

45. In the interest of unanimous decision Mr. Katz-Suchy said that if a vote were taken immediately, he would be prepared to limit the draft resolution, as suggested by the Cuban amendment, to a specific appeal to set aside the death sentence passed on Catherine Zevgos.

46. Mr. CASTRO (El Salvador) supported the Australian draft resolution. As to the Polish proposal, however, he urged that the matter be considered from a realistic point of view. For a Committee of the General Assembly to appeal for commutation of a sentence passed by a tribunal of one of the Member States obviously meant that pressure was being exercised on an essentially domestic question and it was therefore a violation of Article 2 paragraph 7 of the Charter. Nevertheless, there was clearly something which the Committee could do in the matter. Mr. Castro recalled that in a similar situation the French delegation had presented a successful proposal which had merely expressed the opinion of the First Committee and had left it to the Greek delegation to present that opinion to its Government.¹ Thus, in accordance with that precedent, Mr. Castro submitted a draft resolution (A/C.1/485) as follows:

"The First Committee

"Resolves to authorize the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee to approach the representatives of Greece in order to make clear to them the satisfaction with which the First Committee would view the Greek Government's efforts to exercise all possible moderation, as far as is consistent with justice, in the punishment of acts prejudicial to the internal peace of Greece."

If the Committee were to adopt that draft resolution, then it would not be interfering with the domestic jurisdiction of Greece.

47. Mr. COUVE DE MURVILLE (France) speaking on the question of procedure raised by the Chairman expressed his opinion that the Committee should adhere to rule 120 of the rules of procedure and that the decision on the Polish draft resolution should be postponed until a vote had been taken on the Australian proposal. He added that such a procedure seemed appropriate since discussion on the Polish draft resolution was

apparently far from being completed. The Committee had just received a draft resolution submitted by El Salvador and it was possible that further proposals might be submitted.

48. A second argument in favour of postponement was that the discussion had shown that although the Polish proposal might be inspired by humanitarian sentiments, it was nevertheless likely to have a political interpretation since it was directly related to the whole of the question under discussion and in particular to the Australian draft resolution.

49. Another reason was that the Polish draft resolution raised important questions of principle with regard to interference in the internal affairs of Member States. Furthermore, it cited as facts certain matters on which, no doubt, the Polish delegation was well informed but on which other delegations, particularly the French, desired further information.

50. Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom) supported the representative of France. While he fully appreciated the sentiments of the Polish representative, he pointed out that under rule 109 of the rules of procedure, no proposals could be discussed or put to the vote unless circulated in writing to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting. Therefore it could not be said that the Committee had failed to act properly by not seeking to ask for an adjournment but rather that the Polish delegation had failed to follow the usual procedure. Moreover, as the French representative had pointed out, the matter was very involved and in view of the United Kingdom delegation, the discussion ought to be adjourned to enable Members to study both the Polish and El Salvadorian draft resolutions.

51. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the French proposal that the Committee follow its normal procedure and deal with the draft resolutions submitted by Poland and El Salvador after it had voted on the Australian draft resolution.

The proposal was adopted by 44 votes to 8 with 4 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.

TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Thursday, 29 September 1949, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).

Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece: report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans, (continued) (A/935, A/978, A/981, A/C.1/481, A/C.1/483, A/C.1/484 and A/C.1/485).

1. The CHAIRMAN recalled the decision, adopted by the First Committee at its previous meeting, to

deal first of all with the Australian draft resolution (A/C.1/481).

2. Mr. LÓPEZ (Philippines) associated himself with the delegations which had spoken in favour of the Australian draft resolution.

3. Hostilities had practically come to an end in Greece; that fact, together with the improvement in Greek-Yugoslav relations and the progress previously made by the Conciliation Committee created at the third regular session of the General Assembly,² made it possible to view with optimism

¹ See *Official Records of the third session of the General Assembly, Part I, First Committee*, 186th meeting.

² See *Official Records of the third session of the General Assembly, Part I, First Committee*, 193rd meeting.

the proposed new conciliation committee's chances of success.

4. As regards the Polish proposal (A/C.1/483) and the Cuban amendment thereto (A/C.1/484), the delegation of the Philippines favoured in principle all appeals of a humanitarian character on behalf of political offenders. In the case in point, the Philippine delegation supported the Cuban delegation's amendment to address an appeal to the Greek authorities for the suspension of the death sentence on Mrs. Zevgos. It also supported the draft resolution of El Salvador (A/C.1/485) calling for an appeal to the Greek Government.
5. The CHAIRMAN reminded members of the First Committee that discussion at that stage should be restricted to the Australian draft resolution.
6. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) stated that his delegation, inspired by a desire to ensure the integrity and independence of Greece and the maintenance of peace in the Balkans, favoured the Australian draft resolution.
7. The delegation of Iraq had heard with satisfaction the representative of Greece speak of the resumption of normal relations between Greece and Yugoslavia. It could therefore be hoped that a similar improvement would take place with regard to Albania and Bulgaria.
8. It was essential, however, to observe two principles. In the first place, only the lawful Government of any country could take action when subversive elements attempted to destroy its authority. Any assistance to such rebels would constitute an act of intervention in the internal affairs of that State. Secondly, a foreign Government had no right to comment on internal measures taken by the legally constituted authorities of a State for the purpose of preserving peace within the country. Unless those two basic rules were observed, there could be no peace among the nations.
9. The delegation of Iraq, while expressing its intention to vote in favour of the creation of a conciliation committee, felt sure that the work of that committee would be greatly facilitated if Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter were better understood in the Organization.
10. Mr. CLEMENTIS (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation welcomed any step which might lead to a solution of the Greek question, it was therefore prepared to support the initiative of the Australian delegation in so far as it could lead to the restoration of peace in Greece and the re-establishment of normal relations between Greece and its northern neighbours.
11. The Czechoslovak delegation had originally intended to submit an amendment to the Australian text on the subject of the powers of the proposed conciliation committee. Since, however, it seemed that the First Committee approved the new committee's mission of conciliation, the delegation of Czechoslovakia would vote in favour of the draft resolution.
12. Mr. EBAN (Israel) stressed the importance of the Australian delegation's contribution. The revival of the idea of an organ of conciliation, which had carried the General Assembly to the very threshold of success in the previous year, was most opportune.
13. The Israeli delegation supported the Australian draft resolution, which should make it possible to achieve the re-establishment of peace in the Balkans—the common objective of all Members of the United Nations.
14. Mr. COUVE DE MURVILLE (France) associated himself with those delegations which had supported the draft resolution of Australia. He pointed out that the problem before the United Nations was not the Greek question, but the relations of that country with its northern neighbours.
15. Confidence might be felt in the success of an attempt at conciliation sponsored by the highest authorities of the United Nations and unanimously supported by the delegations.
16. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) reminded the meeting that his delegation had invariably advocated methods of conciliation before every organ of the United Nations.
17. The delegation of Poland, which had been unable the previous day to express an informed opinion on the Australian proposal, considered that the draft resolution was far from satisfactory, since it dealt with only one minor aspect of the problem—that of the relations between Greece and its northern neighbours, which simply reflected the discord prevailing in Greece.
18. If peace were to be restored, conciliation should begin at home. In that way the relations between Greece and its neighbours would no longer cause any difficulty. That was the attitude of the Security Council's Commission of Investigation, regarding Greek frontier incidents, which had sought to be an effective instrument of peace among the various opposing groups in Greece and had tried to deal with the evil at its root. Unfortunately, at the very moment that that Commission was about to obtain satisfactory results, a new doctrine had made its appearance and plans of strategy had been worked out. The existing situation was simply the outcome of the struggle between the Greek people and the Government imposed upon them, in the first instance by the British forces and, afterwards, by British and American forces jointly. The Polish delegation had opposed the inclusion of the Greek question in the agenda of the General Assembly in the form proposed, since it was convinced that the problems would not be solved by laying the blame on Greece's neighbours.
19. In view of the spirit of conciliation shown in the First Committee, however, the delegation of Poland was prepared to support an attempt at conciliation, which erred only in seeking the solution of a minor aspect of a problem, whereas it should strive to settle at the same time both the internal problem and the relations of Greece with its neighbours. To lay the blame for the situation on the intervention of neighbouring countries and to hold Albania responsible, as did the report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans (A/935) was to lose all sense of proportion.
20. For three years the Greek people had withstood the British Army and the military power of the United States employed in the service of Greek governmental terrorism. It was therefore desirable that the committee to be set up under the terms of the Australian draft resolution should

take into consideration the various points of view put forward in the First Committee and should work for conciliation in every possible sphere.

The draft resolution of Australia (A/C.1/481) was adopted unanimously.

21. The CHAIRMAN said that the vote just taken was a happy augury for the work of the Conciliation Committee. Speaking for the Vice-Chairman and in his own name, he said that the members of the Conciliation Committee would draw inspiration for their work from the example given by the Committee presided over by Mr. Evatt, which had so nearly been crowned with success. He then called upon the Committee to examine the Polish draft resolution (A/C.1/483), the amendment proposed by the Cuban delegation (A/C.1/484); and the draft resolution of the delegation of El Salvador (A/C.1/485).

22. Mr. PIPINELIS (Greece) said that the Polish draft resolution was the latest in a series of similar attacks on the good name and dignity of Greece.

23. His delegation had wished to contribute to the harmony which had seemed to prevail in the First Committee by refraining from replying at once to slanderous charges.

24. Since, however, the question was important both to Greece and to the United Nations, and since it also appeared that the good faith of various delegations had been abused, it was essential to bring out the facts once more.

25. It had been alleged that the carrying out of the death sentence to which Poland had referred was imminent. Upon enquiry, however, it appeared that Catherine Zevgos had been condemned to death on 17 September by the military tribunal of Piraeus by a vote of three to two. As always in such cases, the matter had been brought before the Court of Appeal on the following day, and a definite stay of execution of the sentence had thus resulted. Since that decision was taken on 18 September, it was difficult to believe that it had escaped the notice of the delegation of Poland; hence, in claiming that the matter was urgent, it was taking advantage of the good faith of the Committee.

26. In any case, the important thing was to expose the systematic campaign of defamation directed against the Greek Government. As the representative of France had pointed out, the very act of making an appeal to a Government was tantamount to casting suspicion upon it. Before taking such action, at least a summary examination should be made of the facts of the case. It was a fact that the rebels had executed without trial tens of thousands of innocent people, had deported women and children and had crucified priests. If the Committee were to deal with all those cases, it would cost a great deal to do.

27. Even more basic was the issue of the very competence of organs of the United Nations to deal with the matter. Furthermore it was a case of political action which assumed the form of a humanitarian appeal. However, the Greek delegation did not wish to confine itself to procedural considerations. It preferred to enter into the substance of the matter and to take account of the whole context in which the problem arose. A civil

war had been in progress in Greece, aided as it was by foreign intervention, and the Greek Government had had to suppress it by force as any other State would have had to do in similar circumstances. There was no country whose penal code did not punish sabotage and murder, whether it was in Czechoslovakia, whose Foreign Minister had openly stated in plenary meeting¹ that the suppression of crimes of high treason could not be considered a violation of human rights, or in the legislation of another country enjoying the benefits of popular democracy, such as Poland.

28. Justice demanded that consideration should be given to all the details of the plot against Greece and that the figures should be carefully examined. In four years, the Greek communists had been responsible for the murder of 50,749 persons and destruction of 11,750 villages, without counting the losses incurred by the regular army. The report of UNESCO on the condition of 338,000 homeless children, living in the most abject misery was particularly significant. In the face of so much suffering, it was surprising, as the chief of the United States Mission in Greece had said, that the repression had not been more severe. Actually, in 1948, 11,759 persons had been brought before military tribunals; 6,314 had been acquitted and 1,698 sentenced to death, of whom 695 had been executed. During the four-year period ending on 30 April 1949, 2,314 persons had been executed.

29. On the other hand, the long series of measures for granting amnesties taken during the years 1945 to 1948 should be kept in mind. These measures were carried still further by a new decision submitted to the Greek Parliament on 29 September 1949 in an effort to put an end to the horrible tragedy. Under the new bill, most of the guilty persons who had been sentenced to various punishments short of the death penalty would be interned in re-education camps, where the most satisfactory results had already been obtained. Seventy per cent of the persons detained in those camps were already considered likely to be set free. In addition, the Greek Government had decided to refer all cases of capital punishment to the Court of Appeals in accordance with the principle by which it had always been guided, namely, that punishment should be meted out only to the extent to which it was absolutely necessary. He hoped that this brief statement would put an end to the slanderous and malicious accusations brought against Greece.

30. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) noted that at its preceding meeting the Committee had responded with sympathy to the Polish proposal that preliminary steps of clemency should be taken to ensure the success of the Conciliation Committee's work for peace. The statement by the representative of Greece at the present meeting could not change the situation; the Committee's sympathy went out to those who were most in need of it, to those who had been sentenced. Mr. Katz-Suchy wondered how the Greek representative, who at the preceding meeting had opposed any intervention by the Committee in the case of Catherine Zevgos, a case which had long attracted the attention of public opinion in the United States and elsewhere, could have suddenly heard that her exe-

¹ See *Official Records of the fourth session of the General Assembly, 228th plenary meeting.*

cution had been suspended several days previously. That could only be an attempt to create a diversion.

31. The representative of Poland remarked that it was strange that Mr. Pipinelis should have spoken in such unctuous terms of the measures taken by his Government when, only the day before, the Greek delegation had brutally refused an American women's organization the right of intervening in favour of Catherine Zevgos and when, quite recently, captured partisans had been decapitated and their heads exposed to public view by soldiers of the Greek Army. The words of the Greek representative were also inconsistent with reports in the Greek Press, which boasted of the use of dive-bombers against the civilian population and of tanks against the guerrillas. The Greek Army had even been accused of having used gas and of having shot and tortured prisoners of war in violation of the Geneva Convention on the treatment of prisoners of war. The figures quoted by Mr. Pipinelis did not correspond with those which Mr. Canellopoulos, the Minister of War in the Athens Government, had recently made public. According to those figures, 1,209 guerrillas had been condemned to death in the first seven months of the current year, and 708 of them had already been executed. Moreover, the 50,000 victims mentioned by the Greek representative undoubtedly included many thousands of guerrillas whom the Greek Army, day by day, boasted of having wiped out.

32. Mr. Katz-Suchy added that it was obvious that the Greek Government was responsible for a reign of terror affecting all the social classes of the Greek population as shown by press dispatches. Under those conditions, the United Nations had to act and could not allow itself to be impressed by the promises of re-education referred to by the representative of Greece. If the Conciliation Committee was to be able to act effectively, the atmosphere of terror prevailing in Greece must above all be dispelled. Accordingly the Polish delegation called for unanimous adoption of its proposal, which was in harmony with the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

33. The CHAIRMAN requested the members of the Committee to refrain from saying anything which might make more difficult the work of the Conciliation Committee, the creation of which had just been decided.

34. Mr. MANUILSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), speaking on a point of order, protested against the statement of the Chairman and said that the representative of Greece had been the first to make passions flare up again by dealing with the substance of the question.

35. The CHAIRMAN indicated that a protest against a statement by the Chairman did not in itself constitute a point of order. He added that he had not referred to any particular statement and that he had merely expressed the hope that nothing would be said to make the work of the Conciliation Committee more difficult.

36. Mr. MARTÍNEZ MORENO (El Salvador) stated that the proposal which his delegation had presented the preceding day (A/C.1/485) had been based on humanitarian principles as well as on the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of a State. Nevertheless, in the light of the

statement of the representative of Greece informing the members of the Committee that sentences against political prisoners had been commuted, the delegation of El Salvador would withdraw its draft resolution and would vote against the Polish proposal, which seemed to be based on political rather than humanitarian considerations.

37. Mr. KAN (China) said that there was no political or juridical reason for adopting the Polish proposal. First of all, it was the responsibility of the Conciliation Committee to achieve conciliation and, if the First Committee thought it essential, it could at best invite the Conciliation Committee to give consideration to the problem mentioned in the Polish proposal. Nevertheless, it was obvious that that proposal was contrary to the Charter of the United Nations in that it constituted interference in the internal affairs of a State. In addition, that proposal was a political manoeuvre in humanitarian disguise to condemn the Greek Government even before the Conciliation Committee had been seized on the matter. Therefore the Polish proposal was unacceptable.

38. Mr. ALVAREZ (Cuba) recalled that his delegation had been sympathetic to the humanitarian character of the Polish proposal. He pointed out, however, that according to information published in the Press that morning the Greek Government had decided to suspend the execution of death sentences pending the promulgation of an amnesty law. That information had been confirmed by the Greek representative. Therefore the Polish proposal must henceforth be regarded as pointless. Accordingly the Cuban delegation withdrew the amendment (A/C.1/484) which it had proposed to that draft resolution.

39. Mr. C. MALIK (Lebanon) supported the opinion of the representative of El Salvador and Cuba. He hoped that the representative of Poland would follow their example and withdraw his proposal since the purpose it sought had already been achieved without action on the part of the Committee.

40. Mr. DÓMINGUEZ CÁMPORA (Uruguay) expressed the view that in humanitarian guise, the Polish proposal tended to shed unfavourable light on Greece at the very time a question involving the territorial integrity of that country was being discussed. The Uruguayan delegation would have voted in favour of a proposal calling for clemency on the part of the Greek Government if a death sentence had been passed, but it was opposed to the Polish proposal, which under the pretext of putting an end to the alleged violations of human rights was political in character.

41. Mr. MANUILSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) stressed the fact that his country, together with the fifteen other Soviet Socialist Republics, was part of the only State which, after the war, had abolished the death penalty. It therefore had a moral right to intervene in the substance of the question raised by the Polish draft resolution.

42. Mr. Manuisky first of all questioned the statements of the representative of Greece and recalled those made in 1946 by three representatives of the British Labour Party and also by Mr. Jouhaux, which proved that a reign of terror prevailed in Greece. He added that the number of refugees mentioned by Mr. Pipinelis did not correspond to the figure of 250,000 quoted by Mr.

Tsaldaris during the second session of the General Assembly.¹ Why did the Greek representative blame Albania and Bulgaria for the misfortunes of Greece when commanders of the Greek Army had stated that their arms had been brought on Italian and Turkish ships? Was there any intention to hold the Turkish and Italian Governments responsible for the misfortune of Greece? Mr. Pipinelis had said that priests had been crucified, but he had not given any names. The Conciliation Committee would have to verify those allegations and not merely listen to one of the parties involved.

43. The representative of the Ukrainian SSR expressed surprise that, after the unfounded statement of Mr. Pipinelis, the representatives of Cuba and El Salvador had withdrawn their proposals and that the representative of Uruguay had stated that he was opposed to the Polish proposal because it constituted interference in the internal affairs of a State. He recalled that in 1946, impelled by humanitarian motives, Uruguay had requested (A/Bur/22) that the death sentence should not be carried out against the hitlerite war criminals judged by the International Tribunal of Nürnberg.

44. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR supported the Polish proposal, which, by its humanitarian nature, would enable the Conciliation Committee to achieve success in its work.

45. Mr. DÓMINGUEZ CÁMPORA (Uruguay), in reply to the representative of the Ukrainian SSR, pointed out that he had not opposed the Polish draft resolution on the ground of the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, but because of the political character of that proposal. It was true that at the time of the Nürnberg trials his country had asked that the death sentences passed by that Tribunal should not be carried out, and that Uruguay had acted in accordance with its usual line of conduct, which was to oppose the death penalty on all occasions.

46. He pointed out that certain representatives who appealed to the humanitarian feelings of members of the Committee were showing great cynicism, since they had remained unmoved at the death of tens of thousands of persons who had committed no other crime than that of belonging to a certain social class.

47. Mr. VITERI LAFRONTE (Ecuador) recalled that the death penalty had been abolished in his country fifty years previously and stated that his delegation approved in principle any appeal to suspend the execution of a death sentence. Nevertheless, it was for the Conciliation Committee to create a favourable atmosphere for conciliation among the four Governments, and any recommendation it might make would necessarily apply to those four States. Hence, it would be desirable for the representative of Poland to find a more general formula applicable to the four States concerned, or, better still, to withdraw his proposal in order to give the Conciliation Committee full scope for action.

48. Mr. KURAL (Turkey), in reply to a remark made by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR, pointed out that arms had, in fact, been sent to

Greece in Turkish vessels; but that had happened during the war and the arms had been sent to the Greek resistance movement against the Germans; however, to his knowledge, no illicit traffic of arms existed at the present time between Turkey and Greece.

49. The Turkish delegation would vote against the Polish proposal, which would involve interference in the internal affairs of a State, and which was also useless, since, according to the Greek representative's observations, Greek legislation afforded every guarantee of justice.

50. EL-KHOURI Bey (Syria) drew the attention of the representatives of small States to the importance of their vote. Instead of taking one side or the other, it would be better for them to abstain and to let the parties concerned discuss the matter. Furthermore, since the death sentence against Mrs. Zevgos had been suspended, there was no need to adopt the Polish proposal.

51. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) regretted that the representative of El Salvador had expressed doubts as to the sincerity of his proposal. He pointed out that Poland's history in the past two centuries afforded sufficient proof that no human issue could be a matter of indifference to Poland.

52. With regard to the statement of the Chinese representative, he considered that the sentiments expressed by the Committee on the previous day were the best reply to the charge of absurdity levelled by that representative against the Polish proposal.

53. He regretted that the representative of Cuba had withdrawn his proposal, for Mrs. Zevgos was still in danger.

54. He could not agree with the Lebanese representative's request that he should withdraw his proposal, since his conscience would not allow him to assume a responsibility which might cost the life of a human being.

55. In reply to the representative of Ecuador, he stressed that his delegation's proposal had been submitted with a view to creating a favourable atmosphere for conciliation. British trade unions and the International Red Cross had frequently taken action against the terror in Greece. Why should the Committee not follow the example of those organizations?

56. It seemed to him that the attitude of certain delegations had changed during the night. The attitude of the Polish delegation, however, remained unchanged and he asked for a vote by roll-call.

57. Mr. PANYUSHKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stressed that the Committee's decisions influenced world public opinion and said that all right-minded people would welcome with a feeling of relief the adoption of the Polish proposal. The statements that had been made regarding the political character of that proposal were designed to evade the protection that the United Nations was bound to give to human rights.

58. The USSR delegation would vote in favour of the just and humane Polish proposal, which was likely to enhance the prestige of the United Nations.

59. Mr. McNEIL (United Kingdom) wished first of all to disassociate himself from any re-

¹ See *Official Records of the second session of the General Assembly, First Committee, 63rd meeting.*

marks which cast doubt on the sincerity of the statement by the representative of Greece. Greece was a sovereign State, a Member of the United Nations; it was only normal that its representative should explain his point of view. Moreover, since there was opposition in the Athens Parliament and since the free transmission of news from Athens to other countries was permitted, those were additional reasons for believing the statements made by the representative of Greece.

60. Mr. McNeil also pointed out that in November 1948 the First Committee had rejected,¹ by 43 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions, a proposal (A/C.1/371) similar to the Polish resolution, because it would have constituted interference in the domestic affairs of Greece.

61. Finally Mr. McNeil made it clear that the change in the views of the representatives of Cuba and El Salvador was not due to pressure exerted on them during the night, but simply to the fact that the statement of the representative of Greece had offered ample proof that the life of Mrs. Zevgos was no longer in danger and that there was no longer any need for the Committee to act.

62. Mr. COUVE DE MURVILLE (France) felt that the Polish proposal raised two contradictory problems: on the one hand it appealed to humanitarian feelings; while on the other it touched upon the competence of the United Nations, which, as was known, could not interfere in the domestic affairs of a State. To avoid that situation, he had intended, before the statement by the representative of Greece, to propose that the question should be referred to the Chairman of the Committee so that he could take the necessary measures consistent with the ideas expressed by the Committee. However Mr. Pipinelis' statement, which had pointed out, in the first place, that the death penalty against Mrs. Zevgos had been suspended and, secondly, that the Greek Government intended to adopt a policy of appeasement with regard to convictions for political offences, had changed the facts of the problem and had made the Polish proposal unnecessary, as well as the proposal which the French delegation had intended to submit.

63. In those circumstances, the representative of Lebanon had pointed out the wisest course when he had asked Mr. Katz-Suchy to withdraw his proposal. If that proposal were not withdrawn, however, the French delegation would oppose it in order to facilitate the work of the Conciliation Committee.

64. Mr. LONDOÑO Y LONDOÑO (Colombia) thought that the persistence with which the representative of Poland pressed his proposal gave the impression that it concealed some political motive.

65. Of course the Colombian delegation would never refuse to participate in an appeal for clemency in connexion with the execution of a death sentence. The statement of the representative of Greece, which should be accepted unquestioned, showed, however, that the execution of the death penalty had been suspended. That being so, the Polish proposal was exclusively political in nature. It was important to note that, in spite of the war, Greece had been able to maintain intact a juridical system which did it honour.

66. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) regretted that the Colombian representative had withdrawn his support of the Polish resolution and that the United Kingdom representative had made reservations. He added that the reasons for which the Polish draft resolution had been submitted were still valid since the statements by Mr. Pipinelis on the death sentence of Mrs. Zevgos and on the suspension of her execution ought to be regarded with caution. He pointed out that during the third session of the Assembly he had submitted a similar resolution (A/C.1/353) which had been rejected² because the fate threatening the accused had been claimed to be non-existent; yet the execution of two of them had been announced the following morning. To prevent a similar case the Polish delegation wished to maintain its proposal.

67. Mr. BEBLER (Yugoslavia) did not feel reassured by the statements of the Greek representative regarding the case of Mrs. Zevgos, since Mr. Pipinelis had failed to say what action the court of appeal would take. Nor did he indicate the intentions of the Greek Government with regard to similar cases in the future. Would it be fair to victimize Mrs. Zevgos because in the view of some representatives, the Polish draft resolution was made for propaganda purposes?

68. The Yugoslav delegation had already drawn the attention of the Committee to the terror prevailing in Greece, especially in regard to the Macedonian minority, which had for a long time lived under the authority of the democratic government on territory at the moment occupied by Greek governmental troops. That was why he appealed to the Committee to forget the speeches, which had naturally failed to please everybody, and to confine themselves to the substance of the question.

69. Sir Benegal N. RAU (India), while agreeing with the humanitarian appeal of the proposal, felt that the efforts at conciliation would have a better chance if the Polish draft resolution were not adopted.

70. Mr. PIPINELIS (Greece), replying to the new accusations levelled against Greece by Mr. Bebler, observed that more numerous accusations had recently been made against Yugoslavia by States holding the same social ideals. A Bulgarian newspaper, for example, had recently accused Minister Rankovic of having sentenced hundreds of Macedonian communists from Skoplje, and the USSR had accused Yugoslavia of having instituted a reign of terror. Thus, if Yugoslavia continued its propaganda about terrorism in Greece, it would have to be recognized that terrorism also existed in Yugoslavia, Poland and Czechoslovakia.

71. He did not wish to reply to the rather un-called-for allegations of the Polish representative he did, however, wish to state that his Government was giving every proof of its sincerity and good faith by facilitating the investigations of all the United Nations organs and particularly of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans.

72. *A vote was taken by roll-call on the Polish proposal (A/C.1/483) as follows:*

73. *In favour:* Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukrainian

¹ See *Official Records of the third session of the General Assembly, Part I, First Committee, 186th meeting.*

² See *Official Records of the third session of the General Assembly, Part I, First Committee, 173rd meeting.*

Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

74. *Against:* Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Turkey, Union of

South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

75. *Abstentions:* Afghanistan, Chile, Egypt, Iran, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Yemen.

76. *The proposal was rejected by 41 votes to 6, with 9 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.

TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Lake Success, New York, on Friday, 30 September, 1949, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).

Order of an additional agenda item

1. The CHAIRMAN said that, before proceeding to the next item on the agenda, he would draw attention to document A/C.1/486 containing a letter from the President of the General Assembly with regard to the decision of the General Assembly¹ to refer to the First Committee the additional item entitled "Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of China and to the peace of the Far East, resulting from Soviet violations of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Alliance of 14 August 1945, and from Soviet violations of the Charter of the United Nations". The Chairman invited the representatives to express their views on the order in which that item should be discussed.

2. Mr. TSIANG (China) recalled that the Committee had previously adopted a decision (274th meeting) regarding the order of discussion of the six items which had been referred to it so far. His delegation had then suggested that the Committee should only decide which should be the first item to be discussed, leaving a decision on the order of the other items for later consideration. Moreover, the Chairman had stated that, should a new item be referred to the First Committee, the order of debate might be reconsidered. In view of that declaration, and since the First Committee would be soon discussing the question of the disposal of the former Italian colonies, he moved that the new item should be placed third on the Committee's agenda.

3. Mr. MANUILSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that there were considerations of a formal character militating against the motion of the representative of China. The First Committee had already discussed at length the order of its agenda and had adopted a decision regarding that order. Any change in the present order of items, therefore, would introduce some perturbation; furthermore it was impossible to discuss the new item, since no documentation had been submitted.

4. Moreover, that question had been dealt with in a number of documents which cast unfavourable light on the case of the representative of the Kuomintang Government, namely, the State Department White Paper, and General Stilwell's

papers. It would be unfortunate, and against the interests of the General Assembly to create, at the very outset, an unhealthy atmosphere by dragging the Committee into such a controversial issue. The representative of the United States, the President of the United States and the President of the General Assembly had endeavoured to christen the present General Assembly "the Assembly of peace". If the General Assembly was to deserve such a name, discussions should be held in an atmosphere of serenity.

5. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America) agreed with the first part of the remarks made by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR to the effect that the Committee was only concerned with the formal question of the order of the items on the agenda. No debate on the substance of the items involved had yet taken place. With regard to the objection raised as to the absence of material on the proposed item, that objection applied equally to the proposal of the Soviet Union. He recalled that Mr. Austin had already proposed that all items suggested for inclusion on the agenda should be supported by preliminary evidence; that proposal had not been adopted and the representative of the USSR had opposed it. Therefore, the Committee was in the position of having to deal with the placing of an item on its agenda without having any previous documentation pertaining to the case. His delegation believed that Member States were entitled to raise international questions for discussion by the General Assembly.

6. As to the order on the agenda of the Chinese motion, the representative of the Ukrainian SSR had alleged that such a motion might envenom the discussion. In that connexion it should be recalled that the first paragraph of the Soviet Union proposal (A/996) might also be described as somewhat provocative and not conducive to an atmosphere of peaceful discussions. Finally, it should be noted that the item proposed by the USSR referred to a peace pact to be concluded between the five permanent members of the Security Council and that the relations between two of those Powers were pertinent to the discussion of that item. In view of the above considerations, his delegation favoured the motion presented by the representative of China.

7. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) noted that the First Committee had already considered seriously and in detail the order

¹ See *Official Records of the fourth session of the General Assembly*, 230th plenary meeting.