

# GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



# 351st PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 7 December 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

## CONTENTS

	Page
Credentials of representatives : report of the Credential Committee (A/1938)...	211
Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece : (a) report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans ; (b) repatriation of Greek children : report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Political Committee (A/1984 and Corr.1).	214
Consideration of the various items on the agenda of the meeting.....	214
Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece ( <i>concluded</i> ).	215
Question of the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council : report of the Fourth Committee (A/1990) .....	220

*President* : Mr. Luis PADILLA NERVO (Mexico).

*In the absence of the President, Sir Gladwyn Jebb (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Vice-President, presided.*

### Credentials of representatives : report of the Credential Committee (A/1983)

*Mr. Costa du Rels (Bolivia), Chairman, presented the report of the Credentials Committee (A/1983).*

1. The PRESIDENT : As regards the draft resolution submitted by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (A/1996), I propose, with your permission, to make a short statement.

2. The Assembly will recall that, as already stated by the Chairman of the Credentials Committee, on 13 November [342nd meeting] it adopted a recommendation of the General Committee, the effect of which was that the Assembly decided " to postpone consideration, for the duration of the meeting in Paris of the sixth regular session, of any further proposals to exclude representatives of the National Government of China from the Assembly, or to seat representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to represent China in the Assembly ".

3. In view of that resolution of the Assembly, I have no doubt that it would be possible for me to rule that the Byelorussian draft resolution is out of order and consequently, not to permit it to be discussed at all. It would, I repeat, be possible for me to do that. However, in view of the fact that this matter, as we all know, raises deep feelings on both sides in the Assembly, and seeing—if I may add this—that I am, after all, only your Acting President, I have decided not to take this perhaps somewhat drastic line, but rather to assume, as I think I legitimately may, that what our Byelorussian colleague will be doing when he introduces his draft resolution is to move for a reconsideration of the Assembly's resolution of 13 November

to which I have referred. That is what I shall assume that he, in effect, is doing.

4. I, therefore, propose, if there is no objection, to ask him to come up to the rostrum as soon as I have finished my remarks in order to make his speech, which I can only hope will not be simply a repetition of all the old arguments which we have heard so many times, but rather will be limited to explaining why, in his opinion—that is to say, in the opinion of our Byelorussian colleague—a new situation has now arisen, if indeed he thinks a new situation has arisen. When he has finished his speech I shall, under rule 82 of our rules of procedure, call upon two speakers opposing the presumed motion for reconsideration. When these two speakers have been heard opposing the presumed motion for reconsideration, we shall, I suggest, immediately proceed to a vote on the Byelorussian motion for reconsideration, and if that fails to obtain a two-thirds majority we shall immediately begin consideration of the second item on our agenda [item 19].

5. Unless there is objection to my suggestion, I propose to call upon the representative of the Byelorussian SSR.

6. Mr. KISELYOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The Byelorussian delegation pointed out at the meeting of the Credentials Committee, of which it is a member, that the credentials of the Kuomintang representatives could not be recognized as valid since those representatives had been appointed by a group of bankrupt politicians who represent no one. The so-called government of the Kuomintang which was expelled by the Chinese people and has taken refuge on the island of Taiwan, is no longer the legitimate government representing the Chinese people.

7. The Kuomintang group has now long since lost governmental authority and control over the territory and people of China and has at the same time lost all moral and legal right to speak in the United Nations in the name of China.

8. It is well known that the true and lawful representative of the Chinese people is the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, which exercises governmental authority over the whole territory of China and enjoys very wide support by the Chinese people.

9. In view of the fact that the credentials of the Kuomintang representatives were issued—I emphasize this point—and signed by a private individual and on behalf of a group of persons who represent no one, and taking into consideration the fact that this is not permissible under rule 27 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure, the Byelorussian delegation submits for consideration by the General Assembly a draft resolution calling upon the Assembly not to recognize the credentials of the representatives of the so-called Kuomintang government at the sixth session of the General Assembly.

10. Permit me to read out this draft resolution [A/1996].  
"The General Assembly,

"Having considered the proposal of the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR on the non-recognition of the credentials of the representatives of the Kuomintang, Chiang Kai-shek Government at the sixth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations,

"Resolves to regard as invalid the credentials of the representatives of the so-called Kuomintang Government to the sixth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations since these credentials do not satisfy the requirements of rule 27 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly."

11. The PRESIDENT: In spite of the fact that the representative of the Byelorussian SSR has not actually said that his motion is a motion for reconsideration I shall so consider it. I shall now hear, if they so desire, two representatives who will speak on the other side, that is to say against the presumed motion for reconsideration.

12. Mr. TSIANG (China): As this issue has been debated several times during even this present session, and as the representative of the Byelorussian SSR had nothing new to say, I shall confine my remarks to an examination of the terms of his draft resolution, the operative part of which is based on rule 27 of our rules of procedure.

13. The Chairman of the Credentials Committee reported to us that his Committee had examined the credentials of all the delegations to the present session of the General Assembly, with particular reference to rule 27. The Byelorussian SSR representative thinks that the Committee is wrong and that he is right in the application of rule 27, but I have no doubt that the General Assembly will repose faith in the findings of the Credentials Committee rather than in the arbitrary statement of the Byelorussian SSR representative. In the first part of his draft resolution he uses this phrase: "the representatives of the Kuomintang, Chiang Kai-shek Government". Is that an accurate description, and, if it were accurate, is that a reason for this Assembly to declare the credentials of my delegation invalid?

14. The Byelorussian SSR representative says my delegation is composed of representatives of the Kuomintang. As a matter of fact my Government is a coalition government composed of three different parties, but even if his description were correct, and the Government I represent were only a Kuomintang government, has this General Assembly any reason to discredit my position on that account? Not at all. This phrase "Kuomintang" literally means "Citizens Party". It was founded by

Dr. Sun Yat-sen, one of the greatest statesmen of the modern period who overthrew autocracy in China and established the Republic. Since the death of Dr. Sun Yat-sen the Kuomintang has been led by President Chiang Kai-shek and under his leadership this Government has continued to carry out the political principles of Dr. Sun Yat-sen. I do not wish to take advantage of the present occasion to give you a long history of it; let me only remind you of certain very recent facts.

15. It was the Government led by President Chiang Kai-shek which resisted Japanese aggression. The world today must realize the great service which that resistance to Japan meant, not only to the people of China but to all the peoples of the world. In the winter of 1936 the great newspapers of Moscow, *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, acknowledged that it was only President Chiang Kai-shek who could lead China to resist Japanese aggression. As late as 1945 the Government of the Soviet Union thought it right and proper to conclude with the Government of President Chiang Kai-shek a treaty of friendship and alliance, promising Soviet moral and material support to President Chiang Kai-shek's Government.

16. These events are fresh in our minds. Today, to say that my Government should be excluded from this General Assembly of the United Nations and that the so-called Central People's Government should be included can have only one meaning, and that is to further the communist domination of the world.

17. Mr. GROSS (United States of America): I think that the question before us is that of reconsideration of the action by the General Assembly on 13 November, and I take it that that is the only subject which is under discussion. Speaking for my delegation I should, nevertheless, like to express the thought that, as the President has pointed out, this matter could have been dealt with on a point of order. We do wish, however, to meet the problem which is now before us, namely, whether there is any reason why the Assembly should reconsider the action so recently taken.

18. It is clear, I think, that no reason has been raised before this Assembly which would justify such reconsideration. There is no change in the situation, and none has been set forth by the representative of the Byelorussian SSR in submitting his draft resolution. The situation today is precisely the same as it was on 13 November when the decision was taken to postpone, for the duration of the meeting of the sixth session of the General Assembly in Paris, consideration of any further proposals to exclude representatives of the National Government of China from the Assembly. As I have said, the situation on that day was precisely the same as the situation now. There still exists an aggression against the United Nations; there still exists precisely the situation which impelled the Assembly to decide on 13 November to postpone consideration of the question for the duration of the present session.

19. My delegation opposes the motion to reconsider, and believes that there is no reason before the General Assembly to justify any consideration of the question at all.

20. The PRESIDENT: I shall now read out the text of rule 82, which is as follows:

"When a proposal has been adopted or rejected it may not be reconsidered at the same session unless the General Assembly, by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting, so decides. Permission to speak on a motion to reconsider shall be accorded only to two speakers opposing the motion, after which it shall be immediately put to the vote."

21. I therefore propose that we should now proceed to a vote. Before doing so, however, I call upon the representative of the USSR, who has indicated his desire to raise a point of order.

22. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Of course, the President has the right to call attention to the broad powers possessed by the Chair, although the representatives here are entirely familiar with them. However, representatives have the right to believe that the President's powers are set down in the General Assembly's rules of procedure, in order to facilitate the consideration of questions before the Assembly and the explanation of viewpoints on the question now being considered by the Assembly in plenary meeting, and not in order to enable only one side to express its opinion while depriving the other of an opportunity to do so.

23. If that is the way in which the President of the Assembly is going to be guided by the rules of procedure, there are bound to be repercussions on the course of our discussion. I would therefore ask to be given an opportunity to explain my vote on the report of the Credentials Committee if a vote is about to be taken.

24. The PRESIDENT: I am sorry, but in my view, quite irrespective of the wide powers which the representative of the Soviet Union says are attributed to the President of the General Assembly or his representative, rule 82 is entirely clear. It does not permit explanations of vote; it merely says: "Permission to speak on a motion to reconsider shall be accorded only to two speakers opposing the motion, after which it shall be immediately put to the vote." I rule that that is the clear meaning of rule 82.

25. If that is disputed, or if the representative of the Soviet Union thinks I am wrong, I am perfectly willing to put my ruling to the Assembly now. That is not abusing in any way the powers of the Chair. I am willing to put my ruling to a vote of the General Assembly and shall do so now if the representative of the Soviet Union so desires.

26. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): When representatives are given the opportunity to explain the reasons for their votes on the Committee's report, I request to be given the floor, as I wish to speak on that report and explain the reasons for my vote.

27. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the USSR is not speaking on the report of the Credentials Committee. Had he intended to do so he would have come to the rostrum immediately after the representative of Bolivia had concluded his remarks, but I had no intimation at all that the representative of the USSR wished to speak on that matter.

28. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Before voting on the Committee's report, I am asking to be given an opportunity to speak on the reasons for my vote, since the report has to be put to the vote.

29. The PRESIDENT: If that is the request of the representative of the Soviet Union, I shall immediately put it to the Assembly. We shall now vote upon the proposal that the representative of the Soviet Union should be permitted to explain his vote.

*The proposal was rejected by 20 votes to 7, with 20 abstentions.*

30. The PRESIDENT: I am very sorry, but apparently only seven Members of the General Assembly would like

to hear the representative of the Soviet Union explain his vote, twenty are opposed and twenty have abstained. It is, therefore, not the humble representative of the President of the Assembly but the Assembly itself which does not want Mr. Malik to explain his vote.

31. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I note that the Anglo-American bloc at the plenary meeting of the Assembly prevents the delegations which disagree with it on the Chinese question from expressing their opinion on this question.

32. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on the proposal to reconsider submitted by the representative of the Byelorussian SSR.

*The proposal was rejected by 39 votes to 7, with 4 abstentions.*

33. The PRESIDENT: We shall now pass on to the second item on our agenda [*item 19*].

34. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*speaking from the floor*): A point of order, I request a vote on the report of the Committee.

35. The PRESIDENT: Very well, we shall take a vote on the report of the Credentials Committee.

36. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*speaking from the floor*): And I request permission to speak in order to explain my vote.

37. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has already dealt with the report of the Credentials Committee, and there was no debate, but if the representative of the Soviet Union requests a vote on the report itself I shall put the report to a vote.

38. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*speaking from the floor*) (*translated from Russian*): I insist on being given the floor to explain my vote.

39. The PRESIDENT: I am unable to accept explanations of votes on the report of the Credentials Committee.

40. We shall now proceed to vote on the report.

41. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) (*speaking from the floor*): A point of order.

42. The PRESIDENT: A vote is being taken.

*The report of the Credentials Committee was adopted by 32 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions.*

43. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*speaking from the floor*): A point of order.

44. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Soviet Union has already said that he wishes to speak on the Byelorussian SSR draft resolution. The Assembly has said that it does not want to hear the explanation of vote of the USSR representative or any other representative on that matter. Consequently, I suggest that the Assembly now wishes to pass on to the second item on our agenda, and it will pass on to that item unless there are any objections.

45. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*speaking from the floor*): A point of order.

46. The PRESIDENT: No point of order arises. We shall vote on my proposal to pass on to the second item [*item 19*].

*The proposal was adopted by 21 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions.*

47. The PRESIDENT : We shall pass on to the second item [item 19].

48. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) (*speaking from the floor*) : A point of order.

49. The PRESIDENT : Does the point of order concern the question we have just decided ? A point of order cannot be raised on an item which has not arisen. Does it relate to the Credentials Committee ?

50. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) (*speaking from the floor*) : It is in reference to the question of voting and discussion. It is in connexion with the conduct of the debate.

51. The PRESIDENT : In that case it is out of order, because we have already decided to go on to our next item.

52. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) (*speaking from the floor*) : Surely I can intervene on a point of order.

53. The PRESIDENT : I do not agree, nor would Mr. Padilla Nervo if he were here.

**Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece : (a) report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans ; (b) repatriation of Greek children : report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (A/1984 and Corr.1)**

[*Agenda item 19*]

54. Mrs. SEKANINOVA-CAKARTOVA (Czechoslovakia) (*speaking from the floor*) : A point of order on this item.

55. The PRESIDENT : A point of order cannot be raised before the Assembly has heard the Rapporteur.

56. Mr. SEVILLA SACASA (Nicaragua), Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (*translated from Spanish*) : You have before you the report [A/1984 and Corr. 1] which, as Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, I have the honour to submit for your consideration. The report contains the Committee's recommendations regarding item 19 of our agenda : "Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece". In entering upon such a delicate task, I should like to make a few brief remarks regarding the course taken by the discussion of this important item in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

57. As you will have noticed, item 19 is divided into two parts. The first deals with the report of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans, and the second with the reports of the Secretary-General and of the international Red Cross organizations on the repatriation of Greek children."

58. The Committee's work on the second part of the item has not yet been completed. The final report will be submitted to you when various consultations recommended by the Committee have been completed. In this connexion, and with regard to the repatriation of Greeks of full age, the Greek representative stated that he reserved the right to speak at a later stage when the matter was discussed in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. On this occasion I shall therefore confine my remarks to the action so far taken by the Committee on item 19.

59. I shall now deal with the first part of the report which is directly concerned with UNSCOB.

60. The *Ad Hoc* Political Committee has recommended the adoption of two draft resolutions reflecting the view of the great majority of delegations which, while agreeing that the crisis in the Balkans has diminished, believe that the situation in that area must continue to be watched closely by the United Nations.

61. Except for a few representatives who held that it was desirable to terminate UNSCOB immediately and that there was no need to set up any authority whatsoever to succeed it, the majority view expressed in the discussion was that under these circumstances the United Nations should not interrupt its constant observations of the situation in the Balkans, but should on the contrary establish new machinery to replace UNSCOB and continue observation in that area, in accordance with the new developments of the situation in the Balkans.

62. Draft resolution B, approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee on 23 November 1951 requests the Peace Observation Commission, set up under the "Uniting for peace" resolution [377 B (V)] of 3 November 1950, to establish a Balkan sub-commission. Under this draft resolution, which is based on the draft resolution submitted jointly by the delegations of France, Greece, Mexico, the United Kingdom and the United States, the Balkan sub-commission will have authority : first, to despatch such observers as it may deem necessary to any area of international tension in the Balkans on the request of any State or States concerned, but only to the territory of States consenting thereto ; secondly, to visit, if it deems necessary, any area in which observation requested under the preceding paragraph is being conducted ; and thirdly, to consider such data as may be submitted to it by its members or observers and to make such reports as it deems necessary to the Peace Observation Commission and to the Secretary-General for the information of Member States.

63. I feel that I should point out to the Assembly that in the discussion in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee it was clearly brought out that the proposal for the establishment of a Balkan sub-commission, for purposes very similar to those of UNSCOB, was adopted because it is required by the new development in the situation in the Balkans.

64. In concluding these brief remarks, I feel it is my duty to repeat the deserved tributes which were paid, during the discussion in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, to the noble and untiring efforts of the members of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans which culminated, as is universally recognized, in a splendid and fruitful work of international conciliation.

**Consideration of the various items on the agenda of the meeting**

65. The PRESIDENT : I think at this point I must consult the Assembly on the application of rule 67 of the rules of procedure. Rule 67 reads :

"Discussion of a report of a Main Committee in a plenary meeting of the General Assembly shall take place if at least one-third of the Members present and voting at the plenary meeting consider such a discussion to be necessary. Any proposal to this effect shall not be debated, but shall be immediately put to the vote."

66. The second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth items on the agenda of this meeting [items 19, 55, 36, 39 and 48] are all reports of Main Committees. I propose to ask the Assembly, in relation to each one separately, whether it desires to have a debate on that item.

67. I shall now ask the Assembly to vote on whether it desires to hold a debate on the second item [item 19].

*By 21 votes to 1, with 18 abstentions, it was decided not to hold a debate on the second item [item 19].*

68. The PRESIDENT: There will, therefore, be no debate on the second item.

69. Perhaps I should add at this point that, in accordance with precedent, even if there is no debate it is open to any representative to explain his vote, either before or after the vote is taken. However, also in accordance with precedent, I think I should be right in limiting such interventions to seven minutes. Unless there is any objection, I shall assume that that proposal is agreeable to the Assembly.

*It was so decided.*

*By 23 votes to none, with 19 abstentions, it was decided not to hold a debate on the third item [item 55].*

*It was decided not to hold a debate on the fourth, fifth and sixth items [items 36, 39 and 48].*

70. The PRESIDENT: In that case we shall have no debate on any of these items, and we shall simply proceed to the vote unless any representative wishes to explain his vote.

71. On the second item [item 19] I think that the representative of the Soviet Union wishes to explain his vote.

### **Threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece (concluded)**

[Agenda item 19]

72. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): At every session of the General Assembly from 1948 onwards, during the discussion on the reports of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans, the USSR delegation and a number of other delegations have carefully analyzed both the Committee's reports and their appended material.

73. With the aid of facts taken from the Committee's reports themselves and their appended material, the USSR delegation on each occasion exposed the complete worthlessness of the attempts of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans to slander Greece's neighbours, Albania and Bulgaria. The USSR delegation pointed out that the Special Committee, in its endeavour to accuse the People's Democracies, had not shrunk from obvious falsifications and distortion of fact, and had made use of false evidence tendered by various types of traitors, turncoats, deserters and other persons who had fled from the People's Democracies to escape the consequences of crimes they had committed.

74. The United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans, as was incontrovertibly proved by an analysis of the material in its report,<sup>1</sup> had no authentic facts whatever which could in any way bear out, or support, the charge made against Albania and Bulgaria by Greece that those countries were threatening its political independence and territorial integrity.

75. The worthlessness of these charges is now obvious even to those who were previously inclined to believe such slanders and fabrications on the part of the Committee.

76. The discussion which took place on the report of the United Nations Special Committee in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee during the present session has been typical in this respect.

77. Not one of the speakers, apart from the delegations of the USSR and the Peoples' Democracies, so much as attempted to touch the substance of the Special Committee's report, and not one of them tried to examine the material it contained from a critical point of view. Even the most ardent defenders of the Special Committee confined themselves to stating that they had confidence in the report and did not intend to make a close scrutiny of the material and "proofs" which it contained. Many of the representatives were, however, obliged to admit that there was no threat on the part of Albania and Bulgaria to the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece.

78. Placed in a rather difficult position and unable to sustain their slanderous charges against Albania and Bulgaria and the other Peoples' Democracies, the Anglo-American directors of the Special Committee were obliged to accept its discontinuance. But they thereupon resorted to a new and highly dubious manoeuvre: they submitted a proposal for the establishment of a so-called Balkan sub-commission. The "reason" they gave for setting it up was that "the situation in the Balkans may require prompt establishment of observation" as contemplated in the Anglo-American draft resolution. This "reason" gave away the Anglo-American authors of the resolution completely and showed their real aggressive designs in the Balkans; they need a Balkan sub-commission to act as a cloak for those designs.

79. In the light of experience gained from a study of the Special Committee's activities, it is obvious that the American proposal to establish a Balkan sub-commission has a quite definite aggressive motive. It is intended to extend the United States' sphere of intervention in the Balkans, an intervention which could promote tension in international relations without contributing in any way to the settlement of the Greek question. It is impossible to settle the Greek question unless the United States' intervention in the internal affairs of Greece is brought to an end.

80. The USSR delegation in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee produced more than enough data from both Greek and American sources showing gross intervention on the part of the United States in all Greece's internal and external affairs. By its intervention in Greek affairs the United States of America has violated Greek sovereignty and has upset the country's economy, which is now subordinated to the interests of the American monopolies, while the territory of Greece is being turned into a jumping-off ground and military base for American sea, land and air forces.

81. In order to suppress democratic and patriotic movements in Greece, which the United States sees as a threat to its dominance in that country, it is inspiring unbridled political terrorism, which has been raging in Greece for the past five years.

82. The resolutions adopted at earlier sessions of the General Assembly recognizing the necessity for the cessation of death sentences in Greece, have been ignored by the American powers controlling Greece and by the Greek Government. The terror in Greece is not dying down but actually assuming still larger proportions. Death sentences pronounced by special military courts are steadily increasing. Only three weeks ago the military court in

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixth Session, Supplement No. 11.*

Athens passed twelve new sentences of death on Greek democrats, patriots. It is clear that the present situation in Greece can not be described as normal.

83. The first prerequisite for settlement of the Greek problem is the elimination of the main causes for the presence of that item on the General Assembly's agenda, that is to say: cessation of intervention by the United States of America in the internal affairs of Greece; cessation of terrorism; declaration of a general amnesty in Greece; abolition of concentration camps for Greek democrats and annulment of all death sentences passed by Greek courts on Greek democrats, including the death sentences on twelve Greek patriots passed by the extraordinary military tribunal in Athens on 16 November 1951.

84. The Greek representative, in a statement in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, has tried to mislead the other delegations in the Committee by declaring in very vague and deliberately obscure terms that the condemned men might perhaps, as he put it, not be put to death. This deliberate vagueness on the part of the Greek representative, however, merely increases the anxiety of all honest people throughout the world about the fate of these democrats, whose lives may be forfeit at any moment.

85. In view of all this the USSR delegation believes that the draft resolutions contained in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee are unacceptable, since they do not solve a single one of the problems we have mentioned.

86. The USSR delegation appeals to the Assembly to adopt the draft resolution which it has submitted [A/1989]. Its adoption could result in a return to normal conditions in Greece, in the saving of the Greek patriots sentenced to death and in the restoration of Greece's sovereignty, which has been grossly violated by United States intervention in its internal affairs.

87. The PRESIDENT: I call upon the representative of Poland to explain his vote.

88. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland): During the discussion before the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, my delegation gave a thorough analysis of the report of UNSCOB. We proved that the report is based completely on fabricated information collected from men to whom no one could pay any attention. We proved that UNSCOB only tried to cover up the American intervention as well as the aggressive desires of the Greek Government towards its neighbours, while not paying any attention to what is really going on in Greece, to what really constitutes a threat to the political independence and integrity of Greece. We proved that, while exaggerating minor frontier incidents which have been mostly provoked or fabricated by the Royal Police or by the Royal Gendarmerie, they paid no attention to the war cries raised by various representatives of the Greek Government calling for the seizure of territories belonging, for example, to Albania. We proved beyond any doubt that the aim of that Special Committee was to cover up the aggressive desires which the United States has in that part of the world, desires which started with the introduction of the Truman Doctrine and brought about, after four years existence of the Special Committee, the total subjugation of Greece in the political, economic and military sense.

89. In this situation, the attention of the General Assembly should turn towards the internal situation in Greece and towards those factors which really threaten the independence of that country. In this situation, it is not sufficient to accept a dissolution of that unhappy Committee which

played such a sad role in the history of our Organization and a much sadder role in the history of Greece. It is necessary to take further steps which would protect the Greek people, which would eliminate the danger spots in the Balkans and which would ensure that no threat of war or of aggression will come from that part of the world.

90. Today we know that the Greek people vehemently dissociate themselves from the aggressive desires of both the Greek Government and its American masters. We know that, following the great traditions of their heroic struggle against occupation, they fight for the independence of their country, they fight against foreign subjugation of their country, and they fight for the maintenance of democratic traditions in Greece. Time after time in the debates this year, as in past years, names like Manolis Clezos, Belyannis, Ambatlelos and General Sarafis came up in the debates as men who played a great role in the struggle for independence during the Nazi occupation, and who continue to play their role now in spite of imprisonment, in spite of the reign of terror and in spite of their sufferings. The Greek people dissociate themselves from aggressive designs wherever they are, both in Greece and in Cyprus.

91. Today we have before the Assembly only one resolution which can effect a real solution to the problem which has been on our agenda for many years. That resolution is the one which has been submitted by the USSR, which alone calls for the cessation of foreign intervention, which alone calls for the cessation of the terror, and which alone can bring peace to that unhappy part of the world.

92. We wish to draw the attention of this Assembly to the fact that one of the resolutions, that is to say the resolution which proposes to institute immediately a sub-commission to deal specifically with the Balkans, is but another attempt to bring about new forms of foreign intervention which would spread the war not only into Greece but all over the Balkans. These aggressive designs have been confirmed by many speeches. These aggressive designs are confirmed by the many statements which have been made both within the General Assembly and outside the General Assembly.

93. We call upon the Assembly, while agreeing to the immediate dissolution of UNSCOB, to oppose the creation of that sub-commission and to adopt the resolution submitted by the Soviet Union as being the only solution to the present situation in Greece.

94. Mr. POLITIS (Greece) (*translated from French*): The USSR representative has just made an accusation against Greece which our people might well resent as an insult. He did not weigh his words. He spoke light-heartedly of Greece as a country of terror. He even spoke—and that, I must tell him, was another blunder—of concentration camps.

95. This constantly recurring accusation of a state of terror in other countries is a sort of old refrain, not to say a threadbare slogan, in which only the representatives of the USSR and the People's Democracies find delight. Every year, during the General Assembly they look for every possible opportunity to talk of the state of terror in other countries, so much so that one might be tempted to believe they are obsessed with the idea of terror.

96. Why is that? Everyone knows that the countries beyond what is, by common agreement, called the Iron Curtain are the very throne of terror. In them terror is the only foundation of established authority and the principal instrument for its exercise. Time does not permit me to

paint in the details. But everyone is aware of the fact, and anyone who might still have any doubts on the subject need only consult the records of those congresses of a special type recently held in Brussels, Dijon and Milan (the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions) where this question too was dealt with. They provide most edifying accounts of the atrocities committed in that region, accounts given by the refugees who are constantly escaping from those parts and who all speak from experience. Since terror is an asset of the Soviet Union, I can assure the USSR representative that I have no desire to claim the slightest share in it for my country.

97. Furthermore, if the USSR representative feels any anxiety of that sort, why should he not do us the honour of visiting our country? He could bring with him any of his colleagues who share his anxiety; Mr. Tsarapkin, in particular, who is so greatly concerned about the devastating effects of the Marshall Plan on our national economy, should be interested. We guarantee them perfect safety during their stay. They would have an opportunity to see what is happening in our country and would cease to labour under the delusion which now afflicts them. They could see for themselves the state of things in Greece and thus form an opinion. They would see not only that Greece is not a country of terror, but that it is a country where freedom is often abused, as is proved by the fact that these inmates of our prisons all keep up a steady correspondence, sometimes even by telegraph, with Mr. Vyshinsky, Mr. Tsarapkin and the Polish representative who spoke just now. Day by day and hour by hour they keep them informed of their wishes and ask them to intervene to save them from justice. Is there anyone in this hall who imagines that that would be possible for prisoners in the gaols of Moscow?

98. In any case, the true motive for the tendentious statements of these delegations is definitely not that which they allege, the humanitarian principle. It would have been more natural for anyone who was moved by humanitarian sentiments to sympathize with the twelve million innocent victims dying a lingering death in prisons and forced labour camps, than to lament the fate of the two, five or ten criminals mentioned in Mr. Vyshinsky's letters, criminals whose lives are not at stake although they are all guilty of high treason, armed rebellion and non-political crimes, and are not merely opponents of the party in power as was the case in those celebrated Moscow trials, where the prosecutor demanded that the men accused of that petty misdemeanour should all be shot, just as they were, and obtained his wish.

99. Every year we are treated to this grotesque performance. Every year we are subjected to this wearisome debate on the state of terror in other countries; we all know the tendentious purpose for which it is served up to us.

100. Last year, at least a month before the opening of the Assembly, the USSR delegation laid down a preparatory barrage, as the military phrase goes. It opened fire with a request to the Security Council, couched in most moving terms and purporting to be an attempt to save the lives of twenty persons whose execution was alleged to be imminent. Those making the request knew quite well, even while they were assuming such a woeful mien, that their motives were not those they alleged. They knew quite well that all the persons concerned had the benefit of the measures of clemency in force in my country. Despite that, they dragged their request from the Security Council to the General Committee of the Assembly and thence to a plenary meeting, then to the First Committee and finally back to the Assembly in plenary meeting again. At all points their request was

rejected and for a good reason: not one—I repeat, not one—of those twenty persons was ever executed.

101. Though the spite and dishonesty that actuate them stand clearly revealed, they will not let go. Once again this year they came back to the charge with a new request. If they are to be believed, eleven persons are at death's door. There is hardly time to rescue them. And it is all the more important to save them because they are patriots fighting for democracy and peace.

102. In that connexion allow me to demonstrate to you how they are fighting for democracy and peace by giving you a short life history of the leader of the gang.

103. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I must point out to the speaker that his time is limited to seven minutes.

104. Mr. POLITIS (Greece) (*translated from French*): I have the sacred duty of legitimate self-defence. My country has been accused. It has been called a country of terror. I ask permission to reply to that accusation.

105. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has decided on what I recommended in principle, namely, that speeches must be limited to seven minutes. I do not mind a minute or two here and there but I should like to recall that you have already spoken for eight minutes. I will allow you another two or three minutes if you like.

106. Mr. POLITIS (Greece) (*translated from French*): The time limit applies to explanations of votes. An explanation of a vote is not an accusation and I am bound to defend my country when it is attacked.

107. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly decided on seven minutes but if you would like me to ask if you can have longer, I shall do so. Otherwise you can only speak for another two minutes.

108. Mr. POLITIS (Greece) (*translated from French*): Well then, this is who Mr. Beloyannis is. He is a gang leader and political commissar of a subversive organization in the Peloponnese. He has been convicted of crimes against the State and non-political crimes. He has committed pillage, arson and massacre. He is a hardened terrorist. An accredited agent of his subversive organization, he fled from Greece after the collapse of his terrorist empire in the Peloponnese. Some two years later he returned secretly under another name with an Argentine passport and a quantity of gold currency. He is trying to build up his staff again and to resume his career of crime.

109. Those are the patriots, the champions of peace, who are to be saved. What a lie! For this time too they know just as well as they knew last year that these eleven men are benefitting by the same measures of leniency as those other convicts and that the Greek Government has even issued a solemn declaration with regard to them. They know all that, but the Cominform must needs throw dust in the eyes of the world. It must at all costs talk of the state of terror in other countries, to divert attention from the communist terror.

110. That reminds me of what the Public Prosecutor of the USSR said of Radek during the famous Moscow trials. He said that Radek was acting like those hardened criminals who cry "stop thief" in order to escape from the police. I say to the USSR representatives that such wiles are of no avail. Truth will always out in this court. And since it must be so, I will expound the truth in a few words.

111. The Soviet Union conceived long ago its plan for subjecting Greece to communist rule. To that end all the European countries, where its influence is paramount, were cunningly mobilized. The reports of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans itself bear out this fact. The lowest dregs of society were carefully recruited and enlisted in that horde of demons and furies that over-ran Greece and everywhere unleashed a storm of hatred and bloody riot. Innocent people were tortured, hanged or shot in the market place without any kind of trial, on a simple order from the political commissars. Robbery, arson and massacre, the rape of women and children under age, were their principal weapons. Nothing was respected, neither property nor faith, nor human life. There were more than 100,000 victims, many of them decapitated by the emissaries of the Cominform, doubtless in the name of peace and democracy, with old tin cans, a specially sadistic feature designed to heighten the terror they brought upon us. And now that this torment from hell has been broken on the indomitable resistance of the Greek people, there are some who come here and shed tears over the sad lot of the perpetrators of those noble deeds, of the very folk appointed as leaders in the whole sinister business. And they dare thus defy morality, and flout the principles of our Charter, when a great-hearted and peace-loving people has already extended its mercy even to those who committed these frightful outrages.

112. You will, I feel sure, agree that it is entirely inadmissible that those who bear the main responsibility for these disgusting acts should come to this platform and lecture honestly democratic nations on human rights and humanitarian principles. It is high time to put a stop to such trickery. That is my reply to the speech you have just heard.

113. Greece will vote in favour of the two draft resolutions presented by the Committee.

114. The PRESIDENT: However provoked representatives may feel, in the interests of the expedition of business I would urge them if possible to confine their explanation of votes to seven minutes. Anything between seven and ten minutes would, I imagine, meet the desire of the Assembly, but we should not go on longer than that.

115. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): When the draft resolution submitted by the Greek delegation and the joint draft resolution of the five countries, France, Greece, Mexico, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, were discussed, the Ukrainian delegation pointed out that there were no grounds whatever for an examination of the so-called Greek question if the relations between Greece and its northern neighbours, Albania and Bulgaria, were borne in mind.

116. There is no foundation whatever for the accusations levied against Albania and Bulgaria, or against Hungary, Romania, Poland and Czechoslovakia, to the effect that those countries are threatening the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece. Such trumped up accusations are used to slander the People's Democracies and to increase the existing tension in the Balkans.

117. The Greek delegation has tried once again here in the General Assembly to bring slanderous accusations against the USSR. The USSR delegation and the delegations of the People's Democracies have long since shown up all those insinuations for what they are worth; they are so absurd that there is no need for me to dwell on them.

118. As many facts show, the real threat to the independence of Greece comes not from the People's Democracies, but from the United States of America, which interferes in the domestic concerns of that country. That is the main cause for the situation that has arisen in Greece.

119. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans, established in violation of the Charter, merely serves as a convenient cloak for United States interference in the internal affairs of Greece. The same purpose is served by that Committee's report which has been submitted to the General Assembly, and which from beginning to end, is based on inventions and insinuations and consequently deserves no credence.

120. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will therefore vote against the approval of that report and in favour of the USSR delegation's proposal that the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans should be dissolved. It goes without saying that we protest against and will also vote against the proposal to set up a Balkan sub-commission instead of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans since the aggressive character of that proposal is beyond doubt.

121. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic whole-heartedly supports and will vote in favour of the draft resolution [A/1989] submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The adoption of that draft resolution cannot but help restore the situation in Greece to normal and strengthen peace in the Balkans since it recommends such important and vital measures as the cessation of interference in the affairs of Greece by the United States of America, the declaration in Greece of a general armistice, the suppression of concentration camps for Greek democrats, the annulment of all death sentences passed by Greek courts on Greek democrats, the establishment of diplomatic relations between Greece and Albania and between Greece and Bulgaria, and finally, as already mentioned, the dissolution of the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans.

122. The PRESIDENT: Since I have no further requests from representatives to explain their votes, we shall now proceed to the vote. I imagine that, unless there is any objection, it will be the wish of the Assembly that I should put first to the vote the amendment to draft resolution A of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee which has been submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union, that next we should vote on the draft resolutions of the Committee, and finally that we should vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

123. Since there is no objection, we shall now vote on the amendment submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [A/1994] to draft resolution A contained in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee [A/1984 and Corr. I]. The amendment is to delete paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the draft resolution and, in paragraph 4, to delete the words "within sixty days after the adoption of the present resolution". I now put the USSR amendment to the vote.

*The amendment was rejected by 48 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.*

124. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on draft resolutions A and B which appear in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee [A/1984 and Corr. I].

*The draft resolutions were adopted by 48 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.*

125. The PRESIDENT : We now come to the draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [4/1989]. I have had a request from one representative to put this to the vote in parts : first paragraph (c) and afterwards the remainder. This will be followed by a vote on the whole.

126. Unless there is any objection to voting on paragraph (c) separately and in advance of the remainder of that draft resolution, we shall vote on paragraph (c) only.

*The paragraph was adopted by 15 votes to 10, with 20 abstentions.*

127. The PRESIDENT : We shall now vote on the remainder of the draft resolution, that is to say the whole draft resolution with the exception of paragraph (c).

*The remaining paragraphs were rejected by 37 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions.*

128. The PRESIDENT : We shall now vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

*The draft resolution as a whole was rejected by 38 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions.*

129. Mr. VAN GLABBEKE (Belgium) (*translated from French*) : My delegation feels that it should, very briefly, explain its vote, and more particularly its abstention during the separate vote on the text of paragraph (c), an abstention in no way contrary to its opposing vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

130. That abstention during the vote on paragraph (c) is explained by the consideration that while the establishment of normal diplomatic relations between neighbouring States always seems to be a highly desirable thing in itself, inclusion of such a wish in the draft resolution just rejected seemed to my delegation, in the particular case with which we are concerned, to be quite out of place, for it is absolutely impossible to envisage the establishment of normal diplomatic relations between Greece on the one hand and Bulgaria and Albania on the other hand, if only because of the fact that thousands of Greek children have been in Bulgaria for years and that that country, in spite of the successive resolutions of the General Assembly, systematically refuses to restore those children to their parents who are in Greece, and thereby declines to comply with the desire of this Assembly that those children should be repatriated to Greece. In our opinion, normal diplomatic relations cannot be established with countries which refuse to restore to a neighbouring country children who, by thousands, are being claimed by their parents.

131. Mr. PROCHAZKA (Czechoslovakia) : Allow me to explain briefly the vote of the delegation of Czechoslovakia. Concerning the report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and the draft resolution included in it, we have already, during the discussions in that Committee, stated that the Czechoslovak delegation had been from the very beginning opposed to the establishment of a Balkan committee because in our opinion the setting up of that committee, its terms of reference and all its activities, violated the sovereignty of certain countries and were therefore contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter.

132. In our opinion the United Nations Special Committee on the Balkans was set up mainly to hide as much as possible the fact that the present Greek Government has kept itself in power and is keeping itself in power mainly with the support of the Anglo-American intervention in Greece. The reports that this illegal Committee has submitted

to the United Nations General Assembly from 1948 onwards were aimed, above all, at hiding this intervention and at explaining the events in Greece on the basis of biased, prejudiced and false data, investigations and evidence, and by a preposterous statement that the People's Democracies threaten the political independence and territorial integrity of Greece.

133. Draft resolution A approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee proposes the dissolution of the Special Committee. This means that now, when the American and British imperialists have succeeded in incorporating Greece into the aggressive Atlantic bloc, the main task of the Special Committee has been fulfilled and that it is possible to proceed to new forms of misuse of the United Nations for the support of the American-British aggression in the Balkans. This is the aim of draft resolution B recommended by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, in which it is proposed to set up a new organ, a Balkan sub-commission of the Peace Observation Commission, the real task of which will, in our opinion, be to continue to cover and support further aggression in the Balkans and to accuse slanderously the People's Democracies.

134. For this reason the Czechoslovak delegation resolutely opposed the draft resolution and voted against it.

135. From what I have said it is clear that the Czechoslovak delegation favoured the dissolution of the Special Committee, but for completely different reasons from those stated in the draft resolution, namely, because from the very beginning we have considered the establishment of the Committee to be illegal and its activities harmful.

136. We do not consider, of course, that the situation in Greece is in any way satisfactory. That country, whose heroic people proved themselves so great in the fight against fascist and nazi occupation, immediately after the liberation resulting from the advance of the Soviet army on the eastern front, became a subject of imperialist intervention, first British from December 1944 and then, since the declaration of the Truman Doctrine in March 1947, mostly American. This intervention and the support which the interventionists have given to the anti-popular Greek Government caused the ensuing civil war, the merciless persecution of the democratic elements, and the present disconsolate situation of Greece.

137. A prerequisite for the settlement of the Greek situation in accordance with the interests and desires of the Greek people, and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, is, in our opinion, therefore, first of all, the termination of this intervention and the liquidation of its unfortunate consequences which would enable the Greek people to settle their internal affairs by themselves. This would at the same time contribute substantially to an improvement in the Balkan situation and to peaceful co-operation among all nations generally.

138. We take the view that this is the only way which corresponds to the spirit of the Charter, and this solution of the Greek problem was proposed in the draft resolution submitted by the USSR delegation. This draft resolution contained a number of proposals which, in our opinion, were the only ones which could contribute to the achievement of a really normal situation in Greece. The Czechoslovak delegation, therefore, voted in favour of this draft resolution.

139. The PRESIDENT : If there are no further explanations of votes, we can proceed to the next item on our agenda.

**Question of the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council : report of the Fourth Committee (A/1990)**

[*Agenda item 55*]

140. The PRESIDENT : As you will see from having read document A/1990, this is a comparatively simple, if not altogether uncontentious item ; indeed, I think the points contained in it are so obvious that the Rapporteur, Mr. Lannung of Denmark, did not feel it necessary to introduce this particular report. It can, therefore, be said to speak for itself. All the Assembly has to do, therefore, is to vote on the draft resolution which was approved by the Fourth Committee by a majority of fifty against a minority of five.

141. The representative of France has asked for an opportunity to explain his vote.

142. Mr. Maurice SCHUMANN (France) (*translated from French*) : Now that the General Assembly is called upon to decide on the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council, the French delegation prides itself on having taken an initiative which meets the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations. The Fourth Committee, by an almost unanimous vote in favour of the draft resolution before you, recognized the need to put an end to a situation which was abnormal both in law and in equity.

143. Italy was entrusted by the United Nations with the administration of the Trust Territory of Somaliland. When it accepted that task, it pledged itself to assume the responsibilities inherent in it. In that respect, Italy's obligations are identical with those of other Administering Authorities. Nevertheless, Italy does not enjoy the same powers. It is denied the right which, in itself, represents the basic counterpart of its duties, the right to vote in the Trusteeship Council. Is not that a paradox, recognized by the Council itself, a particularly unfair discrimination against a State which is fulfilling the task assigned to it to the general satisfaction and in accordance with the provisions of the Charter ?

144. The Assembly must now decide whether to prolong a situation which is hardly consistent with the discharge of the responsibilities it has itself placed upon Italy or with our common concern that our Organization should operate under the best possible conditions.

145. However, for Italy to become a member of the Trusteeship Council and take part in its work on a basis of complete equality, it must become a Member of the United Nations. That is the only course open under the terms of Article 86 of the Charter which offers a solution to the problem before us. It is merely a matter of accepting all the consequences of the decision whereby Italy became an Administering Authority on behalf of the United Nations. Are not those consequences set down in the very statement of the objectives of the Trusteeship System contained in Article 76 of the Charter ?

146. Permit me to remind you of the basic provisions of that Article.

“ The basic objectives of the Trusteeship System, in accordance with the Purposes of the United Nations... shall be :

“ a. to further international peace and security ;

“ b. to promote the political, economic, social... advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territories...

“ c. to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all...and to encourage recognition of the interdependence of the peoples of the world ; and

“ d. to ensure equal treatment in social, economic and commercial matters for all Members of the United Nations and their nationals...”

147. By confiding to Italy trusteeship over Somaliland, our Organization recognized that Italy was capable of carrying out that task. At the same time, did it not implicitly recognize that Italy fulfilled the conditions laid down in Article 4 of the Charter for admission to the United Nations ? With an amendment to the original text fortunately introduced by the Guatemalan delegation, the draft resolution you are to vote upon emphasizes that aspect of the situation. Nor am I aware—and the debate in the Fourth Committee is further proof of the fact—that anyone has ever questioned Italy's qualifications for admission to the United Nations.

148. I should like to say finally that it would be inconceivable to continue to exclude from a world organization a nation whose beneficent influence has spread far beyond its frontiers and which has made so great and inspired a contribution to the progress of civilization. The glorious past of Italy, from the time of the Roman Empire to the present day, the decisive orientation of that democratic country in the new directions it has unhesitatingly taken, are sure guarantees of the part it is to play side by side with us for the greatest benefit of the United Nations.

149. In short, the French delegation feels that the admission of Italy to the United Nations is consistent with the objectives of the Charter, necessary to the effective operation of the United Nations, and in the interests of the entire international community.

150. Mr. ZARUBIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*) : The delegation of the Soviet Union will vote against the draft resolution on the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council submitted by the Fourth Committee for the consideration of the General Assembly.

151. The question of the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council was included in the agenda of the Fourth Committee although it was clear to everybody that the Committee could not adopt any decision on the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council because Italy is not a Member of the United Nations.

152. The delegation of the Soviet Union considers that the question of the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council can be discussed only after a decision has been taken to admit Italy to membership in the United Nations. The question at issue now, therefore, is not the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council but the admission of Italy to membership in the Organization, a matter with which the Fourth Committee is not competent to deal. The rules of procedure state that the Fourth Committee has the important and clearly defined task of considering matters relating to the Trusteeship System, as laid down in Article 16 and Chapters XII and XIII of the Charter. The Committee may also consider any matters arising under Chapter XI. Under the rules of procedure, the Fourth Committee cannot discuss and still less make any decisions or recommendations on the admission of new Members to the United Nations.

153. The admission of new Members to the United Nations is regulated by a special procedure, and in particular

by Article 4 of the Charter and rules 133 to 137 inclusive of the rules of procedure. In spite of this perfectly clear provision relating to the Fourth Committee, and in spite of the procedure for admission to membership in the United Nations laid down in Article 4 of the Charter and in the rules of procedure, the Fourth Committee has approved a draft resolution in which it is recommended that the Security Council should give urgent consideration to that resolution with a view to recommending the immediate admission of Italy to membership in the United Nations.

154. In approving that draft resolution, the Committee has committed a gross breach of the rules of procedure relating to itself and the rules of procedure relating to the admission of new Members to the United Nations; furthermore, it has exceeded its powers, for the matter which the General Assembly had allocated to it was the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council, item 55 of the agenda of the General Assembly, and not the admission of new Members to the United Nations.

155. There is a second reason why the delegation of the Soviet Union cannot agree with the resolution proposed by the Fourth Committee. On 1 December 1950 the USSR delegation submitted for the consideration of the fifth session of the General Assembly a draft resolution on the admission of new Members, document A/1577.<sup>2</sup> In that draft resolution it was recommended that the Security Council should review the applications of Albania, the Mongolian People's Republic, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Finland, Italy, Portugal, Ireland, Transjordan, Austria, Ceylon and Nepal for admission to membership in the United Nations. At that time the USSR delegation pointed out that although the Soviet Union had serious reasons to object to the admission to the United Nations of some of those thirteen countries, it was prepared, in order to help to reach a solution of the question of the admission of new Members, to waive its objections to the admission of those countries provided, of course, that there was no discrimination against other countries which had every right to be admitted to membership in the Organization, since they satisfied the requirements of the Charter.

156. The Members of the General Assembly at this session are well aware that owing to the policy of discrimination in the matter of the admission of new Members pursued by the United States, France and the United Kingdom, that proposal by the USSR delegation for the admission of new Members to the Organization was not adopted.

157. Speaking in the Fourth Committee, the representatives of some delegations have alleged that the admission of Italy to membership in the Organization has hitherto been prevented by the use of the so-called veto. Such assertions are not in accordance with the facts. They are calculated to mislead public opinion by completely misrepresenting the situation. Everybody knows that the Soviet Union never objected to the admission of Italy to membership in the United Nations on equal terms with all the other States legally entitled to admission. If Italy has not so far been admitted to membership in the United Nations, it is the fault exclusively of the United States, the United Kingdom and France, which have adopted in the United Nations a quite untenable position on the matter of the admission of new Members.

158. Since the purpose of the draft resolution on the admission of Italy to membership in the United Nations

submitted by the Fourth Committee and now being considered by the General Assembly is to continue the policy of favouring some States seeking admission to membership in the United Nations and discriminating against other States which have also submitted applications, the USSR delegation objects to such discrimination and will vote against the draft resolution proposed by the Fourth Committee recommending that the Security Council should submit a recommendation on the admission of Italy to membership in the United Nations.

159. Mr. THORS (Iceland): Since the delegation of Iceland did not have the opportunity to participate in the discussion in the Fourth Committee of the item which is now before the General Assembly under the heading, "Question of the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council: report of the Fourth Committee", I should like to explain our vote in a few words.

160. My delegation desires to see Italy admitted immediately as a full Member of the United Nations, and is decidedly of the opinion that Italy satisfies the conditions laid down in Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Charter, which states:

"Membership in the United Nations is open to all... peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

161. Italy applied for membership of the United Nations several years ago, which means that Italy accepts the obligations of the Charter. No one can doubt that the present democratic Italy is a peace-loving State. Nor is there, indeed, the slightest doubt that Italy is able and willing to carry out its obligations. Why, then, keep the doors of the United Nations barred to this great nation of culture, perseverance and progress?

162. In the opinion of the Icelandic delegation, no sensible reason can be found for keeping Italy outside the United Nations. The participation of Italy in the work and deliberations of the United Nations would strengthen the Organization, and it is a serious drawback for the prestige of the United Nations that such a great nation as Italy should be barred from the Organization merely for irrelevant political reasons.

163. The United Nations will become stronger with the membership of Italy, and it is a token of weakness that Italy is not with us. The Icelandic delegation, therefore, warmly approves the resolution now before the General Assembly and hopes that the Security Council will give urgent consideration to admitting Italy to the membership of the United Nations during its present session.

164. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The General Assembly has before it a draft resolution submitted by the Fourth Committee, calling upon the Security Council to give urgent consideration to the present draft resolution with a view to recommending the immediate admission of Italy to membership in the United Nations.

165. The Ukrainian delegation has already pointed out in the Fourth Committee that consideration of the proposed draft resolution is contrary to the General Assembly's rules of procedure defining the competence of the Committees, and that the Fourth Committee is neither empowered nor competent to consider or decide such questions.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Fifth Session, Annexes, agenda item 19.

166. We wish to emphasize that the Fourth Committee's decision is directly counter to Article 4 of the Charter and to rules 133 to 137 inclusive of the rules of procedure governing the admission of new Members to the United Nations.

167. Some delegations in the Fourth Committee have expressed the view that that Committee is empowered to consider the question of the admission of Italy to the United Nations since that question is included in its agenda by decision of the General Assembly. This, however, does not correspond to the facts. The Fourth Committee's agenda did not include the question of Italy's admission to the United Nations. The item which was placed on the Fourth Committee's agenda was entitled: "Question of the full participation of Italy in the work of the Trusteeship Council". It is obvious that if it were a question of Italy's admission to the United Nations, that political question would by its very nature have been referred not to the Fourth Committee, but to the First Committee. That was the course followed by the General Assembly at its present session with regard to the admission of new Members to the United Nations, when it decided in plenary session to place these questions on the First Committee's agenda. The fact that the recommendation for Italy's admission to the United Nations has been submitted by the Fourth Committee, which is not competent to consider and decide questions relating to the admission of new Members, merely provides evidence of the attempt by a number of delegations to camouflage the discriminatory policy of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and France with regard to a number of States which have applied for admission to the United Nations.

168. In view of the fact the question of recommending the admission of Italy to the United Nations exceeds the Fourth Committee's competence, the General Assembly should, on the basis of Article 4 of the Charter and of rules 133 to 137 inclusive of the rules of procedure, reject the Fourth Committee's draft resolution. Taking this into consideration, the Ukrainian delegation will vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/1990.

169. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (*translated from Spanish*): We are all anxious to vote without delay on the question of the full participation of Italy in the work of the United Nations. I would not have spoken now about my vote, since it was explained at length in the Committee, if a legal point of great importance to the future debates of the Assembly had not arisen.

170. It has been said that the Fourth Committee was not competent, under its terms of reference, to make a recommendation to the Assembly with regard to the admission of Italy. That view is untenable in the light of Article 10 of the Charter, which confers upon the Assembly certain rights concerning the functions of any organs of the United Nations.

171. If the Fourth Committee, which is required to consider matters relating to trusteeship, finds that the functioning of trusteeship is in some ways defective because one of the Administering Authorities does not possess the necessary rights which, as the French representative very rightly said, are the counterpart of its duties and functions as an Administering Authority, the General Assembly should obviously hear the views of its Committee on the matter. Or more correctly, it is obvious that the Committee, as an organ of the Assembly, is perfectly entitled to draw the attention of the Assembly to imperfections in the functioning of an institution, so that the Assembly may not only exercise the rights conferred upon it by Article 10,

but also fulfil its duty of supervising the working of all organs forming part of the machinery or general structure of the United Nations. Hence the Fourth Committee's right to draw the Assembly's attention to any weakness or imperfection in that structure and to indicate to the Assembly the appropriate remedy, cannot be denied.

172. Furthermore, the Assembly cannot overlook the fact that it has powers concerning the admission of new Members under both Article 4 and Article 10 of the Charter.

173. The Peruvian delegation takes this opportunity, and will take any other opportunity that may arise, to draw the attention of the General Assembly to this fundamental matter: United Nations action for universal peace and welfare is based on two principles, the principle of universality and the principle of peace. Those two principles are indivisible; there can be no peace without universality and no universality without peace. Those principles are therefore the very foundation of our Organization.

174. Consequently the functioning of any organ of the United Nations—and above all the Security Council, which is the organ specifically charged with the maintenance of peace—is clearly hampered if any resolution exists which hinders the maintenance of peace, prevents the taking of measures to preserve peace, or impedes the United Nations in its main task, the achievement of universality.

175. This point is of major importance in relation to Italy. We who are friends of Italy must find real satisfaction in the thought that no legal objection was raised against that country, and that even those who exercised the veto against its admission recognized that it had all the qualifications and fulfilled all the conditions required under Article 4. Therefore, the veto against the admission of Italy was a political one, the exercise of a discretionary power which is incompatible with the spirit and letter of the Charter, for the Charter has based universality upon objective conditions and empowered the Assembly to give decisions, not opinions. And this also applies to the Security Council. Consequently, if on a given occasion the Security Council has failed to pronounce an objective and well-founded judgment, or if it has expressed an opinion or made a purely political move, the Assembly, under Article 10, is perfectly entitled to inform the Council that it is failing to conform to the Charter, because the Charter lays down specific and objective qualifications, which can be verified by evidence, concerning the requirements for candidates for admission to the United Nations.

176. That is the attitude of the Peruvian delegation. It has voted for the admission of Italy not only for the reasons eloquently expressed here by the French delegation, but it has also taken advantage—and it now wishes to remind you of this—of the fact that the Assembly is perfectly entitled to place on record that there is no legal objection to the admission of Italy, and that the maintenance of the present attitude against that country represents—and this is the essential point—a violation of the spirit of universality which, together with the defence of peace, is the main reason for the existence of the United Nations.

177. Accordingly, the Peruvian delegation consistent with the attitude it adopted in the general debate and in the Fourth Committee, reserves the right, in the event of a veto being used against the admission of Italy, to refer the matter to the Assembly again, and is glad that it is now going before the Security Council on the recommendation of the Assembly, thus clearly establishing the competence of the latter to examine the veto if it is exercised in the Security Council.

178. Furthermore, this will be a great day for the United Nations if we recommend the admission of Italy ; similarly it would be a great day for the United Nations if the Council—or, in the case of refusal by the Council, the Assembly—were to declare Italy a full Member of the United Nations.

179. If there is one country which may with full justification be said to personify the spirit of universality, it is Italy. It has done so ideologically by synthesizing Jewish thought, Greek thought and the ancient law of Latium with the political spirit of other countries and with Christian thought. It was the personification of universality in the time of the Roman Empire, in the Middle Ages and during the Renaissance ; and in the nineteenth century it represented the principle of self-determination and nationality.

180. We, the peoples of America, cannot but pay our tribute to Italy which played its part, through the great Columbus, in the discovery of our continent and whose sons have contributed with brain and hand to the prosperity of so many American nations.

181. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) : My delegation wholeheartedly supports this resolution for two reasons, the first general and the other particular.

182. The general reason is the faith of my delegation in the universality of this Organization. We believe that the door of this Organization should be opened to all peace-loving nations which wish to enter it. We believe that the veto has no place in the admission of members. We believe

that the responsibility for admitting members rests on the shoulders of this Assembly and not on the shoulders of the Security Council. The Security Council merely recommends to this Assembly but the decision as to who shall enter rests finally with this Assembly. It is in accordance with this idea of universality that we believe that Italy should enter the United Nations—not only Italy but other nations. Jordan, for instance, a peace-loving nation, could enter. Portugal, Eire, Spain and others also should enter. We should not shut the door to any peace-loving nation that deserves to enter the United Nations. This is the general reason for which we would welcome Italy to this General Assembly.

183. The particular reason is that Italy is such an important Power in the world today ; it occupies such an important position with regard to peace and strategy and economy in the world. It has such a civilizing influence that it has been entrusted by this General Assembly with the task of undertaking the trusteeship of a territory. That in itself shows that this Assembly gives Italy its place and credit and it is not logical, having given Italy that authority of trusteeship, to deprive it of membership in this Organization. It is for these two reasons that my delegation wholeheartedly supports the admission not only of Italy but of all peace-loving States which wish to enter the doors of this Organization.

184. The PRESIDENT : I have two more speakers on my list. If there is no objection I propose to adjourn now and resume the discussion at three o'clock.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*