



Monday, 5 December 1955,
at 3 p.m.

New York

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 21:

Admission of new Members to the United Nations:
reports of the Security Council and of the Com-
mittee of Good Offices (*continued*).... 123

Chairman: Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand).

AGENDA ITEM 21

**Admission of new Members to the United Nations:
reports of the Security Council and of the
Committee of Good Offices (A/2973, A/AC.80/
L.3/Rev.1) (*continued*)**

1. Mr. PALAMAS (Greece) said that a solution of the question of the admission of new Members appeared to be in sight. Although there might still be last-minute difficulties and disappointments, there were nevertheless high hopes of that thorny question being settled, because the ground had finally been prepared largely as the result of the unremitting and persevering efforts of the Committee of Good Offices.

2. The solution in view was a political solution involving the wholesale admission of all applicants without distinction. After vain attempts to find a legal or administrative solution, or a solution based on interpretation or procedure, it had perforce been recognized that the only way to settle the problem was to accept a compromise. At first sight, it seemed reasonable to make mutual concessions. The good sheep could not be kept outside the fold indefinitely for fear that a few black sheep might slip inside. The door to the fold was therefore being opened and all were to be admitted indiscriminately.

3. That method, while not ideal, at least had the merit of providing a solution. It took all kinds to make a world, and it was natural that the United Nations should be fashioned in the image of the world. Increasing support thus seemed to be gathering for the principle of universality.

4. He had no wish to contest the value of political procedures. Those must be judged not by their propriety, but by their effectiveness. It must, however, be recognized that there were in all things certain limits which could not be overstepped with impunity. That was why he had listened with relief to the statement made by the representative of Canada (25th meeting).

5. In that statement, Mr. Martin had tried to give not only political, but also legal and even moral justification for the "package deal". He had realized that the United Nations must at all costs avoid creating the impression that it was sacrificing principles or rules of law. He had accordingly advanced the theory that, far from being contrary to the principles of the Charter, the "package" admission of all applicants was even in accord

with a more realistic interpretation of that document. According to him, the principle of universality imposed on all Member States the obligation to admit all applicants to the United Nations without distinction.

6. With regard to the application of Article 4 of the Charter, Mr. Martin had said that a liberal interpretation must be placed on the stipulation that membership in the United Nations was open only to peace-loving States. Since war was becoming increasingly unthinkable, all States should henceforth be recognized as being peace-loving. It was, furthermore, impossible to know the intentions of every State. Mr. Martin had concluded by saying that the admission of all States *en bloc* would not be a "package deal" but a practical solution in conformity with the principles of the Charter.

7. That formula, as a compromise solution, was good, but a compromise should not mean a total renunciation of the rules of law or of principles. It should not, moreover, be forgotten that for each Member State the Charter was not merely an instrument of security and international co-operation but also a domestic law for whose application that State was answerable to its own parliament and people. A Government was not, therefore, free to accept interpretations of the Charter for the sole purpose of facilitating the solution of international problems without weighing the repercussions of such action within its own country.

8. Reference to the provisions of Article 4 made it clear that the Charter did not merely specify the qualifications which States must have in order to secure admission, but also left it to the United Nations to decide whether those qualifications were met. Every Member State thus had the right and duty to form a judgement on each application in the light of the conditions prescribed by the Charter.

9. While some delegations might be in a position to make a global assessment of all the candidates, others—and the Greek delegation was among them—were unwilling to renounce their right to consider each application individually.

10. The Soviet Union representative had stressed (25th meeting) the need to avoid all discrimination based on the political or social structure of applicant States. In Mr. Palamas' opinion, the Assembly, in judging applications, should be guided solely by considerations relating to the ability of States to fulfil their international obligations.

11. After the Second World War, Greece had signed peace treaties with Italy and the western democracies, and also with some of the peoples' democracies. Italy had fulfilled all the obligations it had assumed under those treaties, but that was unfortunately not true of the peoples' democracies. The Greek people therefore had the right to pass judgement on the conduct of those régimes and in particular, on the manner in which they honoured their international undertakings and their obligations in regard to observance of human rights. He

ventured, however, to believe that an honest compromise was feasible between a desire for the earliest possible settlement of the question of the admission of new Members and respect for the obligations arising out of the Charter.

12. In present circumstances, it was unlikely that all the applicants could receive the unanimous support of the Assembly. What was needed was that each of the eighteen candidates should obtain the majority required by the Charter, that is, a two-thirds majority. That was quite possible, and mutual concessions were conceivable with that end in view. That also meant that each delegation would be free to express its views and would not be subject to the intolerable pressure of having to accept all or nothing.

13. Turning to the twenty-eight Power draft resolution (A/AC.80/L.3/Rev.1), he said that at first sight he had wondered whether that proposal would really promote a solution of the problem.

14. If its sponsors' intention was to express yet again the Assembly's desire that the Security Council should take the necessary decisions, the proposal would be of limited value only. The Security Council was in fact already seized of the question, the Committee of Good Offices had taken every possible advantage of the trend of political developments, and world public opinion was exerting pressure for admission. If, on the other hand, it was a question of members of the Council desiring a guarantee that the candidates they favoured would secure the required two-thirds majority in the Assembly, the draft resolution provided no such guarantee. In order to meet their point, a preliminary vote in the Committee itself should perhaps be taken on each application and the result communicated to the Security Council. That could, for example, be done by putting the Soviet Union amendment (A/AC.80/L.5) to the vote. In that event, the Greek delegation would request a separate vote on each of the applicants listed in that amendment.

15. He was also very much afraid that paragraph 2 of the operative part of the draft resolution would give rise to ambiguities that might jeopardize the possibility of agreement in the Security Council. If a delegation voting for that paragraph had to assume a categorical obligation to vote for all eighteen applicants in the General Assembly, it would be better to say so in unmistakable terms; if, on the other hand, a delegation voting for the paragraph was to be free to vote in the Assembly as it saw fit, it was doubtful whether that arrangement could help the Security Council or provide any guarantee for those of its members who sought one.

16. All ambiguity on that point must be removed for, although some delegations seemed to accept and even to prefer a global vote on all eighteen applicants, others regarded such a vote as unacceptable. It was therefore necessary to be realistic and see what was possible and not merely what was desirable.

17. Several amendments had been submitted. While the Soviet Union amendment provided the Committee with a possible solution, the Cuban amendments (A/AC.80/L.7 and A/AC.80/L.8) were likely to put a number of delegations in an extremely difficult position, because it was hard to see how they could vote against applying Article 4 as proposed in the Cuban amendment.

18. Before concluding, he said that the Greek delegation regarded the present debate as preliminary and

that it reserved the right to state its views on each application during the discussion of the item in the General Assembly, should the Assembly have before it a report by the Security Council proposing the admission of all or some of the applicants.

19. If the Soviet Union amendment was adopted, the Greek delegation would give a preliminary indication of its views in voting on each individual application. It would then have occasion to explain its vote. If the Soviet Union amendment was rejected, the Greek delegation would be compelled to abstain in the vote on operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution proposed by the twenty-eight Powers.

20. Mr. SAPOZHNIKOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) agreed with those members of the Committee who had said that any further postponement of the admission of new Members might well be prejudicial to the United Nations as a whole.

21. Like most other delegations, the Ukrainian delegation considered that the absence of a large number of States which would be able to make a valuable contribution to the work of peace was weakening the United Nations and its influence throughout the world. The admission to the United Nations of all States which satisfied the conditions laid down in the Charter would help to increase the Organization's authority and reduce tension in the world, as the Secretary-General himself had pointed out in his last annual report on the work of the Organization (A/2911).

22. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic had always spoken in favour of the admission of all States satisfying the conditions laid down by the Charter, whatever their political régime or their economic or social structure. His country considered that, far from being an ideological bloc, the United Nations was a universal body designed to strengthen international peace, and that in accordance with the Organization's own Charter, all peace-loving States must belong to it.

23. The events that had occurred during the present session justified the hope that the deadlock which had hitherto prevented the admission of a number of States to the United Nations could finally be broken. The support which the vast majority of the members of the Committee had stated they were ready to give to the proposal for the admission of the eighteen applicant States showed that all those countries were eager for a quick settlement of the question. The Ukrainian delegation, which shared that point of view completely, would therefore also support the draft resolution sponsored by the twenty-eight Powers.

24. Although the situation had considerably improved, it must not be forgotten that there were still many obstacles to overcome. There were still countries which were not at all anxious that the question of the admission of new Members should be settled by a concerted decision. They preferred to exploit the present situation in order to sow hatred among nations and thus poison the international atmosphere.

25. In that connexion he cited the statement made by the representative of Cuba at the 27th meeting, who had marshalled all possible and imaginable arguments in support of his contention and had indulged in acrimonious attacks on certain applicant countries and made charges against them which had been refuted long ago. The representative of Cuba, who was no doubt a supporter of the cold war, had attempted thus to sabotage the admission of countries whose internal

régimes he did not like, and, in that connexion, had referred to a statement by Mr. Ernest A. Gross, a former United States representative to the United Nations, to show that some years before, Mr. Gross had been opposed to the admission of Albania, Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria and the Mongolian People's Republic. He had, however, omitted to mention a letter from the same Mr. Gross published in *The New York Times* of 8 November 1955. In that letter Mr. Gross had said that it was time the United States changed its attitude towards the admission of new Members. By making a statement of that kind, Mr. Gross had displayed much good sense, and the representative of Cuba would do well to follow his example.

26. The representative of Formosa had also made a statement on the subject of the admission of new Members, but his speech did not even deserve a reply, for he was only obeying the orders of those who were seeking to prevent the adoption of the twenty eight Power draft resolution.

27. The Ukrainian delegation, which was in favour of the admission of the eighteen applicant States, gave particular support to the applications of the peoples' democracies, for those countries applied a policy of international peace and co-operation and sought to extend their economic, commercial and cultural relations with all countries wishing to do the same. In conformity with the Charter, they were attempting to reduce international tension, and they wished to co-operate with the United Nations in that work. They also stated that they were ready and willing to fulfil the obligations embodied in the Charter. It must not, moreover, be forgotten that some of those countries were members of specialized agencies and had already proved that they satisfied the conditions laid down in the Charter. Obviously, therefore, they were entitled to be admitted to the United Nations.

28. With regard to the Mongolian People's Republic, to which a number of delegations had referred specifically, it should be recalled that that country had been independent for some thirty years and that it maintained diplomatic relations with a number of other States. In particular, its independence had been recognized by China in 1946 after the plebiscite which had been held in October 1945. Nor must it be forgotten that the United States of America had as early as 1946 recognized that the Mongolian People's Republic satisfied the conditions for admission laid down in the Charter, since it had proposed that country's admission, together with Afghanistan, Albania, Ireland, Iceland, Portugal, Sweden and Jordan.

29. Mr. Belaúnde, Chairman of the Committee of Good Offices, had also affirmed (25th meeting) that the Mongolian People's Republic, Albania and the other above-mentioned countries undeniably constituted States and that their admission to the United Nations would help to bring them within the great family of nations.

30. Those who opposed the admission of the eighteen States to the United Nations were merely continuing to apply their traditional policy of discrimination so as to keep out of the United Nations countries whose political and social systems they did not like. The attitude they had adopted was preventing the General Assembly from settling the matter satisfactorily. On the other hand, the twenty-eight Power draft resolution (A/AC.80/L.3/Rev.1), which most Members of the United Nations seemed to support, would enable the problem to be settled and the United Nations to become

more representative than ever. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR would therefore support the revised draft resolution.

31. Sir Percy SPENDER (Australia) said that the question under examination had been a complicated and difficult one from the beginning and that all the members of the Committee should therefore welcome the twenty-eight Power draft resolution, which would at last make a solution possible.

32. The Australian delegation had always advocated the admission to the United Nations of all applicant countries satisfying the conditions laid down in Article 4 of the Charter.

33. Normally, such admission should not have caused any difficulties. International conditions had, however, developed in a way which could not have been foreseen by those who drafted the Charter. In consequence, the question of the admission of new Members had become so intractable that a complete deadlock had been reached. The fact that large areas of the world were now kept outside the United Nations involved great disadvantages not only for the countries concerned but also for the Organization itself, which could be effective only if it was fully representative.

34. Numerous attempts to solve the problem had been made in the last seven years. All the legal and constitutional solutions, however, had failed to gain acceptance, just as had all the procedural solutions. It had at last become clear that the problem was not legal, but mainly political, and that it was therefore a problem which must be settled by the acceptance of a political compromise.

35. There had been for some time an increasing tendency to admit as many countries to the United Nations as possible. It seemed therefore that the difficult problem in question was now on the point of being solved. In that connexion he would like to pay a tribute to Mr. Belaúnde, Chairman of the Committee of Good Offices, and to Mr. Martin, the representative of Canada, for the efforts they had made to facilitate a solution.

36. He would like to emphasize, however, that the real problem before the Assembly was whether to reject or accept the applications of the eighteen countries *en bloc*, irrespective of the terms of the Charter. The decision had to be based, not on principle, but on the political necessities of the moment. The fact was that it was expedient, in the interests of the United Nations and world peace, to admit all the applicant countries, irrespective of any reservations that might be entertained with regard to some of them. It was in that spirit that Australia had been the first to join in sponsoring the twenty-eight Power draft resolution.

37. He asked how such a situation had developed. For years, the provisions of the Charter had been ignored and a single country had persisted in vetoing the admission of new Members, not because the nations concerned had not satisfied the conditions laid down in the Charter, but because that one country wished by that means to secure the admission to the United Nations of its own candidates. That was the price it had demanded for the admission of certain countries.

38. Australia had never favoured the idea of a "package deal", and had always been of the opinion that each application must be considered on its merits. It had, however, become increasingly apparent that refusal to accept those applicants whose fidelity to the prin-

ciples of the United Nations seemed doubtful would prevent the admission of other countries, which nevertheless deserved to be Members of the United Nations. Among those countries were very old nations as well as nations which had obtained their independence only recently but wished to base their international relations on their participation in the work of the United Nations. Among the last-named nations, he mentioned particularly Ceylon, Laos and Cambodia. All those nations were in a position to make a valuable contribution to the work of the United Nations. To facilitate their admission it was therefore necessary to admit other countries whose applications called for some reservations.

39. That was the price which must now be paid, but Australia would like to take the opportunity of saying that it did not accept the price willingly, for in its opinion the acceptance of a "package deal" was tantamount to doing away with Article 4 of the Charter.

40. The Australian delegation had always been of the opinion that the admission of a new Member could not be subject to veto. The fact was that under Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter, the veto could be applied only to decisions of the Security Council on matters of substance. According to Article 4, however, it was not the Security Council but the General Assembly which was to decide on the admission of a new Member, while the Council could only make recommendations on the subject. If that had not been the position, the authors of the Charter would have expressed themselves differently.

41. If the Security Council was of the opinion that a recommendation was a decision, the answer must be that the Council was not the interpreter of the Charter and if it was affirmed that the International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion of 3 March 1950¹ had likewise not made that distinction, then, reference must be made to the opinion given by the same Court on 28 May 1948,² an opinion from which it clearly followed that all "package deal" admissions were contrary to the Charter.

42. The Chinese representative had drawn attention (26th meeting) to the advisory opinion of the International Court of 1948 to show that the members of the Security Council or of the General Assembly were not entitled to make their vote for or against a given applicant State dependent on any conditions other than those set forth in Article 4, paragraph 1, and hence would not make such vote dependent on the simultaneous admission of other applicant States. He himself admitted that the twenty-eight Power draft resolution was completely at variance with that advisory opinion. He wished to stress, however, that an advisory opinion had no binding force if it did not correspond to the wish of the majority of the Member States of the United Nations. If the majority of those States did not accept a given advisory opinion, the will of the majority must prevail. If the controversial problem at issue was to be solved, political considerations must override legal principles.

43. However, the Security Council would have been consistent with the advisory opinion of 1948 if it had decided on each request for admission separately, by a majority of any seven of its members. According to

the advisory opinion of 1948, the General Assembly needed only a recommendation of the Council, irrespective of whether or not a permanent member of the Security Council had voted with the majority.

44. At first sight, that interpretation might seem to be inconsistent with the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of March 1950, according to which the General Assembly could not decide to admit a State if the Security Council had not made a recommendation to that effect because the applicant State concerned had not obtained the necessary majority or because a permanent member of the Council had voted against such a recommendation. Nevertheless, a perusal of the reasons for the advisory opinion showed that the Court had not considered the question whether the negative vote of a permanent member could invalidate a recommendation which had obtained seven or more votes in the Council.

45. The purpose of his statement was to explain his view that the veto could not apply to the admission of new Members. He considered that the General Assembly had always been entitled to admit States to the United Nations on the basis of recommendations adopted in the Council by a majority of seven votes. If the Assembly had exercised that right, it would undoubtedly have met with the opposition of one of the permanent members of the Council, and a political crisis would have ensued. Nevertheless, the Australian delegation had always believed that the opposition of a single Member State of the United Nations should not be allowed to paralyse the efforts of the overwhelming majority of the Member States. It maintained that view now that another permanent member of the Council was threatening to use its veto to prevent the adoption of the draft resolution under consideration.

46. He had stated his views on the matter in order to reaffirm the supreme authority of the General Assembly and also to salvage for the future what remained of Article 4. He fully realized, however, that in the present situation everything possible should be done to secure the adoption of the draft resolution and accordingly to admit the eighteen States concerned. The United Nations was now in a position where none of its permanent members wished to waive the right of veto. The choice therefore lay between admitting all the eighteen States or excluding them all indefinitely. Although the problem had legal aspects, it was almost wholly political and could be solved only on the political level.

47. It might be asked whether the price of the admission of the States which really deserved membership was not too high. He considered that the advantages of the proposed solution outweighed the disadvantages. By ceasing to oppose wholesale admission, some countries, including Australia, might give the impression that they were reversing their former position. That was an undeniable disadvantage. There were, however, situations in which such votes were not only necessary, but inevitable. Acceptance of wholesale admission entailed acceptance of the admission to the United Nations of countries which would swell the chorus of Soviet propaganda, and that might imply approval of régimes whose international behaviour left much to desire. That was another disadvantage. Australia accepted those disadvantages unwillingly and because there was no other way out, but also because it hoped that they would be outweighed by positive gains.

48. The adoption of the twenty-eight Power draft resolution would serve to inject new blood into the

¹ See *Competence of Assembly regarding admission to the United Nations, Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1950*, p. 4.

² See *Admission of a State to the United Nations (Charter, Art. 4), Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1948*, p. 57.

United Nations; it would open the doors of the Organization to more Asian and European countries; it would help new States to find their place in the modern world; it would lead to the admission of Italy and Japan, two great Powers which should no longer be kept outside the Organization; it would allow for the admission of Ceylon, which was of special concern to the British Commonwealth; and it would lead to a decisive step towards the implementation of the principle of universality and towards the ultimate admission of a unified Germany, Korea and Viet-Nam. The representation of Communist countries in the United Nations would be increased, but the Organization would, on the other hand, benefit by the collaboration of countries representing Asian and European civilizations.

49. In reply to a remark by the USSR representative, who had recalled the undertaking of the Allied and Associated Powers to support the requests of Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Italy and Finland for admission to the United Nations, he pointed out that that statement was based on an incorrect interpretation of the Potsdam Agreement and the treaties of peace. The support promised to those five countries by the former Allied and Associated Powers was subject to the fulfilment of the conditions laid down in Article 4 of the Charter. The Australian delegation had considered in the past that Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary had not fulfilled those conditions and that the treaties of peace imposed no obligation on the Powers to admit those countries to the United Nations. Nevertheless, there were certain overriding reasons for paying the price of the admission of those States. In changing its former position, Australia had acted deliberately and for the sake of broader objectives, the results of which would justify the reversal. It was therefore prepared to give favourable consideration to any recommendation that the Security Council might make in favour of any or all of the eighteen States. However, the consultations it had held with other delegations had given it the impression that the Assembly's decision would be facilitated if the Security Council's recommendation was collective and the Council did not submit individual recommendations to the Assembly.

50. In conclusion, he addressed an urgent appeal to the Chinese representative not to exercise his country's vote in the Security Council in such a way as to obstruct the will of the great majority of Member States.

51. Mr. SHUKAIRY (Syria) recalled that all aspects of the question of the admission of new Members had been considered, but that no solution had yet been found.

52. It now seemed, however, that the problem might be solved at the tenth session, thanks to the efforts of the Committee of Good Offices and the Canadian delegation, to which he paid a well-deserved tribute.

53. In presenting the twenty-eight Power draft resolution, the Canadian representative had dealt with all the aspects of the problem and little could be added to his penetrating and comprehensive analysis. He himself would therefore merely explain his delegation's position.

54. The Syrian delegation supported and defended the principle of the universality of the United Nations with all the conviction at its command. Universality was the very essence of the Charter and the cornerstone of the whole structure of the Organization. The Member States of the United Nations were pledged to maintain international peace and security. How could they honour that pledge if the Organization was not really universal,

especially since peace was indivisible? In those circumstances how could they attain other purposes of the United Nations, such as developing friendly relations among nations, achieving international co-operation and being a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of those common ends?

55. Turning to the qualifications required for admission to the Organization, he observed that Article 4 was perfectly clear and was not open to the many interpretations which some representatives had tried to ascribe to it. Under that Article, membership in the United Nations was open to all peace-loving States which accepted the obligations of the Charter and were able and willing to carry out those obligations. Article 4 was therefore positive. It established a presumption of admissibility and not a presumption of unfitness. Moreover, the words "all other States", which meant States other than the original Members of the United Nations, were highly significant and could not be used to keep outside the United Nations States which fulfilled the required conditions, irrespective of their political, economic or social structure.

56. With regard to the correct concept of a peace-loving State, every State should be presumed to be peace-loving until the contrary was established, just as any accused person was deemed innocent until proved guilty. There was nothing to warrant the assumption that the eighteen States requesting admission were not peace-loving States. Many of them had made valuable contributions to civilization and were taking an active part in international life. All of them had a contribution to make to the progress of mankind and to the maintenance of international peace and security. It was hardly justifiable to cast doubts on their love of peace when certain Member States of the United Nations were now engaged in an unrestrained armaments race and when the great Powers had failed, after ten years of effort, to achieve disarmament and eliminate atomic weapons.

57. The meaning of the joint draft resolution was perfectly clear. The twenty-eight sponsors were in favour of the wholesale admission of the eighteen applicant States. Any selection between the applicants would result in maintaining the present deadlock, whereas the great majority of the Member States had made up their minds to break that deadlock.

58. The representative of China had raised a number of doubtless pertinent legal arguments against the principle of the admission of new members *en bloc*. But there was nothing in the Charter to preclude the General Assembly from requesting the Security Council to give favourable consideration to applications for admission from eighteen States and from making a recommendation to it in favour of the admission of those eighteen States.

59. The Chinese representative had also touched on the question of Korea. The joint draft resolution did not include countries about which a problem of unification arose, since the question of their admission to the United Nations raised controversial matters whose discussion could only be prejudicial to their unification.

60. The Netherlands representative had been concerned lest the Assembly should be intervening in a question essentially within the competence of the Security Council. Mr. Shukairy wished to allay the Netherlands representative's fears on that point. It was true that the Assembly could not issue directives to the

Security Council. But it should be borne in mind that the General Assembly and the Security Council were an integral part of the framework of the United Nations, and it was hard to conceive of the Security Council brushing aside the General Assembly's recommendations. The prestige of the United Nations called for harmony between the two principal organs of the Organization. If, however, the Security Council rejected the General Assembly's recommendation, the Assembly would have to take the necessary action to meet the situation.

61. In conclusion, he suggested that Member States were in no position to go too closely into the question whether applicants fulfilled all the requisite conditions for admission, when they themselves were not exempt from faults and defects. He expressed the fervent hope that the joint draft resolution would be adopted unanimously by the Committee and subsequently by the Security Council.

62. Mr. MIR KHAN (Pakistan) said that although under the United Nations Charter membership in the United Nations was open to all peace-loving States which accepted the obligations contained in the Charter and were able and willing to carry out those obligations, no State had been admitted to the Organization since 1950. Yet twenty-one States had submitted applications for admission. At its eighth session, the General Assembly, by resolution 718 (VIII), had formed a Committee of Good Offices to consult with the members of the Security Council in order to facilitate the admission of States in conformity with Article 4 of the Charter. In that connexion, he paid tribute to the Committee of Good Offices, and particularly to its Chairman, Mr. Belaúnde, who had spared no effort to achieve the desired end.

63. Under the provisions of the Charter relating to the admission of new Members, the Assembly could admit an applicant State only on the recommendation of the Security Council; and such a recommendation was not possible unless the five permanent members of the Council either voted in favour of it or abstained from voting. The fact was, however, that the authors of the Charter had intended the Organization to be universal and to comprise all peace-loving States able to assume the obligations contained in the Charter. While they had admitted the right of the five great Powers to decide in the last resort on all questions of primary importance to the Organization, they had certainly not wished to confine the membership of the Organization to the original signatories, or to make admission dependent in every case on unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council. The need to facilitate the admission of new Members was one of the reasons for arguing in favour of a review of the Charter. In any event, it would seem that circumstances had never been more favourable for increasing the membership of the Organization by admitting the countries fulfilling the required conditions — including the Asian and African countries — in accordance with the wish expressed by the twenty-nine countries from those regions which had attended the Bandung Conference.

64. Many of the applicant States would be able to make a valuable contribution to the work of the Organization. Several of them were already members of the specialized agencies and subsidiary organs of the United Nations. As for those States whose policy did not appear to certain speakers to be in conformity with that of the majority of Member States, and whose admission

was giving rise to certain apprehensions, it might be pointed out that the admission of those countries as Members of the United Nations would in fact be an incentive to them to collaborate in the Organization's efforts to maintain international peace and to promote social progress. That was why his delegation had joined the sponsors of the joint draft resolution, under which the General Assembly, having noted the general sentiment in favour of the widest possible membership of the United Nations, requested the Security Council to consider the pending applications for membership of all those eighteen countries about which no problem of unification arose. The twenty-eight sponsors of the joint draft resolution had abstained from enumerating the countries whose admission was desired, in order to leave the Security Council an entirely free hand. His delegation would support any recommendation the Security Council might see fit to make to the Assembly concerning the admission of new Members. If, however, the permanent members of the Security Council did not succeed in reaching agreement on the question, they would have to bear the blame for frustrating the hopes of those States, representing a considerable part of the human race, which had waited so long for their admission to the Organization.

65. Mr. KHOURI (Lebanon) wished first of all to pay tribute to the Committee of Good Offices and the Canadian delegation for their unwearied efforts to settle the problem of the admission of new Members. The present moment was a crucial one for the United Nations, a moment of hope, but also of apprehension. Eighteen States were requesting admission to membership in the United Nations. Some of those States were economically and socially advanced, possessed some degree of military might and had been independent for centuries. Others, on the other hand, were relatively undeveloped from the economic and social point of view and had enjoyed their national sovereignty for only a short time; but they showed great political maturity and boasted ancient civilizations and cultures. Some of them were linked to Member States by ties of friendship and by cultural, political and religious affinity. All were prepared to shoulder their responsibilities in the modern international community. His delegation was most anxious to see those countries admitted as Members of the United Nations. In its view, the United Nations must be not a kind of privileged club but an international association open to all countries fulfilling the requirements for membership.

66. There had been much discussion of the legal aspects of the problem of the admission of new Members. Lebanon had been a member of the Special Committee on the admission of New Members set up by the General Assembly at its seventh session (resolution 620 (VII)) to make a detailed study of the admission of States to membership, in the light of the history of the question and of the principles of international law. Accordingly, he would not hark back to the legal arguments already discussed at length by the Special Committee; he would refer to those arguments only in so far as they might be necessary to support his delegation's position.

67. The Lebanese Government still held that each application for admission should be examined on its own merits. In fact, his delegation had examined the application for admission of each of the eighteen applicant States, and had decided that all those States fulfilled the requirements of Article 4, paragraph 1, of the

Charter with regard to membership in the United Nations. It might be pointed out in that connexion that the authors of the Charter had wisely refrained from offering any precise definition of the conditions determining whether a State was peace-loving and whether it was capable of carrying out the obligations contained in the Charter. The futility of the attempts that had been made in the Sixth Committee to define aggression were sufficient evidence of the difficulties the authors of the Charter would have encountered had they tried to offer any such definition.

68. The question whether Security Council decisions relating to the admission of new Members were subject to veto by the Council's permanent members was still a matter of controversy, and it was certainly not a question which could usefully be raised in the Committee. On the contrary, the Committee's essential purpose should be to appeal to the political wisdom of the great Powers upon whom the maintenance of international peace depended. Was it too much to ask them to renounce their preferences, or their grievances against particular applicant States, without for that reason abandoning, for reasons of political expediency, the principles for the admission of new Members set forth in the United Nations Charter? Was the Organization going to seize the present golden opportunity to make itself truly representative of the world order and fully equipped as an instrument of peace and harmony among nations? Or was it going to aggravate its present inability to cope with the problems facing the international community? Was the Organization going to further the cause of peace and harmony between nations by admitting the eighteen applicant States, or was it going to close its doors to them at the risk of driving them to open hostility? Was the Organization going to enrich itself by the contribution which the eighteen applicants could bring, or was it going to deprive itself of the benefits of their cultures and their civilizations? Those were alternatives facing the United Nations. The twenty-eight countries which had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution before the Committee had already made their choice. They had decided in favour of admitting the eighteen applicant States *en bloc*, and many other countries had promised their support. Some of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution and certain other delegations might feel some doubts as to the degree to which certain of the applicant States fulfilled the requirements for admission to the Organization. But the fact remained that those applicants were able to fulfil the minimum obligations imposed on them by the Charter. In any event, his delegation believed that the cause of international peace would be better served by admitting a State which just managed to fulfil the conditions laid down in the Charter, than by keeping it out of the Organization and thus arousing its hostility and resentment.

69. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the permanent members of the Security Council would heed the General Assembly's appeal and would not disappoint the hopes, not only of the twenty-eight sponsors of the draft resolution, but of all those who had placed their faith in the United Nations and who had peace, friendship and co-operation between all the nations of the world close to their hearts.

70. Mr. THORS (Iceland) observed that since 1945 the General Assembly had approved the admission of only nine Members, on the recommendation of the

Security Council, and that since 1951 no Members at all had been admitted.

71. Article 4 of the Charter laid down the conditions to be fulfilled by a State for admission to membership in the United Nations. Paragraph 2 of that Article made it clear that General Assembly approval by a two-thirds majority was not enough, and that there must be a recommendation from the Security Council. But in the Security Council, the permanent members had the right of veto, which they had systematically applied with regard to new applicants. Of course, paragraph 1 of the Article might, as indeed might all the provisions of the Charter, be open to varying interpretations. But in a world where all countries were devoting part of their national income to armaments while announcing that they were doing so for purposes of defence, it was hard to see how a country could be proved not to be peace-loving.

72. The provisions of the Charter must be interpreted in the light of realities. The real question was whether the United Nations wished to increase its membership or if it wished to remain a kind of exclusive club. One-fourth of the nations of the world were not at present represented in an Organization whose purposes were essentially universal.

73. His Government had joined the countries sponsoring the joint draft resolution in order to reaffirm its belief that it would be to the greatest advantage of the Organization to apply the principle of universality to the utmost possible extent; for the larger the number of countries represented in the Organization, the greater would be its influence. In the present situation, only eighteen countries could be proposed for admission, for in the case of certain others a problem of unification had first to be settled. It was reasonable to suppose that the admission of those countries would not be long delayed.

74. It was to be hoped that the Security Council would respect the draft resolution which expressed the views of a very broad section of world opinion and represented the only practical method of breaking the deadlock. It would be valueless at the present juncture to indulge in idle debate. A number of nations, among them some which had been cradles of civilization and culture, had the right to enter the United Nations, and that right must be respected. They had been the victims of political manoeuvres, and it was time to put an end to that injustice. The main objective of the draft resolution was to give expression to the widely-held view that the United Nations should be open to all nations; that it should be a world Organization in which all opinions and all systems of government were represented. Only then would the Organization be able to discuss world problems with any hope of settling them.

75. Mr. BRILEJ (Yugoslavia) said that at the present session, as the twenty-eight Power draft resolution (A/AC.80/L.3/Rev.1) showed, the problem of the admission of new Members to the United Nations had assumed a more favourable aspect.

76. His delegation, which was one of the sponsors of the draft, had not altered its position on the question. It had always supported the applications of States desiring membership; a policy in which it had never been guided by any one-sided appraisal of the qualifications of those States or by the current relations between them and Yugoslavia. It had been guided solely by the interests of the community of nations and by the principle of the universality of the United Nations. It

regarded that principle not as an abstract idea but as one of the prerequisites for success in the work of the United Nations. The present international political situation made a positive solution of the problem of the admission of new Members imperative. It was strange and anomalous that a group of States numbering almost one-third of the present United Nations membership should be kept outside the world Organization at a time when efforts were being directed towards the settlement of international disputes by means of negotiation and towards increased international co-operation in all matters of common interest.

77. The opportunity now existed — and it might not recur — to put an end to a difficult situation. As the New Zealand representative had said (26th meeting), the problem of new Members was not a constitutional or an administrative question; it was a question of high policy, with a bearing on the future of the Organization.

78. It was not his intention to consider the merits of the individual applicants; he would merely point out that while the purposes and principles of the United Nations would in no way be endangered by the admission of new Members they might well be jeopardized if the problem under review was dealt with by reference to ideological differences. In those circumstances the Organization would become a private club, indeed a weapon of ideological warfare.

79. It must also be borne in mind that in different countries, varying social systems existed and would continue to exist, and that the coexistence of those systems was essential for the maintenance of peace. In that connexion, the United Nations must reckon with the real ties. It was encouraging therefore that so many countries had applied for membership. They were entitled to admission, and it was the Organization's duty to admit them. In his delegation's opinion, admission to membership in the United Nations was not a good conduct certificate or a favour to the country admitted; it was primarily a political matter, which must be considered in the light of the interests of the international community and of the development of international relations.

80. The Yugoslav delegation was convinced that the course advocated in the twenty-eight Power draft resolution was the only way in the present circumstances to achieve the desired results. The compromise solution it suggested had even brought about a change in the position of some of the permanent members of the Security Council.

81. The various difficulties that had affected Yugoslavia's relations with some of the countries in question were well known; but Yugoslavia would whole-heartedly endorse the draft resolution and hoped that other nations would do the same. Otherwise the present deplorable situation would continue unchanged and the responsibility for that state of affairs would rest with the General Assembly and the permanent members of the Security Council. It was to be hoped that no State would be willing to assume such a responsibility, and that all of them would adopt policies which would make a final settlement of the problem possible.

82. With regard to the various draft amendments to the twenty-eight Power draft resolution, his delegation felt that they represented a step backward in view of the wide measure of agreement which had been achieved in the draft resolution, and it would therefore vote against them. It particularly hoped that the Soviet

delegation would not press for a vote on its amendment (A/AC.80/L.5).

83. He expressed his delegation's gratitude for the work of the Committee of Good Offices and its Chairman, and for the active role that the Canadian delegation and Mr. Martin had played in bringing nearer an acceptable solution to the problem of the admission of new Members during the present session of the General Assembly.

84. Mr. MENEMENCIOGLU (Turkey) said that his delegation would support the twenty-eight Power draft resolution (A/AC.80/L.3/Rev.1).

85. The Turkish delegation's position on the admission of new Members had always been based on two principles. It believed that the admission of new Members would strengthen the position of the United Nations, and it considered that in connexion with the admission of new Members the Organization should adhere strictly to the principles of the Charter. Accordingly, it was able to accept the draft resolution. For although the procedure to be adopted by the General Assembly under the draft resolution was not envisaged by the Charter, the text of the draft resolution contained no contradictions of substance to the provisions of the Charter.

86. His delegation considered that the USSR amendment would change the draft resolution in form and in substance, and it would therefore be unable to support the draft resolution if that amendment was adopted.

87. It was clearly unnecessary, in the present discussion, to express an opinion regarding the various States that had applied for admission; he did, however, wish to express his regret at the fact that a great number of peace-loving countries were being denied the right of membership. Turkey maintained ties of friendship with some of those countries and hoped that such States as Italy, Portugal, Spain, Austria, Jordan, Libya and Ceylon would be admitted to the United Nations and thereby enabled to contribute to its work.

88. In conclusion, he paid a tribute to the Committee of Good Offices and its Chairman and thanked the Canadian delegation for its efforts to bring about a solution.

89. Mr. OLIVIERI (Argentina) agreed with the Canadian representative that the problem before the Committee was primarily political, and that it could best be resolved by action. However, it was to be hoped that political factors would be excluded in the consideration of problems involving the very principles of the United Nations, such as the problem of the admission of new Members.

90. His Government had always upheld the principle of universality, a principle which, while it was not explicitly mentioned in the Charter, was nevertheless essential, since a United Nations Organization must necessarily include all the nations of the world.

91. He would not enlarge on the rules of substance and procedure which governed the admission of new Members, but he did wish to draw attention to the basic cause of the earlier failures, which in his opinion came into play whenever the United Nations had to deal with a fundamental problem. The United Nations was the parliament of the world, in which decisions affecting all its Members were taken in conformity with democratic principles. But many of the difficulties that beset the Organization derived precisely from the methods it adopted. Steps should be taken to improve those methods, for it was frequently found impossible to settle

the serious problems debated in the General Assembly, not because of an insufficient number of votes, but because of the veto.

92. It had been pointed out on many occasions that if the United Nations aspired to safeguard international peace and security and to help States to achieve the noble purposes proclaimed in the preamble to the Charter, it could not continue to be a closed institution composed of privileged countries.

93. All the draft resolutions relating to the admission of various States had been systematically rejected by resort to the veto. That right should not have been used in the circumstances. The decisions in question should have been taken by majority vote in the General Assembly after consideration of each application on its merits.

94. Today, however, the General Assembly had before it a proposal recommending the simultaneous admission of a number of States. If in order to give effect to the principle of universality a political compromise had to be applied, that compromise should be accepted.

95. When future generations came to assess the work of the United Nations during the preceding decade, they would find nothing to justify its obstinate refusal to admit the nations applying for membership, particularly as the principle of universality had assumed constantly increasing importance. The reason why the United Nations had been unable to fulfil the hopes that the nations of the world had placed in it was that the principle of universality had not been realized. Accordingly, the time had now come to end discussion and to act. The United Nations must break the present deadlock. The Committee now appeared to have a good opportunity to do so, since the draft resolution (A/AC.80/L.3/Rev.1) before it seemed to have won general support. The draft resolution treated the problem in a realistic and practical way; although it had weaknesses from the legal point of view, his delegation felt that it was the most suitable formula to give effect to the principle of universality.

96. The only thing that could doom the draft resolution to failure would be the use of the veto; he therefore appealed to the permanent members of the Security Council to refrain from the use of that right. The terms

of Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Charter should be carried out to the letter. The main objective of all the Members of the United Nations should be to promote mutual trust and tolerance in a world where every country had its own legal and political system. The barriers excluding a large part of the human race from the United Nations should be removed once and for all. The applicant countries had agreed to assume the obligations contained in the Charter and to work for the cause of peace. Many of them, for example, Spain, Italy and Portugal, had played an important role in history. It was to be hoped therefore that the States possessing the right of veto would follow a course that would permit the admission to the United Nations of all new countries which could contribute to the good of mankind.

97. Mr. DIAZ ORDOÑEZ (Dominican Republic) said that owing to a misunderstanding his delegation had been listed among the sponsors of the twenty-eight Power draft resolution but that the necessary correction had been made.

98. His delegation supported the principle of the universality of the United Nations. He would even go so far as to say that if the United Nations was to accomplish the task it had set itself it would inevitably have to admit all the countries of the world. Only in that way would all the peoples of the world be able to benefit from the Organization and be required to respect the principles of the Charter. To permit a State or group of States to remain outside the Organization would be tantamount to recognizing the right of a State or group of States to act in a manner contrary to the principles of the Charter. It was natural that the principle of universality should be accepted; but adherence to the basic principles of the Charter implied the obligation to respect them in practice.

99. In the present circumstances his delegation would vote for the draft resolution submitted by Canada; but that did not imply any change in his Government's position so far as its foreign policy was concerned, or any compromise with regard to its vote when the time came to take a decision on the questions of substance raised in the draft resolution.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.