

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**



**AD HOC POLITICAL COMMITTEE 1st**

MEETING

SIXTH SESSION

Monday, 19 November 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

Official Records

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Pages
Election of Chairman .....	1
Election of Vice-Chairman .....	1
Election of Rapporteur .....	2
Adoption of the agenda (A/AC.53/2) .....	2
Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece :	
(a) report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans	
(A/1857).....	4

*Acting Chairman* : Mr. Luis PADILLA NERVO (Mexico).

*Chairman* : Mr. Selim SARPER (Turkey).

**Election of Chairman**

1. The ACTING CHAIRMAN called for nominations for the post of Chairman.

2. Sir Mohammad ZAFRULLA KHAN (Pakistan) proposed Mr. Sarper (Turkey) as Chairman. The nomination was seconded by Mr. BUSTAMANTE (Ecuador), Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan), Mr. MUNIZ (Brazil), Mr. Liu CHIEH (China), Mr. PEON DEL VALLE (Mexico) and Mr. SEVILLA-SACASA (Nicaragua).

*Mr. Sarper (Turkey) was unanimously elected Chairman.*

**Election of Vice-Chairman**

3. Mr. BARRINGTON (Burma) proposed Mr. Palamarchuk (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) as Vice-Chairman.

4. The nomination was seconded by Mr. PROCHAZKA (Czechoslovakia), Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland), Mr. KISELYOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. PANIKKAR (India).

5. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark) proposed Mr. Grafstrom (Sweden) as Vice-Chairman.

6. The nomination was supported by Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom), Mr. LACOSTE (France), Mr. COHEN (United States of America) and Mr. PATIJN (Netherlands).

7. The CHAIRMAN announced that under rule 103 of the rules of procedure a vote would be taken by secret ballot.

*A vote was taken by secret ballot.*

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Barrington (Burma) and Mr. Borberg (Denmark) acted as tellers.*

<i>Number of ballot papers.....</i>	59
<i>Invalid ballots .....</i>	1
<i>Number of valid ballots .....</i>	58
<i>Abstentions.....</i>	1
<i>Number of valid votes cast .....</i>	57
<i>Required majority .....</i>	29

*Number of votes obtained :*

<i>Mr. Grafstrom (Sweden) .....</i>	41
<i>Mr. Palamarchuk (Ukrainian SSR).....</i>	16

*Mr. Grafstrom (Sweden), having obtained the required majority of those present and voting, was elected Vice-Chairman.*

*The printed Official Records of the sixth session of the General Assembly are being published in fascicule form, that is, the record of each meeting will be issued separately as soon as possible. These will be so produced that they may eventually be bound into volumes, by organ and session. Pagination will therefore be continuous throughout each series of fascicules representing the records of a single body, and at the end of the session there will be issued, for each series, a prefatory fascicule containing a title page, table of contents, list of members attending, initial agenda, and other prefatory material. This prefatory fascicule should be placed in front of the record of the opening meeting, before binding. For ease of recognition the fascicules of the opening and closing meetings will be clearly identified as such in the masthead.*

*After the close of the session, sets of fascicules, collated and bound, will be placed on sale for the general public.*

### Election of rapporteur

8. Mr. CASTRO (El Salvador), proposed Mr. Sevilla-Sacasa (Nicaragua) as Rapporteur.

9. The nomination was seconded by Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines), Mr. POLITIS (Greece), Mr. PEON DEL VALLE (Mexico), Mr. GOYTISOLO (Peru), Mr. MUNIZ (Brazil), Mr. MACEDO (Uruguay), Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom), Mr. PLAZA (Venezuela), Mr. SALAZAR (Dominican Republic), Mr. ORLICH (Costa Rica) and Mr. COHEN (United States of America).

*Mr. Sevilla-Sacasa (Nicaragua), was unanimously elected Rapporteur.*

### Adoption of the agenda (A/AC.53/2)

10. The CHAIRMAN called for debate on the order in which the Committee would consider the eight items referred to it by the President of the General Assembly in his letter of 16 November 1951 (A/AC.53/2).

11. Mr. PATIJN (Netherlands) thought that since the documentation for items 3 and 5 on the provisional list was not yet available, it would be advisable to defer discussion of the items concerning Palestine and Libya. Documents concerning item 2 on the provisional agenda, which referred to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece, were already available, and he proposed that that item should be discussed first, followed by item 8 on the provisional agenda which referred to Yugoslavia. Item 7 referring to elections in Germany, might be taken next, followed by item 6, dealing with the treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa. The items concerning Palestine and Libya might then be placed fifth and sixth on the list. The report of the Security Council would require little discussion and could be taken up at any time.

12. Mr. TABIBI (Afghanistan) did not agree with the Netherlands representative's proposal. He thought that the documentation on Libya would be sufficient to allow the question to be discussed without delay and since Libya would receive its independence during the General Assembly's sixth session, questions concerning it should be given priority. The documentation on the Palestine questions might then be ready, in which case the Committee could take up those questions, which involved matters of urgency, owing to the plight of the Arab refugees.

13. Mr. CHAI (Secretary of the Committee), in reply to a question from the Chairman, pointed out that the report of the United Nations Commission on Libya, needed for the discussion of the item in question, was of considerable length and would take some time to produce and distribute. A supplementary report would also be submitted later.

14. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom) was in favour of the Netherlands proposal. The items connected with Yugoslavia and the elections in Germany had both been accepted as being urgent and important.

They had been submitted recently and required careful consideration. They might well be given second and third place, while item 2 on the provisional agenda might well become item 1, since documents were available and representatives were familiar with the subject.

15. He did not think that discussion of item 5 on the provisional agenda should be delayed any further, but the question of Libya might be placed sixth in the order of discussion for the reasons already given. The remaining two items might be placed seventh and eighth on the agenda.

16. Mr. KHALIL (Lebanon) supported the Afghanistan representative's proposal. In view of the General Assembly resolutions requiring that Libya should be granted independence not later than January 1952, the questions concerning that country should be dealt with at once. It would be regrettable to defer them because documents were not available and he wondered if the Secretariat could set a date for the distribution of documents relating to the Libyan item.

17. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed surprise at the delay in preparing documents on so urgent and important a problem as the independence of Libya. He suggested that the documents which had been received might be circulated, at least in English, forthwith.

18. He could not agree with the delegations which had declared that the matter was not urgent since it had been decided by General Assembly resolution 289 (IV), confirmed by resolution 387 (V), that Libya should be granted independence as soon as possible and in any case not later than 1 January 1952. He wondered what grounds the delegations of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom could possibly have for wishing to postpone discussion of the subject until towards the end of the Committee's agenda. It was obvious that for the United Kingdom delegation any question containing some slander against the USSR acquired particular urgency whereas questions affecting British or American interests became unimportant. It would, however, be odd if the Committee were to endorse such logic.

19. He was therefore unable to accept the Netherlands representative's proposal with regard to the order of items on the agenda, and supported the Afghanistan representative's suggestion that the Libya question should be one of the first items to be discussed by the Committee.

20. Mr. BOKHARI (Pakistan) said that while all the items on the agenda were important, some were of greater urgency than others. In its treatment of the Libyan question the Committee had to be guided by the definitely established target date of 1 January 1952. Only five working weeks remained before that date and only eight working weeks before the date fixed for the closure of the Assembly. If the item on Libya were placed almost last on the Committee's agenda, as the Netherlands representative had suggested, it would be impossible for the Committee to complete its discussion

before the date fixed for the granting of independence to Libya. It was indeed regrettable that the Committee's work should be delayed by purely mechanical difficulties and he strongly endorsed the USSR representative's suggestion that the English version of the documents on Libya should be made available to the Committee immediately and that the translation of the documents should be completed as quickly as possible.

21. It was perhaps premature to decide on the order in which the whole agenda should be taken up. He therefore suggested that the Committee should decide on the first two items it would examine and leave the decision on the remaining items until later.

22. Mr. BEBLER (Yugoslavia) agreed with the representative of Pakistan that it would be desirable to decide only on the first two items to be considered by the Committee. He supported the Netherlands representative's proposal that items 2 and 8 of the provisional agenda should be taken up first.

23. M. Bébler was compelled to disagree with the arguments advanced by the USSR representative against the early consideration of item 8 which had been proposed by the Yugoslav delegation. Since the item related to a situation of serious international tension, it was the duty of the United Nations to give it its fullest consideration and see what steps could be taken.

24. Mr LACOSTE (France) fully supported the Netherlands representative's proposal. Items 2 and 8, dealing with threats to Greece and Yugoslavia, were of direct concern to international peace and security. Item 7 was urgent because it involved a long-term task and the sooner such work was begun the better. Item 5 was also urgent because of the humanitarian considerations involved.

25. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) supported the Afghanistan representative's proposal. He felt that the Libyan question might be maintained as the third item on the agenda, since the Committee could always postpone its discussion if it found that the documents were not ready when the moment came to take up the question.

26. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) supported the Netherlands representative's proposal. It was obviously impossible to discuss an item when the documents relating to it were not available. Even after the documents had been circulated, delegations would require time to study them and perhaps to refer to their governments for instructions.

27. The suggestion made by the Pakistan representative that the Committee should decide only on the first two items had already been tried the previous year and had resulted in much time being spent in procedural discussion. It would be better for the Committee to decide at once on the order of the entire agenda since, if special reasons later made it necessary to change the order, it would always be possible to do so.

28. Mr. KHALIL (Lebanon), speaking on a point of order, asked whether or not the Committee considered

the date of 1 January 1952, which had been fixed for the granting of Libyan independence, as binding on the United Nations.

29. The CHAIRMAN said that that was not a point of order, since it was covered by a General Assembly decision.

30. Mr. COHEN (United States of America) supported the Netherlands representative's proposal, which he thought would lead to the most efficient dispatch of the Committee's business; but it was indispensable to have the relevant documents, in good shape before certain items could be discussed intelligently. He agreed with the South African representative that it was desirable to decide the order of the entire agenda, subject to the possibility of changing it later if necessary.

31. On the Libyan question, the United States representative pointed out that the item called for review by the Committee of the annual report of the United Nations Commissioner in Libya and the annual reports of the Administering Powers in Libya, which were not yet available. Libyan independence by 1 January 1952, was provided for by existing decisions of the General Assembly. It was not dependent on prior Committee discussion of the Libyan item.

32. Mr. PROCHAZKA (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation supported the Afghanistan representative's proposal, since it considered the Libyan question, which affected the independence of a whole people, one of the most important issues before the United Nations. He opposed the order suggested by the Netherlands representative, particularly with regard to item 8, which his delegation did not consider either serious or urgent.

33. Mr. JORDAAN (South Africa) moved the closure of the debate.

34. The CHAIRMAN, after declaring the debate closed, put to the vote first the proposal by the representative of Pakistan that the Committee should at the present time, decide only on the first two items it would take up for consideration.

*Pakistan proposal was rejected by 28 votes to 15, with 10 abstentions.*

35. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), on a point of order, moved, as an amendment to the Afghanistan representative's proposal, that the Committee should consider first item 2, the question of Greece, then item 3 on Libya and then item 5 on Palestine, followed by the other items in the order that had been suggested.

36. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR amendment to the Afghanistan proposal.

*The USSR amendment was rejected by 31 votes to 14, with 12 abstentions.*

37. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Afghanistan proposal that the Committee should consider first item 1, the report of the Security Council, then item 3 followed by item 5.

*The Afghanistan proposal was rejected by 31 votes to 19, with 6 abstentions.*

38. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland), moved, as an amendment to the original Netherlands proposal, that the Libyan question should become the second item to be discussed by the Committee.

39. The CHAIRMAN put the Polish amendment to the vote.

*The Polish amendment was rejected by 32 votes to 18, with 7 abstentions.*

40. The CHAIRMAN put the proposal of the Netherlands representative to the vote.

*The Netherlands proposal was adopted by 32 votes to 16, with 9 abstentions.*

**Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece : (a) report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans (A/1857)**

[Item 9]\*

41. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, since the agenda had been adopted, and the Greek question was the first item for consideration, his delegation felt obliged to draw the Committee's attention to a matter of particular urgency. On 16 November 1951, Mr. Vyshinsky had received a cablegram from twelve Greek democrats under death sentence. A similar cablegram had been sent to the President of the General Assembly and to the delegations of the United Kingdom, United States and France. The cablegram stated that the authors had been sentenced to death by a special military tribunal for their participation in the struggle for peace and democracy, and requested the addressees to intervene on their behalf.

42. The twelve persons in question had been sentenced to death as a result of the trials in October and November 1951 involving 93 political persons. The facts were given in detail in the appeal transmitted by the Greek patriots to the United Nations on 17 October, in the messages sent by them to Generalissimo Stalin, President Truman, President Auriol and Prime Minister Churchill and in their message to the International Association of Democratic Lawyers. It was an appeal to all civilized people throughout the world. The General Assembly was urged to follow the principles which it had adopted at its third and fourth sessions and to take action to save the lives of the Greek patriots.

43. The USSR delegation USSR was motivated by high humanitarian principles in raising the question in the Committee with due regard to the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of Member States as set forth in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. He recalled that the General Assembly had, at its third and fourth sessions, adopted a humanitarian approach towards a similar case and had passed a resolution which had prevented the execution of several Greek patriots. Again, matters both national and international in character affecting Greece, had been discussed

by the United Nations for several years. The Committee's consideration of the matter to which he had referred would not constitute any interference in the domestic affairs of Greece, but would, on the contrary, be a humanitarian action undertaken by the United Nations with a view to saving lives. He therefore submitted the following draft resolution :

*" The Ad Hoc Political Committee,*

*" Drawing attention to the fact that special military tribunals in Greece are still passing death sentences against representatives of Greek democratic organizations and that the Athens Special Military Tribunal on 16 November 1951 passed death sentences against the following Greek patriots :*

*Nikolaos Beloyannis, Elli Ioannidou, Stergios Grammenos, Dimitrios Kalopholias, Theodora Georgiadou, Aphrodite Maniati, Aphanasios Kanellopoulos, Dimitrios Kanellopoulos, Petros Papapikolaou Evstaphios Dromazos, Calliope Papadopoulou and Liza Kottou.*

*" Requests the President of the General Assembly to enter into negotiations with representatives of the Government of Greece for the remission of the death sentences passed by the Athens Special Military Tribunal on 16 November 1951 against the said twelve convicted Greek patriots".*

44. The USSR representative pointed out that the rejection of his proposal would be tantamount to ignoring the most elementary humanitarian principles.

45. The CHAIRMAN said that, since the Greek representative had requested the floor, he intended to allow him to speak, because it would be unfair to prevent him from answering the USSR representative. On the other hand, he was opposed to opening a discussion on a matter which was irrelevant to the item under consideration, and would rule it out of order.

46. In 1949, in his capacity as Vice-Chairman and in the absence of the Chairman, he had presided at a meeting of the First Committee where a similar question had arisen and his ruling then had been exactly the same.

47. Mr. POLITIS (Greece) stated that the USSR representative was again attempting to introduce the subject of alleged terror in Greece. Similar attempts had been made in previous years, apparently for the gratification of the Cominform.

48. The subject raised by the Soviet Union representative constituted an interference in the domestic affairs of a Member State in violation of the Charter. If the United Nations was henceforth to assume the responsibilities of a supreme court he was prepared to agree, provided that all relevant cases were taken up.

49. If the " iron curtain " was raised to allow qualified investigators to enter, and if they were fortunate enough to return, they would bring back valuable information which might be edifying to peoples less advanced in the fields of freedom, justice and humanity. Such witnesses would be able to provide information about

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

the lofty principles in accordance with which the horrible mass execution of 11,000 Polish officers had been carried out.

50. The CHAIRMAN requested the Greek representative to limit himself to the matter under discussion and to reply, if he considered it necessary, only to the USSR representative's allegations.

51. Mr. POLITIS (Greece) replied that his observations were relevant, because, since the matter of the application of humanitarian principles in Greece had been raised, he was entitled to comment upon what happened elsewhere in that connexion. He would, however, endeavour to abide by the Chairman's request.

52. He could not accept any allegation concerning cruelty and terror in Greece, when matters such as the kidnapping of children, the execution and shooting of dissidents, the vast forced labour camps, the deportation of millions of people to remote areas, and the systematic de-nationalization of certain countries remained uninvestigated. The victims of such brutal methods amounted to millions. It was about such practices that world opinion demanded clarification. Once such clarification was forthcoming, it might be more appropriate to consider the matter raised by the USSR representative.

53. Mr. Politis outlined the activities of the leader of the twelve convicted Greeks referred to by the Soviet Union representative, stating that they were representatives of a country where terror reigned and of a régime which had encouraged communist aggression against Greece and Korea involving hundreds of thousands of victims. The USSR representative's indignation was possibly due to his chagrin at seeing nations, which his country had hoped to undermine, ready and determined to defend themselves.

54. Mr. Politis agreed with the Chairman that the matter raised by the USSR representative was irrelevant to the item on the Committee's agenda.

55. The CHAIRMAN said that if any representative wished to challenge his ruling he would put the ruling to a vote.

56. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, requested that the text of his draft resolution should be distributed forthwith.

57. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) stated that he wished to raise a point of order concerning the Committee's procedure: he doubted whether the procedural situation called for a ruling.

58. The CHAIRMAN replied that a formal challenge to his ruling had been made by the USSR representative and that the challenge must be put to the vote before any further discussion. He added that the text of the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union delegation could be circulated to the representatives since that was something the Chair had no power to prevent. He then requested the Committee to vote on his ruling that the matter raised by the USSR representative was irrelevant to the item on the agenda.

*The Chairman's ruling was upheld by 32 votes to 5, with 16 abstentions.*

59. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) formally moved the adjournment of the meeting.

*The motion to adjourn was adopted by 42 votes to 3, with 6 abstentions.*

60. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, stated that, in his opinion, the Chairman had violated the Committee's rules of procedure. The Chairman was obliged to allow representatives to speak for or against the motion to adjourn, but he had deprived the Committee of the opportunity to discuss the possibility of saving the lives of twelve persons. The results of that decision would remain on the conscience of the Chairman and of his supporters.

61. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that, under rule 117 of the rules of procedure, he had been obliged to put to the vote immediately the motion for adjournment and that he could not have given the floor to any representative in connexion with that motion.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p. m.