almost every remark in the statement. He explained he did not give details on the conditions cited in Roumania, Hungary and Bulgaria in order to conserve the Committee's time, but that he had by reference cited the published statements and notes of his Government on this subject. He added that his Government has sent notes in view of being a party to the Yalta Agreement, the Allied Control Commission and the projected peace treaties.

#### V. PROPOSAL BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF SYRIA CONCERNING ALL APPLICATIONS

At the twenty-second meeting on 8 August the representative of Syria made the following proposal:

"Whereas all applicant states for membership in the United Nations fulfill the provisions of Article 4 of the Charter and in implementation of Article 2, paragraph 6 of the Charter, and with a view of making the United Nations a universal organization comprising all peace-loving democratic nations of the world, the Membership Committee resolves that:

1. The five postponed applications from Albania, Mongolian People's Republic, Transjordan, Portugal and Ireland be recommended

/for membership

for membership in the United Nations;

2. The applications of the four ex-enemy states, namely Hungary, Italy, Roumania and Bulgaria, as soon as the juridical technicalities are completed by ratifying their peace treaties, may be recommended for admission for membership without further detailed discussion by the Membership Committee.

3. As Austria is not considered an ex-enemy state, her admission may be recommended forthwith."

Inasmuch as the Committee considered that the time limit did not permit the Committee to give full discussion and unanimous approval to the Syrian proposal, the Syrian representative reserved the right of his delegation to bring up the matter in the Security Council.

ANNEX I

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS  
AT THE SIXTEENTH MEETING ON 21 JULY 1947, CONCERNING  
THE APPLICATION OF ALBANIA\*

Exactly a year and a half ago the application of the People's Republic of Albania for admission to the United Nations was filed with the Secretariat. This application was considered last year by the present Committee, and, as you know, was rejected, although all the information available spoke in favour of admitting the People's Republic of Albania to the Organization.

During last year's consideration of the Albanian application, I produced numerous indications and documentary evidence which conclusively demonstrated the substantial contribution made by Albania to the Allied struggle against the Italian and German fascist aggressors. I think there is no need to repeat these facts now, since anyone can find them in my last year's statements, which are recorded both in the minutes of the Committee's meetings, and in its report to the Security Council. I need only remind you that the fight waged by the heroic people of Albania was very warmly commended by the highest military authorities and statesmen of the United Kingdom, the United States of America and the Soviet Union. These appreciations were cited both by me and by the Albanian representative last year. None of this can be either forgotten or wiped out, whatever the calumnies heaped on the Albanian people. The charred and shattered towns and villages of Albania, the many fresh graves of her patriots who fell in the fight against the occupying Powers in the Second World War are further and still more convincing proof of how the Albanian people defended the principles which underlie the Charter of the United Nations. None of us has any right to ignore or forget this when the Albanian application is being considered. The people of Albania have shown themselves worthy of being numbered among the United Nations.

In the hope that Albania's opponents will change their position this year with regard to her application for admission, I shall abstain now of proving the groundlessness of the accusations levelled at Albania last year and for past days.

Albania's desire and ability to comply with all the obligations of the Charter have been strengthened still further since her application for admission was considered last year. The Albanian people are engrossed in the peaceful task of rehabilitating their shattered domestic economy. They are filled with a desire to maintain friendly relations with all nations, both great and small, on the basis of mutual respect for sovereign rights.

\* Original Russian.

The Government of the People's Republic of Albania has done all in its power to establish sound diplomatic, economic and cultural relations with all the countries which wished to maintain similar relations with Albania, based on mutual respect for the rights of a sovereign State.

Being a peace-loving nation the Albanian people are most anxious to maintain peace and security throughout the world. The admission of Albania to the United Nations would only be an act of justice towards her people and one that they have earned, both during the Second World War, and since.

The democratic government of the People's Republic of Albania has pledged itself, on behalf of its people, to fulfill all the obligations of a Member of the United Nations, and it is capable of doing so.

The Soviet delegation supports the Albanian request for admission and hopes that it will be supported by the other members of the Security Council also.

ANNEX II

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS  
AT THE SEVENTEENTH MEETING ON 23 JULY 1947,  
CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF ALBANIA\*

The speeches made at the last meeting of the Committee, and events of the last period of time, have shown that some representatives are just as before stubbornly repeating their charges against the Albanian People's Republic, although these charges have more than once already been discussed by the Security Council and convincing documentary data have been advanced proving the charges to be unfounded. No matter how convincing they are, however, they make no impression on those representatives. They, and a great many newspapers entirely ignore the fact that documents, figures and facts against them, and refuse and demonstrate the baselessness and falsity of the charges brought against Albania. These charges are no novelty to anyone but they constitute an unbroken chain of provocation and falsehood from many sources directed unceasingly against the young Democratic People's Republic of Albania which is just getting on its feet. The method of countlessly repeating day by day provocative fabrications and lies with the purpose of getting public opinion to believe all of it was used previously during the recent World War by the well-known Propaganda Minister of Fascist Germany. The failure of these efforts and methods is also generally known. Unfortunately, however, this method is still being used even at the present time.

Let us analyze briefly what are the "crimes" of the Albanian people which disqualify them for admission to the United Nations. We are told that the present Albanian regime unconditionally refuses to recognize agreements concluded by the previous Albanian regime. But may I ask you, Gentlemen, what Article of the United Nations Charter deprives a Government of the right to decide for itself what is useful and what is prejudicial to the well-being of its own people. The Albanian Government considers, and with some reason, that among the agreements concluded by the previous Albanian Government are agreements which are inconsistent with the sovereign rights and interests of the Albanian people. The representatives of the Albanian Government repeatedly sent last year to the Committee statements that Albania was prepared to revise pre-war agreements and to conclude new ones on the basis of reciprocal respect for the sovereign rights and mutual advantage of both parties.

Apparently, however, that was not satisfactory to those dissentients who possessed old agreements with Albania and that was one of the reasons for refusing to admit Albania to membership of the United Nations. We hear the

\* Original Russian.

same charges this year. It should be plain to any common-sense individual and anyone with the slightest experience of international relations what is being demanded in this case from an economically weak Albanian Government. It is equally plain too that what is being proposed to an economically weak Albanian state is the acceptance of dictated terms governing its economic and other relations with a foreign power. Why should Albania be deprived of the rights to have and conclude agreements consonant with her sovereign rights? Why should the Albanian Government have to accept the conditions of the "dollar bag" and why should a refusal to submit to the demands of that "bag" be a reason for refusing Albania's application for admission to membership of the United Nations? That is the only way to regard the charges made against Albania of so-called non-compliance with international agreements.

The second "offense" attributed to Albania is to have created incidents with one of the great States in the United Nations. That charge has already been discussed by the Security Council and the Albanian representative convincingly and factually demonstrated not only the baseless but also the tendentious character of those charges. The shelling of British warships by Albanian shore-batteries, when those ships were infringing the inviolability of Albanian territorial waters, and the incident in the Corfu Straits are merely links in the general chain of efforts to cripple the young Albanian People's Republic. The people of the Soviet Union are familiar not only with such methods of pressure but also with methods of direct armed intervention within the borders of the young Soviet Republic which was born in 1917. The results of and the people who took part in those events are very well-known to representatives present here. Some of the latter may find that some of those who took part in the armed intervention against the young Soviet Republic in the past are the same as those involved in the incidents in Albanian territorial waters caused by the liberties taken by foreign warships. The difference is merely that in the past such action was on a considerably larger scale and was more open and obvious than that which is now called incidents in the Corfu Straits or armed clashes on the Greek-Albanian frontier, about which I shall speak later. The incidents in the territorial waters of Albania merely prove how highly the Albanian people prize the independence they have for the first time received. Respect for the territorial integrity and sovereign rights of all governments is well-known to be completely consonant with the provisions of the United Nations Charter and action in defence of those rights cannot be presented as an argument against the admission of a Government to Membership of the United Nations Organization.

The Soviet Delegation has cited numerous documents in the Security Council proving the absurdity of the charges directed against the Albanian People's Republic and I see no need to refer again to those documents now, especially as it is so evident from the nature of the charges made against Albania that there are some representatives who reject any reasons that may be given, and are motivated in this matter by principles incompatible with the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

We have also heard that Albania is alleged to be guilty of bringing about frontier incidents with one of her neighbours. At the last meeting of the Committee it was also remarked that in the year that has elapsed since the first examination of the Albanian Application and especially in recent weeks Albania's behaviour has seriously worsened and still greater doubts, it is alleged, are entertained of the peace-loving character of the Albanian Government. Added to this also are the recent provocative fabrications about the so-called incursion of guerrillas from Albania, and the participation of the "international brigade" in the fighting against the regular troops of the Greek monarchy.

The Soviet representative on the Security Council and the representatives of three Balkan countries have proved by official data and facts that the frontier incidents are being provoked by Greek Government circles to conceal the reasons for the civil war in Greece and to divert the attention of world public opinion from the reactionary policy of the existing regime in Greece and from the monstrous terror directed against the democratic population of the country, to conceal acts of violence done to the people, fully as great as the violence and contemptuous treatment suffered at the hands of the German-Fascist occupation regime in Greece. These frontier incidents are needed by the reactionary-monarchist regime in Greece to justify direct foreign intervention in the internal affairs of Greece, because without that intervention Greek reaction could not hope to suppress the democratic movement in the country. As regards the recent provocative clamour about the so-called incursion of guerrillas from Albania and the participation in the fighting of an "international brigade", the provocation was so gross and so monstrous that, as we are told by the press, the Greek Minister of Defense himself and Brigadier-General Stailianos Manideikis, one of the military leaders of Greco-Monarchist Army, had to issue a denial of the fabrication. We should also bear in mind the subsidiary group of the Security Council Commission of Investigation stated after investigating the matter on the Greco-Albanian frontier that it had not discovered any tangible traces of the international brigade which according to the Greek Government's complaint was supposed to be responsible for the incursion into Greece.

That is the real state of affairs and the truth regarding this series of charges against Albania. That is still not all, however. In addition, some representatives have stated that their grave doubts regarding Albania and their sorrowful reflections have been still further intensified by the behaviour of the Albanian representative at the last meetings of the Council. What was "improper" in the Albanian representative's behaviour in the Council? The representative of Albania defended his country's rights to independence and the honour of his people; he frankly and simply proved by facts and documents that charges levelled against his country were provocative and false, that those charges were based mainly on depositions made by the scum of human society, namely by traitors to the Albanian people, quislings, criminals, people who had collaborated with the German and Italian Fascist occupants. The Albanian representative proved that the tragedy of the Greek civil war was due to the terror and violence which prevailed in Greece and which was unbearable to the Greek people. It is likely from the accusations towards the Albanian representative that the principal impropriety committed by the Albanian representative was, of course, that he proved that those responsible for the Greek national tragedy were not only the Greek reactionaries in power, but also those foreign Governments which by their open intervention in the internal affairs of Greece support, defend and perhaps even encourage the present rulers of Greece in their fight against the Greek democratic population and incite them to committing acts of provocation against Greece's Balkan neighbours in the North. As you see, that is really a serious reason for some people to be incensed by the behaviour of the Albanian representative. It is less explicable only why the representative of France should also suffer from these "sad reflections" and doubts.

I think I should also refer to the disclosure made by the British representative that the present Albanian Government is not supposed to represent the Albanian people. That is also a point which should be cleared up. From the British representative's statements here and from the attitude of the British Delegation in the fervent support of the existing regime in Greece, it may be inferred that a Government would represent the people of its country if it:

1. delegated complete freedom of action in the country to two Great Powers speaking the same language, who would have to be the real masters in the country where they were staying;
2. unconditionally accepted "aid" and concluded agreements on conditions dictated by these two Great Powers, or even by one of them;

3. allotted seats at General Staff meeting to the representatives of at least one of those Powers;
4. accepted the advice and directives of the military and other experts of these Powers in the internal struggle against the democratic popular movement, etc.

The Albanian Government does not meet any of these requirements and it is likely that there you have the reasons for the attacks on Albania and the reasons for the refusal of Albania's principal opponents to admit her to membership of the United Nations.

The representative of Australia is no less lavish in his baseless charges. In his view, Great Britain had admirably complied with the Security Council's recommendation to submit the so-called Corfu Straits affair to the International Court of Justice immediately, though she let six weeks pass between the time when the Council adopted the recommendation and the time when she submitted the case to the Court. On the other hand, the fact that Albania has left the Secretariat of the United Nations without any information on the case in question for three months - that in the "impartial" view of the Australian representative is a crime committed by Albania against the United Nations.

The Soviet Delegation considers that Albania stands in no need of being reminded to discharge her obligations under the Charter. The Albanian Government is eminently aware of those obligations and there is no necessity whatsoever to send a special telegram to the Albanian Government as the representatives of Brazil and the United States have, with the support of other representatives, proposed.

The Belgian representative's last statement is no less strange than his first. While stating that he does not question Albania's participation in the fighting against the Italian and German Fascist occupying forces on the side of the Allies, the Belgian representative at the same time repeats the old hackneyed and lying Greek charges to the effect that the Albanian people took a voluntary part in the military operations of Fascist Italy against Greece. How can these two notions be reconciled? If the Belgian representative really needs information regarding the conduct of the Albanian people during Fascist Italy's military aggression against Greece, I can draw my Belgian colleague's attention to the text of the letter sent by Mussolini to Hitler on 22 November 1940, as read by myself last year in this Committee. The Belgian representative may find the text of this letter on page 87 of the committee's report (document S/133/Corr.1). The third paragraph of this letter from Mussolini explaining to Hitler the reasons for the failure of the campaign against Greece reads:

".....The treachery of almost all the Albanian troops who have revolted against our units. In one of our divisions alone 6000 Albanians had to be disarmed and sent to the rear."

That document alone leaves no doubt as to the conduct of the Albanian people in Fascist Italy's fight against Greece in the Second World War.

The Albanian nation deserves better treatment than it has received at the hands of certain countries throughout the entire post-war period. It is rebuilding its life peacefully on genuinely democratic principles, and no one has any legal or moral right to interfere with its so doing. Its right to admission into the family of the United Nations is indisputable.

ANNEX III

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE SEVENTEENTH MEETING ON 23 JULY 1947, CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF ALBANIA

I do not intend to dignify with a detailed reply the utterly fantastic, the utterly ridiculous, and the largely irrelevant remarks of Mr. Krasilnikov. I do, however, resent the general tenor of the Soviet statement.

I prefer to reply by reviewing briefly the reasons giving rise to the grave doubts of my Government as to the qualifications of Albania and to show how each doubt is based on a fact, an incontestable fact.

First, there is the failure of the present Albanian regime to reaffirm the pre-1939 bilateral treaties. This is a fact. No reaffirmation has been received. This fact reasonably raises doubts in our minds as to the ability and willingness of the Albanian Government to carry out international obligations including the obligations contained in the United Nations Charter. Let me say a few more words on this treaty question. There is nothing sinister about these treaties as has been suggested. They include an arbitration treaty, a conciliation pact, a money order convention, a most favoured nation agreement. And we have made it abundantly clear that, following reaffirmation, we would be more than willing to consider any revisions in these agreements which the Albanian authorities might desire.

Next is the Corfu case. This has two facets. The first fact is that seven Members of the Security Council voted for a resolution containing the statement that the mines could not have been laid without the knowledge of the Albanian authorities. I might add that this finding would have been adopted had it not been frustrated by a Soviet veto. This fact leads us to entertain serious doubts as to the peace-loving character of the Albanian regime.

Then we have the fact that prior to the hearing of this case in the Security Council, Albania accepted the obligation of pacific settlement under Article 35 of the Charter but has thus far failed to refer the matter to the International Court of Justice as recommended by the Security Council and has been done by the United Kingdom. This fact increases, we think quite reasonably, our already existing doubts as to the ability and willingness of the Albanian Government to respect international undertakings including, specifically in this case, the obligations of the Charter of the United Nations.

Now we come to the case involving the violations of the northern borders of Greece. This also has two facets. The first fact is that a majority of the Members of the Investigation Commission has found that Albania rendered assistance to the guerrillas. This fact increases, and we think reasonably so,

/our already

our already serious doubts as to the peace-loving character of the Albanian regime.

The other facet of the Greek case is the failure of the Albanian Government to co-operate with the Subsidiary Group. This fact increases even more our serious doubts as to the ability and willingness of the Albanian regime to carry out international obligations, including again specifically the obligations of the Charter of the United Nations.

ANNEX IV

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF CHINA AT THE EIGHTEENTH  
MEETING ON 28 JULY 1947, CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF  
THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Members of the Membership Committee who served in the same capacity last year, may be able to recall that when the application of the Mongolian People's Republic was before the Committee the Chinese Delegation advised caution, although it later voted in favour of recommendation for membership when the case came up in the Security Council.

By last summer the applicant State had come into existence half a year. In spite of this fact she maintained active relations with only one country and promised to exchange envoys with only one other. As a result, the world, including the country of which she had been an integral part for centuries and from whom she had just received blessings for her independence, was in the dark as to whether she was a peace-loving State which was able and willing to carry out the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations. China stood, as she still stands, for universality of membership in the United Nations. Furthermore, she was conscious of her own consent to the separate existence of the applicant State, besides being in general in sympathy with peoples who struggled for freedom and independence. For these broader considerations her Delegation waived its objection in the final stage of examination. But the mystery that surrounded the applicant State was so great that not all Delegations were prepared to run the same risk as the Chinese, and in the end no recommendation for membership was made by the Security Council.

Another year has now elapsed in which China, like many other countries, waited fondly for assurance that her Delegation's doubts were not substantial so that it could come to the United Nations to vote for the applicant State's admission with a peaceful mind. But what has she got? It is none other than an armed invasion of her province of Sinkiang by the applicant State, with attempts to seize territory in the Peitashan region there.

This aggression took place in the last couple of months and has not ended even today. Its alleged basis is that the Peitashan region is the territory of the applicant State, not of China. As far as facts go, the said region is on the Sinkiang side of a common boundary, the record of which is clear and undisputable. That boundary was established a little over three decades ago when an autonomous area, known by the name of Outer Mongolia, was created, and as such it remained to the day of invasion unchallenged, even when Outer Mongolia was granted independence under the name of Mongolian Peoples' Republic. During the long years the said region was always under Chinese civil administration and guarded by Chinese armed forces sufficient to maintain peace and order - though not sufficient to repulse a full-dress

/invasion

invasion with paraphernalia of modern warfare, including aircraft, like the one we have witnessed and are witnessing.

Granting, for the sake of argument, that the applicant State has a claim to the Peitashan region, or part of it, there is no reason why she should resort to warlike methods to give effect to it. She had never tried negotiations, or mediation, or conciliation, or suggested inquiry, or arbitration or judicial settlement. On the contrary, the first thing she does is to stage an invasion with a forty-eight hour ultimatum to local authorities and when the Chinese Government protested and demanded suspension of hostilities and retirement from the invaded territory pending investigation, she replied by asserting that the territory concerned was hers.

Mr. Chairman, the Mongolian Peoples' Republic has acted contrary to the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations which she promised to accept when she applied for membership in the Organization. She would not be able or willing to carry out those obligations after admission. She has not shown herself to be a peace-loving State. Whereas the Chinese Delegation had merely doubts as to her qualification for membership before, it has now come to believe she does not possess it. For this reason it finds it not possible to give her support as last year.

ANNEX V

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST  
REPUBLICS AT THE EIGHTEENTH MEETING ON 28 JULY 1947, CONCERNING  
THE APPLICATION OF THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC\*

The application of the Mongolian People's Republic for admission to the United Nations had been in the hands of the Secretariat for more than a year. Not a single representative in the Security Council gave grounds for the rejection of this application last year, the reasons for rejection of the application were not even formulated properly.

Nevertheless, the young Mongolian People's Republic made a very large contribution, in accordance with its means, to the recent struggle of the Allies against German and Japanese Fascist aggression. The Mongolian People's Republic underwent Japanese aggression and successfully repulsed it long before the beginning of the Second World War. At last year's meeting of the Committee, many uncontrovertible documentary facts were brought forward, which gave a clear impression of the valuable contribution of the Mongolian People's Republic to the struggle of the Allied States against the Fascist aggressors. I do not consider it necessary to submit these facts now, since they were contained in official documents. Certain representatives, however, refused to give due consideration to the role of the Mongolian People's Republic in the struggle against Fascism, and to the peace-loving nature of the applicant State, and the Security Council was unable to adopt the relevant recommendation regarding this application. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Delegate therefore considered this to be an inequitable attitude towards the Mongolian People of that country.

Since the consideration of this application last year, the Mongolian People's Republic had continued the reconstruction of its national economy. The Republic has achieved great success and the material and cultural level of the Mongolian People was rising every year. The governmental system of the Mongolian People's Republic was founded on a truly democratic basis, and there could be no doubt that the Mongolian People's Republic was able to fulfill the obligations incumbent upon Members of the United Nations. According to all the documentation and information, the Mongolian People's Republic possessed all the qualifications for membership in the United Nations. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Delegation supported the application of the Mongolian People's Republic for membership of the United Nations and hoped that a similarly just attitude will be demonstrated by other delegations this year.

---

\* Original Russian.

But as we see from the statement which has just been made by the Representative of China, the latter is going to make serious obstacles and trouble not only on the frontiers of the Mongolian People's Republic, but also in the matter of admission of this Republic to the United Nations. Dr. Hsu made a lot of absurd and very serious accusations towards the peace-loving State of Mongolia.

Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to prove that the trouble-makers in China go too far in this case. I have in my hands the official document of the Mongolian People's Republic, which gives a true picture of events about which Dr. Hsu has just complained to us. This is a special communiqué issued by the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic and published by its press on 15 June and by the Soviet press on 16 June. I am starting the quotation of this important document:

"On 9 June the Chinese Agency 'Central News' published a communication stating that on 5 June a cavalry battalion of the Mongolian People's Republic attacked a Chinese unit in the region of the Baltashan mountain range (Baltak-Bogdo in Mongolia) in the eastern part of the Sintsian Province and that four aircraft with Union of Soviet Socialist Republics identification marks allegedly also took part in this. The 'Central News' agency then issued a communication stating that Mongolian military units penetrated 200 miles into Chinese territory.

"A representative of the Chinese Foreign Ministry, commenting on these communications of the 'Central News' agency at a press conference at Nanking on 11 June, not only did not deny the agency's false assertions regarding penetration into Chinese territory by Mongolian troops but, in supporting these assertions stated that the Baltashan mountain range was situated in Chinese territory, far from the frontier of the Mongolian People's Republic.

"The Foreign Ministry of the Mongolian People's Republic is authorized to state that the aforementioned communication of the 'Central News' agency and also the statement of the official representative of the Chinese Foreign Ministry regarding penetration into China by Mongolian military units under cover of aircraft with Union of Soviet Socialist Republics identification signs are false and have been fabricated for obviously provocative purposes. The falseness and untruthfulness of these statements are evident from the fact that the Baltak-Bogdo (Baltashan in Chinese) mountain range is situated not on Chinese territory, as the representative of the Chinese Foreign Ministry avers, but on the territory of the Mongolian People's Republic.

/With regard

"With regard to the incident which actually took place on 5 June on the Mongolian-Sinhsian frontier, the facts were as follows:

"A detachment of Chinese troops, which had violated the frontier of the Mongolian People's Republic, took up a position fifteen kilometres from the frontier line in the valley of the river Huzhirtin Gol, northeast of the Tihiltu Ula mountain (in the Baltak-Bogdo range) and began there to entrench and build emplacements, making sorties against the Mongolian frontier posts permanently established at this point.

"When the command of the Mongolian frontier guards discovered this armed Chinese detachment, which had illegally violated the territory of the Mongolian People's Republic, in order to escape a conflict, and motivated by the friendly relations between the Mongolian People's Republic and China, sent a request through a spokesman to the commander of the detachment with the demand to leave Mongolian territory.

"The commander refused to meet this legitimate request. Furthermore, contrary to accepted international usage, the Mongolian spokesman was arrested by the Chinese and the Chinese detachment remained on the territory of the Mongolian People's Republic. In view of this, the Mongolian frontier guards were compelled to take steps in order to expel the violators of the frontier from the territory of their country. The Mongolian frontier unit, with the support of a few aircraft of the Mongol air force, forced the violators of the frontier to leave the territory of the Mongolian People's Republic. The Mongolian frontier guards did not cross into Chinese territory.

"When the Chinese detachment left the territory of the Mongolian People's Republic, the dead body of the slain Mongol spokesman was found on 9 June at the place where the unit had been. It was seen from the condition of the corpse that the spokesman had been brutally tortured, for his hands and feet had been burned and his stomach cut open. In addition, four corpses of Mongolian frontier guards were found with the eyes gouged out.

"These are the actual facts, which are deliberately and provocatively distorted by the 'Central News' and by the official representative of the Chinese Foreign Ministry.

"This brutal violation of the frontier of the Mongolian People's Republic by an armed Chinese detachment and the barbarous treatment of the Mongol spokesman, the country and in the break of the accepted norms  
/of international

of international relations are arousing a legitimate feeling of deep indignation and protest amongst the Mongolian people.

"The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic lodges a decisive protest against the Chinese Government and reserves the right to demand from the Chinese Government the severe punishment of those responsible for the violation of the frontier of the Mongolian People's Republic and for the brutal treatment of the Mongolian spokesman and frontier guards, and to demand reparations for the losses suffered by the Mongolian side as a result of this incident, which was aroused by provocative actions of the Chinese armed detachment."

As you see, Mr. Chairman, from this document, the real situation is quite different from what was said to us by the representative of China. It is likely that some circles in China like provocative methods that are being used by the ruling circles in Greece and are going to use them also in China. It is likely that some circles in China, by provoking the frontier incidents with the Mongolian People's Republic, want to divert world public opinion from the serious internal situation of China created by the civil war. It is likely that some circles in China, by provoking the frontier incidents with the Mongolian People's Republic, want to justify the necessity of the presence in China of the so-called fact-finding Mission and to justify more open intervention into the internal affairs of China by a foreign Great State which had sent this Mission.

Therefore the Committee cannot act on the basis of one-sided false accusations by the Chinese representative which are officially and by documentary material rejected by the Mongolian Government. From this official communiqué of the Mongolian Government it is clear that the Chinese side is guilty in these frontier incidents.

The Mongolian people were interested only in peaceful pursuits on their own territory and these threatening incidents on their frontier would correspond to the interests of their neighbour, and not to their own interests. Therefore the Committee should disregard these distorted accusations and recommend the admission of the Mongolian People's Republic to the United Nations.

ANNEX VI

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF CHINA AT THE NINETEENTH MEETING ON  
30 JULY 1947, CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF THE  
MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

I regret that until yesterday evening I could not have access to the summary record of my Soviet colleague's statements in our last meeting, and as a result, I am unable to reply point by point. But perhaps I can dispense with this procedure and answer him in a more general way, for after all what he tried to say was quite simple: he said firstly, that it was China who invaded Outer Mongolia, not the other way, and secondly, that China invaded Outer Mongolia just to divert world attention to her northern border.

The question of who invades who depends upon to whom does the territory involved belong. Outer Mongolia may differ with China in other questions, but she agrees with her that the armed conflict of 5 June 1947, took place in Peitashan. The question is therefore what is the status of Peitashan. As far as we know, the claim of Outer-Mongolia to the region is based upon nothing better than a mere assertion made after the conflict of 5 June. Against this asserted claim China has the following facts:

- (a) Peitashan lies on the Sinkiang side of a boundary which was established in 1915 when Outer Mongolia was made an autonomous unit, and remained as such until 5 June 1947 unchallenged by anybody, including Outer-Mongolia even the day she was granted independence;
- (b) During the same period the boundary could be traced on all official maps of China of which Outer Mongolia was an integral part until granted independence;
- (c) During the same period also, Peitashan was under Chinese civil administration and guarded by Chinese armed forces.

Mr. Chairman, from the foregoing facts it should be evident to anybody that Peitashan is Chinese; that the armed conflict which took place on 5 June 1947 at a point more than 200 kilometers from the border is an invasion of Chinese territory by Outer Mongolia; and that all statements made by the Soviet Delegate are Outer Mongolian lies.

On the second Soviet charge that China invaded Outer Mongolia just to divert world attention to her northern border, we need not have to spend much time. Being invaded rather than the invader, as it has been so proved by facts, China naturally does not fit into the picture. As a matter of fact, even common sense alone would have shown that the charge is unfounded. Just think of the struggle the Chinese Government is having with the rebels in Northeast China, or Manchuria as it is called abroad: China simply could not afford to pick a quarrel with Outer Mongolia at a time the rebels in Northeast China launched an attack upon Ssuingkai with an attempt to

/cut Changchun

out Changchun from Mukden. The Soviet Delegate would have demonstrated a better insight into the political situation in the Far East, if he had come with the statement that Outer Mongolia invaded Sinkiang as a diversion for the rebels in Northeast China and as a Second Front against the Chinese Government.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned Outer Mongolia's invasion of Sinkiang last meeting just to show the Committee that she was not qualified for membership. Let us not be diverted by the Soviet Delegate's unfounded counter-charges. I have shown that Peitashan belongs to China. Granting for the sake of argument that Outer Mongolia has a claim to it, may I ask how our Soviet colleague is to justify the conduct of Outer Mongolia in resorting to arms?

While blaming aggression upon China in the place of Outer Mongolia, our Soviet colleague did not fail to prepare for the worst by minimizing the armed conflict into border incidents. I would like to ask him three questions: First, is it customary for border incidents to be fought with aircraft? Second, should a depth of over 200 kilometers be considered border as the term is used in the present connection? Third, can attacks that are repeated in spite of protests be still called incidents?

The border of Sinkiang on the Outer Mongolian side had some border incidents before. In fact, the attack of 5 June actually was preceded by a period beginning with the fall of 1946, of what looked like incidents. But the attack of 5 June itself was no incident. It was carried out by regular armed units with up-to-date equipment and a formal forty-eight-hour ultimatum to the Chinese local authorities, and it was followed by other attacks on many points in the same region afterwards. The Chinese Delegation has reports up to the end of June. According to these reports Chinese troops were attacked by Outer Mongolian armed forces, land, or air, or both, on nine occasions within twenty-five days after 5 June, namely, on the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 13th, 17th, 26th, 28th, and 30th, averaging once in three days.

Mr. Chairman, Outer Mongolia has shown herself to be not peace-loving by invading Chinese territory, by attacking Chinese armed forces, and by continuing her attacks even after the Chinese Government initiated discussion to have the case settled peacefully. I submit that she is not qualified for membership in the United Nations.

## ANNEX VII

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE  
TWENTY-SEVEN MEETING ON 4 AUGUST 1947, CONCERNING THE  
APPLICATIONS OF EX-ENEMY STATES AND AUSTRIA

My Government favours the procedure suggested at our last meeting by the representative of Belgium that the proper procedure is to examine these new applications from the ex-enemy states and from Austria individually, and at once.

In view, however, of the proposal made by our Soviet colleague, to which I reaffirm the strong opposition of my Government; I recognize that some general discussion may have to take place. I hope, however, it can be brief and that we can proceed quickly this morning to the individual consideration of the applications. I intend to demonstrate that this general discussion by itself will be rather pointless. The facts and the merits of the several applications vary considerably and the only logical procedure will be to examine the treaty question and other relevant factors in the light of the merits or demerits of each application.

It is not possible to find a single word in the Charter which imposes upon us the obligation to postpone consideration of membership applications from ex-enemy states until the completion of ratification and the entry into force of the peace treaties. There is also nothing in the peace treaties themselves containing such an obligation to postpone. Some members of the Committee may refer to the wording of the preamble of the treaties, and I quote: "...thereby enabling the allied and associated powers to support application to become a member of the United Nations." That statement does not in any way preclude or prohibit earlier support or admission to the United Nations of ex-enemy states. If such had been the intent certainly the wording of the preamble would have been more precise and would have made such an intention clear.

May I point out now as a matter of record the treaties were finally signed on 10 February 1947 and have been ratified by all but one of the States whose ratification is necessary for their entry into force. Surely the peoples of States which merit admission should not be penalized solely because of the failure on the part of one State to ratify.

The completion of the final step by which the peace treaties come into force should of course be taken as quickly as possible, but we cannot ignore that a number of important steps in the normalization of relations between the Allies and the ex-enemy states have already been taken. Hostilities have been terminated by armistice arrangements concluded for an indefinite period. Formal diplomatic relations have been re-established in a number of instances. This re-establishment of normal relations should justify consideration of the applications of ex-enemy states on their merits.

/I repeat

I repeat there is no good reason why the absence of ratification by one State should be used as the pretext for not considering on their merits each of the applications now before this Committee. Some may point out that restrictions in armistice agreements or other control arrangements are of such a nature as to impair sovereignty and thus make a state ineligible for membership. My Government rejects the application of such a thesis blindly to all cases. In the case of some applications, the way armistice agreements have been implemented may well have restricted sovereignty to such an extent as to cast serious doubt on the application of a state, but in many instances, such as Italy, on which I will have much more to say when we consider the Italian application on its merits, controls are practically non-existent. The Allied Commission, for instance, was terminated on 31 January 1947, and I may add terminated with the approval of the Soviet Union. This illustrates the point which is the main thesis of my remarks - that we have to examine each application to determine whether armistice arrangements and other factors are such as to raise doubts as to the eligibility of a state for membership. We cannot generalize. The question should be resolved by the facts in each individual instance.

Some may raise the question of military occupation in connection with sovereignty. I submit that under international law this cannot be substantiated. I shall cite two illustrations. If my French colleague will pardon me, may I refer to the fact that following the treaties in 1815, the Sovereign State of France - and sovereignty was not questioned - was occupied by approximately 150,000 foreign troops for three years. I can also cite the occupation of the Rhineland after the first World War, during a period when the sovereignty of Germany was not a matter of dispute. In bringing the matter up to the present, this is another question on which the facts and conditions vary as between the several applicant states. For instance particularly in the case of Italy, there is only a token occupation. I will give further details on this when we consider the Italian application individually.

I notice that the Soviet proposal includes the deferment of the application of Austria as well as that of the ex-enemy states. This is most difficult for me to understand. Again I will go into this matter in detail when we consider the Austrian application individually as I hope we can very shortly, but I would like to say now that in our judgment the Soviet objection to considering her application at this time is completely without foundation. She is not an ex-enemy state, and no possible obligation can be found to justify the postponement of consideration of her application, or, for that matter, her admission to the United Nations.

One more word as to Austria's application, the word "peace" does not  
/appear in the

appear in the treaty title to which the Soviet Union has agreed. The title for the treaty is, and I quote "Treaty for the Re-establishment of an Independent and Democratic Austria", and this was based on the recognition in the Moscow Declaration that Austria was the first victim of Nazi aggression and forced annexation.

I sincerely hope I have convinced the members of this Committee that the only sound and proper way to proceed is to consider the applications individually. I urge the members of this Committee, if it is necessary to vote on the Soviet proposal, to reject it promptly so that we can begin our examination of the applications.

ANNEX VIII

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE TWENTIETH MEETING ON 4 AUGUST 1947, CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF HUNGARY

Events in Hungary since the end of May 1947 raise doubts on the part of my Government that the reorganized Hungarian Government will be able or willing to carry out the obligations of the Charter of the United Nations. This reorganized Hungarian Government came into being by methods which, in the opinion of my Government, are inconsistent with basic international agreements in force applying to Hungary.

Further steps are now being taken by the present Hungarian authorities which will deny to the Hungarian people, even more drastically, the human rights envisaged in the peace treaty. For instance, political meetings of moderate groups not dominated by the left are being disrupted by Communist sympathizers with the obvious tacit approval of the police authorities. Another illustration, Communist pressure has resulted in the postponement of the annual convention scheduled for 18 July of the National Committee of the Small Holders Party, the party to which the Hungarian people gave a majority in an election. A revised election law, which will disenfranchise various non-Communist elements in forthcoming elections has been passed.

These illustrations should suffice without going into the situation in great detail, to indicate why my Government has doubts as to the eligibility of the reorganized Hungarian Government for United Nations membership.

ANNEX IX

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES  
AT THE TWENTY-SEVENTH MEETING ON 4 AUGUST 1947  
CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF ITALY

The United States warmly supports the application of Italy and believes that Italy well merits admission at this time to the United Nations.

In comparison with other ex-enemy states, Italy is in an entirely unique position. This statement is based on two major premises: first, Italy was declared to be a co-belligerent in the war against Germany in a joint statement issued to the world on 13 October 1943 by the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the Premier of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. You will note the Soviet Union was a party to this declaration. I emphasize that no other ex-enemy state was granted this status of co-belligerency.

The second reason for the unique position of Italy is the fact that it is to all intents and purposes not restricted whatsoever as to sovereignty. The Allied Commission was terminated on 31 January 1947. I should add that this termination was approved by the Soviet Union as well as by the other powers at the time the statement was made that the need for the Allied Commission -- which in paraphrase means the need for control -- no longer existed.

The situation today is that all Allied control over Italy has been relinquished with the exception of Venezia Giulia and Udine. In those areas there is still a small military occupation force of British and American troops. This should be considered, however, only as a token occupation. They are situated on the northeast frontier of Italy for the purpose of insuring a peaceful solution to the boundary problem existing in that area. They are not there for the purpose of controlling Italy. A corollary of what I have said is that military government has been entirely withdrawn from Italy except for the areas cited and for small administrative forces necessary for its support.

The next point I would like to make is that the Italian peace treaty has been ratified by all of the Great Powers whose ratification is necessary to bring it into full force except for the Soviet Union. It has also been ratified by a substantial vote of the Italian Parliament. It would be patently unjust -- in fact a travesty on justice -- to deny to the Italian people who have done so much since becoming a co-belligerent both to assist the Allies and to develop their democratic processes of government, membership in the United Nations simply because the peace treaty has not been ratified by one Great Power. Italy made a splendid record in her period of co-belligerency. She has established democracy within her own borders.

/She has

She has shown faithful respect for the obligations assumed under the treaty of peace, and she has shown a willingness to collaborate with the United Nations in all international contacts and with the specialized agencies which she has already joined. In the opinion of my Government, Italy's goodwill and her eligibility for membership in the United Nations are beyond question. I urge most strongly that this Committee recommend to the Security Council her admission to the United Nations.

## ANNEX X

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF BRAZIL AT THE TWENTIETH  
MEETING ON 4 AUGUST 1947, CONCERNING THE APPLICATION  
OF ITALY\*

As you all know, my country fought on the Allied side during the last war. Our soldiers fought side by side with American and British soldiers on the very soil of Italy. Our attitude towards Italy was governed by differences in ideology at the time when that country was under a Fascist government.

I make this preface in order to show that, as the representative of a country which fought against the former Italian regime, I am very happy to support the application of a democratically governed Italy.

It may be said that, by the Potsdam Declaration, the Great Powers committed themselves to supporting the admission of Italy to the United Nations after the entry into force of the Peace Treaty. It may also be said that this Treaty provides for the admission of Italy to the United Nations and that, since this Treaty is not yet in force, Italy cannot be admitted to the Organization.

Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that the Great Powers made certain minimum promises to the conquered countries at Potsdam. They intended to support the admission of these countries to the United Nations as soon as they had set up democratic regimes and as soon as these democratic governments had declared themselves responsible for the acts of war perpetrated by their predecessors. It seems obvious to me that the Italian Government, which is now democratic, has assumed responsibility to the Allies by the very fact of having signed and ratified a Peace Treaty. Thus, it is quite fallacious to argue that the victorious Powers cannot support the entry of Italy into the United Nations on the grounds that the Peace Treaty is not in force. Obviously, if the Treaty is not in force, its provisions specifying the exact time for Italy's admission do not bind any of the signatories and cannot be cited in support of an argument which is exactly contrary to the idea contained in one of its Articles. Thus, on the strength of what I have just told you, I do not think that the signatory States can argue that those provisions preclude them from supporting Italy's claim.

The idea, the spirit and the very meaning both of the Treaty and the Potsdam Declaration speak in Italy's favour. Perhaps the letter of this Declaration does not entirely favour her, but I would ask you whether the Great Powers should abide by the letter of the Declaration and in so doing depart from its real spirit? In the opinion of the Brazilian delegation, this would be slavish adherence to an empty formalism that has no legal justification.

In addition, I should like to ask whether the fact of the Peace Treaty not being in force because one Great Power has not ratified it can prevent us from recognizing Italy as a peaceful State.

\* Original French

/There can

There can be no doubt that for some time past Italy has ceased to be treated as a conquered or enemy country. We would be arguing on much too narrow lines if we alleged that a Peace Treaty was the only way of putting an end to a state of war. A state of war may even be ended by tacit agreement when the belligerents have ceased hostilities with the intention of waging war no longer. A Treaty was, of course, concluded with Italy in order to settle the reparations arising out of the responsibility of war, but it is undeniable that both Italy and the Allied Powers have already given evidence of their intentions not to go on waging war.

Towards the end of the war Italy was no longer considered as an enemy and she became a co-belligerent. In the special chapter of the Moscow Agreement relating to Italy it is said that the Fascist Forces will be overthrown and that the three Great Powers will help to choose a democratic government. It cannot be said that Italy was thereafter treated as an enemy State. Moreover, we are reminded of this fact in the preamble to the Peace Treaty. The Allied Powers accepted Italy as a co-belligerent after having treated her as an enemy. Italy has already acknowledged the responsibility laid upon her under international law as a result of the actions of the Fascist government. After this, can we deny Italy the right of being considered as a peaceful State? We cannot deny her this right. Italy's relations with the United Nations must not, and cannot further be regulated Article 107 of the Charter.

Italy is no longer subject to the control of the Allied Military Command. Since 30 January 1945, the Allied Chiefs of Staff have acknowledged her new position as soon as the Allied Control Commission became an advisory body and the Italian Government reassumed the "jus imperii". Since that time Italy has reassumed all the prerogatives of a sovereign State. The Italian Government is free to make nominations and to promulgate laws without having to ask for the agreement of the Allied Commission. Normal diplomatic relations have been re-established and Italian foreign trade has been free since 2 August 1945.

When the Armistice terms were revised in May 1946, the Allied Control Commission was completely abolished. The sovereign nature of Italy's executive, legislative and judiciary powers, which had existed throughout the previous year, thereafter became incontestable.

The presence of American troops in Italy does not detract from her status as a sovereign country. The presence of these troops is the result of a diplomatic document, an international agreement concluded between the United States and Italy in May 1946, when the Armistice was revised. It has none of the characteristics of the military occupation of a conquered country.

Briefly, Italy has stated her intention of fulfilling the obligations of the Charter; she is a sovereign State, fully capable of fulfilling her international obligations; she has normal international relations with

several States Members of the United Nations; she has a democratic Government which has given proof of an international behaviour in full conformity with the aims of the United Nations.

It only remains for me to give you some facts on Italy's contribution to the Allied war effort since she was recognized as a co-belligerent State.

Italy co-operated with the Allies in the common struggle against Germany. This co-operation was sincere and spontaneous on the part of the Italian Government and people. It began after the Armistice of September 1943 and only ceased after Germany had surrendered. The Allies promised Italy that they would take into account the assistance which she gave to the Allied cause.

We must not forget the co-operation of the Italian army in the final phase of the war; the activities of the Italian Liberation Corps; the part played by Italians in the re-conquest of Corsica and their resistance in the Aegean Islands, at Leros and at Cephalonia. When the Armistice was announced, Italian troops in Yugoslavia went underground to fight with Tito's partisans, or, in other cases, they preferred to be interned by the Germans rather than to collaborate with them; 530,000 Italians were interned by the Germans; scattered units often gave valuable assistance at the individual requests of American and British commanders.

The Italian Navy went to Malta and to other Allied ports as soon as this was possible. It co-operated with the Allies in a disciplined and willing manner. It lost several vessels in fighting against the enemy. After the Armistice, this Navy increased the naval strength of the Allies by 9 cruisers, 10 destroyers, 36 submarines, 23 torpedo-boats, etc.

In September 1943 a naval agreement between the Italian and the Allied Navies established a normal basis for routine co-operation. This consisted not so much of armistice clauses of a coercive character, as of a freely negotiated pact embodying certain mutual obligations. These obligations greatly lightened the tasks of the Allied Navies in the Mediterranean.

Battleships and other vessels were used for the instruction of Allied personnel. Apart from their normal functions, cruisers transported many hundreds of thousands of soldiers engaged in the struggle. After Italy became a co-belligerent the Italian Fleet lost 26 vessels, with a total displacement of 135,443 tons.

The contribution of the Italian air force was also as large as it could be in the circumstances. It carried out more than 11,000 flights for the Allies; it destroyed approximately 90 enemy aircraft and 423 vessels and land vehicles.

Partisans and guerillas sabotaged the enemy's war effort, cut his lines of communication and provided valuable information for the Allies.

/The Italian

The Italian civilian population gave proofs of its hostility towards the Nazis as soon as the Armistice had been signed. The example of the people of Naples and the surrounding districts was perhaps the first of its kind in western Europe.

When hostilities against Germany came to an end, Italy declared war against Japan in June 1945 and only the fact that the Armistice was shortly afterwards concluded in the Far East prevented Italy from taking part in the operations against Japan.

In considering Italy's request for admission to the United Nations we cannot ignore her contribution in lives, in war material, and in sacrifices of all kinds by which the United Nations benefited at the end of the war.

We are not considering today the admission of Mussolini's Italy to the United Nations, but that of another Italy, democratic, anti-fascist, redeemed by her sacrifices. It is understandable that the new Italy should, to some extent, pay for the faults of the past, but it is inconceivable that she should be denied the right of taking her proper place in our Organization amongst the peaceful nations of today.

Italy plays a traditional role in our civilization and in the destiny of the world; she is making determined and sincere efforts to pursue a path compatible with the purposes of the United Nations; her traditional role and her present efforts should be recognized and we should, therefore, admit her to her place amongst us.

## ANNEX XI

## STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE TWENTIETH MEETING ON 4 AUGUST 1947, CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF AUSTRIA

The United States believes that the absence of the treaty in spite of certain remaining impairments of Austria's freedom does not disqualify Austria from membership in the United Nations. The United States bases its views on these grounds:

1. The Actual Restoration and International Recognition of a Separate Austrian State.

The Allied Powers have recognized in several international acts that Austria was a victim of Nazi aggression and in the Moscow Declaration regarded the administration imposed on Austria by Germany as null and void. This nullification has subsequently been accepted in fact by the establishment of a recognized Austrian Government and by appropriate measures for the severance of Austria from Germany.

2. The Provisions of the New Control Agreement on 28 June 1946.

The New Control Agreement expressly provides that Austria may establish diplomatic relations with Government of United Nations, enter into international agreements and exercise other attributes of statehood. In our view, therefore, international recognition has already been given without the conclusion of a treaty to the existence of Austria as a state capable of maintaining normal relations with other states in the international community as evidenced by the exchange of accredited diplomatic representatives between Austria and a number of countries since the signing of the New Control Agreement.

3. The Character of the Projected Treaty.

It should be realized that the treaty in process of negotiation is not a peace treaty essential to the restoration of good relations between former belligerents. The treaty, according to presently agreed provisions, will be signed only by the Four Occupying Powers and Austria. It is of dual character providing not only for engagements by Austria but also for certain commitments between the Four Powers themselves. It is at one and the same time a treaty with Austria and a Four-Power Agreement. In view of this we cannot say that the treaty is in any way necessary to the establishment of normal relations between Austria and members of the United Nations other than the Four Occupying Powers or necessary to Austria's ability to participate generally as an active member of international organizations.

4. Undue Delay

4. Undue Delay in the Conclusion of a Treaty.

The essential task of the occupation have been completed. The need of occupation no longer exists. As a consequence, the United States has earnestly endeavoured to bring about completion of a treaty before this date, but has met an uncompromising attitude on some issues. It would be a manifest injustice to penalize Austria for this protracted delay caused by disagreements among the Four-Powers, concerning, among other things, some highly technical problems. The absence of an Austrian treaty caused by this inability to agree to certain articles and the continued unjustified occupation does not justify, in our opinion, the postponement of the admission of a state that otherwise has the essential attributes and institutions of statehood.

Under these circumstances we strongly opposed and are continuing to oppose any conclusion that the failure to complete a treaty should lead us to postpone consideration of Austria's application until next year or later. I strongly urge this Committee to recommend to the Security Council, of admission to the United Nations of Austria now.

## ANNEX XII

## STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE TWENTIETH MEETING ON 4 AUGUST 1947, CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF ROUMANIA

My Government has doubts as to the ability and willingness of the present Roumanian regime to carry out international obligations.

These doubts arise because of the flagrant violations of human rights, the suppression of human rights, which have taken place in Roumania in clear disregard of international agreements applying to Roumania. There is a specific provision in the peace treaty regarding human rights. This portion of the treaty is being violated in advance. It is a serious matter which my Government has publicly deplored in statements and notes to the Roumanian regime.

In addition Roumania gave a specific assurance on this matter of human rights to the Tripartite Commission sent to Bucharest in January 1946 by the Moscow (1945) Conference of Foreign Ministers.

I submit that these suppressions of human rights constituting as they do violations of international undertakings and assurances, to put it mildly, do not breed confidence as to the ability and willingness of Roumania to carry out international obligations including the obligations of the Charter of the United Nations.

My Government, therefore, expresses its doubt as to the eligibility of Roumania for United Nations membership.

ANNEX XIII

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES  
AT THE TWENTY-SECOND MEETING ON 8 AUGUST 1947,  
CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF BULGARIA

The United States has serious doubts with respect to the qualifications of Bulgaria for membership in the United Nations.

We have doubts with respect to the ability and willingness of the present Bulgarian regime to carry out international obligations, including the obligations of the Charter of the United Nations. These doubts arise in the first instance because of the very serious suppression of human rights and freedoms which have taken place in Bulgaria in clear violation in advance of the specific section of the Bulgarian Peace Treaty referring to human rights. The position of my Government on this point is well known, having been stated publicly and having been brought to the attention of Bulgarian authorities on more than one occasion.

The second doubt with respect to ability and willingness of Bulgaria to carry out international obligations is caused by the record of non-co-operation on the part of Bulgaria with the Subsidiary Group on the Northern Greek Border, and this doubt, of course, relates specifically to the Charter of the United Nations itself.

We also have doubts pertaining to the peace-loving character of the Bulgarian regime. This is based on the fact that the majority of the Balkan Investigation Commission found that Bulgaria had rendered assistance to the guerillas operating in Northern Greece. Furthermore, this doubt is reinforced by the fact that nine members of the Security Council itself voted in favour of a resolution which, in effect, endorsed that portion of the Commission's report.

In summary and conclusion, I repeat that my Government has serious doubts for the reasons I have outlined as to the eligibility of Bulgaria at this time for admission to the United Nations.

## ANNEX XIV

## STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF AUSTRALIA AT THE TWENTY-SECOND MEETING ON 8 AUGUST 1947, CONCERNING THE APPLICATIONS OF HUNGARY, ITALY, AUSTRIA, ROUMANIA, AND BULGARIA

The Committee will recall that during discussion of the Italian application, the Australian representative drew attention to the fact that Article 90 of the Italian Peace Treaty imposed a definite obligation on the Allied and Associated Powers to ratify the Treaty and required that the instruments of ratification should, in the shortest time possible, be deposited with the Government of the French Republic.

The Australian Government considers it clearly unjust that the peace treaties should be prevented from entering into force by the unilateral failure of one power to ratify the treaties, or by delay in the negotiation of a treaty especially where such a delay is not attributable to the country concerned. We have, therefore, come to the conclusion that we should withdraw our objection to the immediate consideration of the applications of Italy, Austria, Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria. This does not in any way affect the view that we have held that because the state of war with these countries is not formally at an end they remain technically ineligible for membership. I must say however, that at the time when we first opposed the consideration of these applications we had naturally assumed that the treaties would be ratified in ample time for the applications for membership to be considered before the next session of the Assembly. This may still be possible but in view of the extreme uncertainty, and the fact that if action is not taken within the next few weeks, admission would have to be postponed until the regular session of the General Assembly in September 1948, we have been obliged to reconsider our previous attitude. We feel that the correct course, in existing circumstances, is for each application to be considered on its merits and that where an ex-enemy country complies with the conditions laid down in Chapter 2 of the Charter, that a provisional or conditional recommendation should be made to the General Assembly for the acceptance of its application. The Assembly might in a similar way, if the treaties are not by then ratified, make a decision for the provisional or conditional admission of the country concerned, which would be automatically operative after ratification of the treaty. We do not propose at this stage to suggest the re-opening of the debate on individual countries, but wish to make this statement now to reserve our right to make proposals along these lines in the full Council.

/ANNEX XV

ANNEX XV

STATEMENT BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST  
REPUBLICS AT THE TWENTY-SECOND MEETING ON 8 AUGUST CONCERNING THE  
APPLICATIONS OF HUNGARY, ITALY, AUSTRIA, ROUMANIA AND BULGARIA

The procedure approved by the Committee for considering applications to join the United Nations from countries with which peace treaties have not yet come into force (as well as from Austria with whom no treaty has yet been drawn up), the character and tone of the speeches made during the discussion of the individual applications, as well as the United States representative's demand to include in the Committee's report his speeches with their direct and completely baseless attacks on the Governments and régimes at present in power in Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria, oblige me to make a more detailed objection against such procedure in the Committee's work and against the way certain representatives have behaved in discussing this question.

In spite of the incontrovertible legal and documentary evidence supplied of the correctness of the proposal of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to postpone consideration of the above-mentioned countries' applications until the treaties came into force, our proposal was rejected by a wall of unjustifiable votes. Furthermore, ignoring the treaty provisions and the declaration of the Potsdam Conference on this subject, and adopting the procedure of individual discussion of each of these applications, certain representatives quite unjustifiably split up these countries into two categories - a group of peace-loving countries capable of complying with the United Nations Charter, in which Italy and Austria were included, and a group of non-peace-loving countries, incapable of complying with the United Nations Charter, in which Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria were included. Moreover, the United States representative, by asking that a selection of his tendentious accusations against the second group of countries should be annexed to the report, apparently means to brand these three countries with this incriminatory label and consolidate these vociferous accusations for the future.

/Leaving

Leaving aside the question of substance underlying the consideration of these countries' applications, which the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers it premature to discuss, I must emphatically condemn such behaviour on the part of the representatives of certain countries, as at the very least unfair and not in conformity with the interests of the United Nations.

In making these serious accusations against the Governments of Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria, the representatives of the United States and United Kingdom apparently forget, or rather do not wish to remember, that the American and British Governments have already made the same allegations to these three Governments and been given a proper answer which rejects the accusations as entirely unjustified and tendentious. The replies of the Hungarian, Roumanian and Bulgarian Governments contained indisputable official documentary facts and, in certain cases, revealing evidence implicating the representatives of those circles for which the Governments of the United States and Great Britain feel so much concern and anxiety. The documentary data and evidences show that the persons whom the United States and British Governments so warmly defend, were agents of certain Powers; it was they who worked clandestinely and openly to overthrow the existing democratic régimes in Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria.

I will not repeat those patent facts which explain the true reasons for the attacks on the present régimes in Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria. I deem it necessary only to give a few documentary facts of recent times.

On 31 July, only a week ago, the Hungarian newspapers published a declaration made by the electoral union of the parties of the Hungarian National Independence Front, comprising four political parties. This declaration states: "A split was created in the union of coalition parties, forming the Hungarian National Independence Front, by reactionaries and conspirators who had infiltrated into the democratic ranks and were trying to restore the old order. Their subversive activities threatened the gains made by democracy, and paralyzed the work of the National Assembly and the Government. The activity of the conspirators and of the former leaders of the Smallholders' Party who have now fled the country, led to a series of crises in that Party and in the Coalition. We are ready to draw all the inferences from the conspiracy and will not allow the enemies of the people to drive another wedge between the democratic parties, which represent the overwhelming majority of the urban and rural workers."

/As you see,

As you see, the four democratic parties declare that they represent the overwhelming majority of the urban and rural workers and thus categorically deny the fables about the so-called "Communist coup d'etat".

Not the least interesting part of the declaration is the closing passage stating that the development of Hungarian democracy is based on the co-operation and close union of peasants, workers and progressive intellectuals. For this reason the parties have declared that, in the spirit of this union and of democratic national unity, they will maintain the Government Coalition after the elections and jointly assume responsibility for the government of the country in the interests of its peaceful development and of augmenting the Hungarian people's well-being and defence. According to the Hungarian Press the following nine parties have announced their desire to take part in the Hungarian parliamentary elections: Social Democratic, Hungarian Independent Democratic, Smallholders', Communist, National Peasant, Radical, Democratic Citizens', People's Democratic and the Hungarian Independence Party.

This documentary information leaves no doubt as to the tendentiousness of the charge of the representative of the United States that the adoption of the new Hungarian "electoral law deprives the various non-Communist elements at the forthcoming election of their civil rights". From this document also it is clear that the number of parties participating in the forthcoming elections is greater than the number of parties which participate in elections, for example, in the United States, Brazil, or Great Britain, whose representatives here have tried to condemn the Hungarian Government. As you will see, the condemnation of the criminal activity of Hungary's former reactionary statesmen came not from the Communist party only, but also from three other parties to which the reactionary statesmen, so warmly defended by certain Great Powers, previously belonged. The talk about a Communist coup d'etat in Hungary, therefore, emanates from circles whose true motives are not the defence of the democratic and human rights of peoples, but something else. Some people, apparently, cannot reconcile themselves to the fact that Hungary has no desire to become the pawn of twentieth-century foreign imperialism.

/I will say

I will say a few words about the accusations made here against the present Government and existing régime in Roumania. On 30 July, i.e. about a week ago, the Presidium of the Roumanian Council of Ministers issued a communiqué in which the following reference is made to the recent attempted escape of several criminal members of the Opposition:

"A group of conspirators tried to give effect abroad to a decision and to directives issued by the leaders of the National-Tsaranist Party under Julius Maniu. These directives included organizing operations designed to detract from national sovereignty, to create a threat to peace and to launch a civil war. This anti-national activity is in line with the whole policy which the National-Tsaranist Party has pursued with great energy since 23 August 1944, when, having gathered all the reactionary forces of the country around itself and in agreement with certain reactionary circles abroad, the National-Tsaranist Party worked to prevent Roumania taking an enthusiastic and effective part in the anti-Hitlerite war, to prevent the denazification of the administration, the punishment of Fascist criminals and the establishment of a democratic régime."

This communiqué gives a real idea of the "victims" of the Roumanian régime who are being defended by some big Powers. These Powers do not want to take account of the fact that the Roumanian people have no desire to return to the time when powerful foreign capital was the real master in Roumania. Is this not the reason why certain circles in some big countries are anxious and disturbed, constantly making a fuss, protesting, and defending certain opposition parties, whose leaders were closely connected with foreign firms and banks?

I would also refer to the attacks which have been made in this Committee against the Bulgarian Government and against the genuinely democratic régime now existing in Bulgaria. In the second half of June of this year, the Prime Minister of Bulgaria, Georgii Dimitrov, replied to charges made by some Great Powers against the People's Republic of Bulgaria. The Bulgarian Prime Minister stated that the Bulgarian Government was steadily fulfilling in due time the obligations placed upon it by the Peace Treaty and international agreements. The Head of the Bulgarian Government also added that where the liberty and the rights of every man are at issue, nobody understood nor can understand this to mean now that liberty and rights should be guaranteed to persons who are clearing the way for the return of Fascism, preaching disobedience to the laws of the People's Republic, and especially of those persons who are preparing and organizing a coup d' état.

/The Head

The Head of the Bulgarian Government appealed to those making charges against Bulgaria to wait until the Bulgarian Courts try the cases of those who are imagined by some foreign powers to be victims of the present Bulgarian regime.

The statement by the Bulgarian Prime Minister and those indisputable documentary data which are at the disposal of the Bulgarian Government and which will be submitted in evidence at the trial of those who have endeavoured to overthrow the democratic regime in Bulgaria and who are being so persistently defended by some Great Power circles, leave no doubts of the fact that those circles desire to see in Bulgaria the same reactionary terrorist and anti-democratic regime as exists in Greece. As for the charges against Bulgaria regarding the role ascribed to her in supporting one of the parties in the Civil War in Greece, I would recommend the representatives of this Committee, once again to read and study the facts and documents submitted by the representatives of the three Balkan countries and by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the Security Council. These facts give nobody any right or justification for accusing Bulgaria of fomenting civil war in Greece. The tendentiousness of these charges is obvious to everybody. You also know that in the Security Council, even the authors of the resolutions supporting the Greek reactionary regime, were obliged to exclude therefrom charges against the Northern neighbours of Greece.

Inccontestable documents state that the Roumanian, Hungarian and Bulgarian reactionaries with the support of certain foreign powers would like to bring Roumania, Hungary and Bulgaria to the same pass as Greece, and they have aimed at liquidating the democratic conquests of the people and the prevention of progressive reforms for the creation of real democratic forms of government and life in those countries.

Permit me to ask the representative of the United States of America on what basis he hurls charges against the present regimes in Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria for "open violation and suppression of human rights" in these countries, when the present regime in the United States of America may be the object of incomparably more serious charges by the Governments of the three countries referred to, or by any other country. Permit me to ask the representative of the United States of America what answer he would give and how his Government would react, if the Hungarian, Roumanian and Bulgarian Governments or any other Government were to send protest notes regarding the dismissal from their official

positions in United States Government departments of American citizens suspected of a so-called disloyal attitude towards the American Government? How would the American Government respond, if the Governments of Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria or any other Government were to send notes of protest against minimizing the rights of tens of millions of workers and employees in the United States of America, and depriving them of a whole series of important rights by the passage in Congress of anti-labour laws, and also protest notes against, for example, the recent trial of the leader of a political opposition party in the United States of America? If that constitutes an internal affair of the present government regime of the United States of America, why have the United States Government and its representative the right to interfere in the internal affairs of those countries which he liberally showers with accusations and protest notes? Permit me to ask the representative of Brazil on what grounds he follows in the footsteps of the representative of the United States in supporting the latter charge regarding Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria? Permit me to ask the representative of Brazil what the Brazilian Government would reply, and how it would react, if the Governments of Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria, or any other Government, were to make charges against and send protest notes to the Brazilian Government regarding, for example, the outlawing of one of the largest political parties in Brazil? If such charges and notes were to be characterized as interference in the internal affairs of Brazil, on what grounds does the representative of Brazil support the charges made by the United States Government against Roumania, Hungary and Bulgaria which represent a direct interference in the internal affairs of those countries?

It must be perfectly clear to every person whose conceptions of democracy extend beyond the bounds of faithful service to the interests of monopolistic big capital, what purpose is really being pursued by the protests and charges against the Governments of Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria, and why certain people are not pleased with those Governments. It must be comprehensible to every person whose conception of human rights and liberties extends beyond the ideals of owning a cottage with a bath-tub, a refrigerator and a motor car, what are, in fact, the aims and aspirations of those who accuse the Governments of Roumania, Hungary and Bulgaria of suppressing human rights and liberties in these countries. Irrespective of whether or not some circles in certain Great Power countries choose to regard the peoples of the Balkan countries and Hungary as being really democratic and independent, those countries and peoples have already started and are proceeding on a new genuinely democratic path of progress /and nobody

and nobody has any right to interfere in their internal affairs. The repeated charges made here against Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria should be considered only in that light.

I do not wish to enter into the substance of the examination of the applications of Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria for admission into the organization, which I would repeat once again that the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers premature, but I thought it necessary to make this statement and also think it fitting to emphasize that the charges made here against Hungary, Roumania and Bulgaria as arguments for refusing the application of those countries for admission to membership of the United Nations organization, cannot serve in the future as arguments against such admissions.

The Committee on the Admission of New Members has no factual basis for labelling the Governments of these countries with such charges. If the Committee supports the request of Mr. Raynor to have the incriminatory statements of the American and other representatives added to the Committee's report, I shall insist that all statements by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are also to be annexed to the Committee's report.

-----