

**General Assembly**A/PV.207
11 May 1949

UNITED NATIONS/NATIONS UNIES

OFFICIAL RECORDS OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, PART II

**PLENARY MEETINGS
OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**SUMMARY RECORDS OF MEETINGS
5 APRIL—18 MAY**1949****LAKE SUCCESS, NEW YORK****207th plenary meeting
11 May 1949****TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING***Held at Flushing Meadow, New York, on Wednesday, 11 May 1949, at 3 p.m.**President: Mr. H. V. EVATT (Australia).***161* Application of Israel for admission to membership in the United Nation report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (A/855)**

Mr. Viteri **LAFRONTE** (Ecuador), Rapporteur of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, presented the report of that Committee and the accompanying draft resolution.

The recommendation of the Security Council (A/818) and of the Committee in favour of the admission of Israel was the outcome of a long process begun outside the United Nations and later continued within the Organization. It was logical that the United Nations, which had created the State of Israel, should also admit it to membership.

The *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had studied the matter from all its aspects in the course of ten meetings. The details of the discussion, which had touched on matters other than the application of Israel but closely connected with it, such as the question of the status of Jerusalem, would be found in the summary records of the meetings.

The Committee's report contained certain declarations relating to the future implementation of the provisions of General Assembly resolutions 181 (II) and 194 (III), adopted respectively on 29 November 1947 and 11 December 1948, relating to the internationalization of Jerusalem and to the necessity for finding a humane solution of the problem of the Arab refugees. The Committee had invited the representative of Israel to

participate without vote in the discussion, with a view to clarifying the Israeli Government's attitude with regard to those and other matters.

At the close of the general discussion, the Committee had voted on a draft resolution submitted by Lebanon proposing that action on the admission of Israel should be postponed until the fourth session of the General Assembly. That proposal had been rejected by 25 votes to 19, with 12 abstentions. An amended text of the original joint draft resolution submitted by Australia, Canada, Guatemala, Haiti, Panama, the United States of America and Uruguay, recommending that the General Assembly should admit Israel to membership in the United Nations, had then been adopted by 33 votes to 11, with 13 abstentions.

In making that recommendation, the Committee considered that its adoption would be of benefit to the State of Israel, which had reached maturity and was in a position to enjoy certain rights and to assume certain obligations. The Committee also felt that the Arab States would benefit from the admission of Israel to membership in the United Nations. The Arab States, however, had strongly opposed Israel's application. Their motives for doing so were generally appreciated and understood, but the Committee believed that, once Israel had been admitted by an overwhelming majority, the democratic spirit of the Arab States would lead them to contribute towards a stable and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Mr. Viteri Lafronte concluded by remarking that, if admitted, Israel would take its place in the General Assembly between Iraq and Lebanon. That neighbourly position would surely have a cultural and intellectual, as well as a human value. He was confident that, in a spirit of goodwill, the Jewish and Arab States would try to bring about future co-operation and understanding, which constitute the primary purpose of the United Nations.

Mr. DROHOJOWSKI (Poland) stated that his country welcomed the decision of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee to recommend the admission of Israel, and expressed his delegation's hope of welcoming the new Member before the current session of the General Assembly came to an end.

Israel had presented itself as an eligible applicant for membership in the United Nations. It was obvious that Israel was not in a position to comply with all that was expected of a new State; the representative of Israel, however, had given the Committee binding assurances of his Government's earnest desire to be a useful Member of the United Nations and to uphold the Charter and its principles. The Polish delegation expected that Israel would fulfil all the obligations of a Member State and would live up to the high standards of observance of the Charter which, with a few regrettable exceptions, had been universally respected. Poland did not doubt that such must be the intention of the new State which was seeking admission, not only as a measure of self-protection but also as a tribute to the efforts of the United Nations on its behalf.

Recent statements by President Weizmann with regard to the Holy Places and to future relations between Israel and its neighbours were to be noted with satisfaction. The overwhelming majority of the Polish People were Roman Catholic, and their religion enjoyed the protection of the Government. The Polish Government knew that the Polish Catholics wished to be assured that all measures would be taken to ensure free access to the Holy Places and to guarantee their safety; similar guarantees should, of course, be extended also to shrines venerated by other religions. The Polish people and Government also expected that the problem of the Arab refugees would be settled in a just and equitable manner. It was hoped that outstanding problems between Jews and Arabs would be settled within a reasonable time in cooperation with those Arab elements which were opposing imperialistic designs in the Middle East.

Poland had actively assisted the Jews in their aspirations not only for a national home but also for full statehood. The Poles and the Jews had been associated for a thousand years; they owed much to each other, they had suffered together, and many Jews had suffered from racial hatred encouraged by the reactionary elements predominant in Poland's pre-war government circles. Poland supported the cause of Israel without mental reservations because it believed that the new State had all the possibilities of becoming a useful member of the family of nations.

During many centuries of oppression, the Jewish people had developed certain valuable characteristics and had left their mark in many fields of human endeavour, particularly in the sphere of progressive thought. The

contemporary movement for peace owed much to the Jews. The past record of the Jews should be a guarantee for the future. Within the framework of the United Nations, Israel could make an important contribution to peace and progress.

The period of sentimental interest in the fate of Israel had come to an end; an era of co-operation based on mutual interest was beginning. The Jewish people, advancing along peaceful and progressive lines, could rely on the assistance of Poland, the Soviet Republics and the peoples' democracies of Europe. Israel would doubtless remember that those countries had been its true friends at the troubled time of its emergence.

It was not long since the British Foreign Office had tried and failed to prevent the creation of Israel. United Kingdom and United States diplomacy had been ready to betray the new State before its birth. The United States Government's change of policy with regard to Israel had occurred for reasons of political expediency divorced from any sense of justice or faith in Israel's future. That should not be forgotten, since the life of a State could not be founded on such a precarious basis. The leaders of Israel should remember that the selfish interests of the international reactionary movement would try, and were indeed already trying, to mortgage the political future of the new State. Neither should it be forgotten that Israel was deeply indebted to the working classes.

Poland would watch the future of Israel with sympathetic interest. It was in favour of Israel's admission because it believed that such action would further the cause of peace. Both Israel and the United Nations would benefit by the admission of that State. The Organization would help Israel as it had done in the past, but the fate of the new State lay in the hands of its own people and depended upon the wisdom of its leaders.

Mr. **CASTRO** (El Salvador) stated that his Government had recognized the Government of Israel and maintained friendly relations with it. His delegation had studied the question of the application of Israel with the warmest desire to promote its admission.

The representative of El Salvador recalled that, at the first special session of the General Assembly, his delegation had proposed that the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine should receive definite instructions to propose, in its report to the General Assembly, that special protective measures should be given to the Holy places and to religious interests in Palestine.[1/ See *Official Records of the first special session of the General Assembly*, Volume III, Main Committees, annex 7, page 368.] The Special Commission had subsequently proposed the internationalization of Jerusalem and the adjacent area, including Bethlehem and certain other towns and villages.[2/ See *Official Records of the second session of the General Assembly*, Supplement No 11, Volume I, pages 44, 49 and 57.] The General Assembly had adopted resolution 181 (II) containing provisions to that effect on 29 November 1947. That resolution was still in effect, since it had been, neither modified nor revoked by a later decision of the General Assembly.

The whole world was anxious that religious' interests in Palestine should be respected and safeguarded. The matter was closely linked to that of the admission of Israel to the United Nations, because authorized representatives of the Israeli Government had officially declared that the internationalization of Jerusalem could not be carried out; in other words, the Government of Israel opposed the provisions of the General Assembly resolution of 29 November 1947 on that subject.

Mr. Castro recalled that, at his suggestion, the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had invited a representative of Israel to clarify his Government's attitude towards that matter, as well as towards General Assembly resolution 194 (III), of 11 December 1948, on the question of Arab refugees. Mr. Castro reviewed the Israeli representative's statements before the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

The delegation of El Salvador did not agree with the representative of Israel that the resolution of 11 December 1948 represented a modification of the resolution of 29 November 1947 as far as the internationalization of Jerusalem was concerned. El Salvador held that the original resolution was still in effect, and that there were no grounds for speculation on possible modifications to be made by the General Assembly at its fourth session. The Israeli representative's statements on the matter, which were essentially based on such speculation, did not manifest the Israeli Government's firm intention to implement resolutions adopted by the General Assembly on the Palestine question.

Article 4 of the Charter provided that membership in the United Nations was open to all peace-loving States which accepted the obligations contained in the Charter. One of the main obligations of Members of the United Nations was surely to respect the decisions of organs of the United Nations. The answers of the representative of Israel had not entirely satisfied the delegation of El Salvador concerning Israel's readiness to implement the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. The delegation of El Salvador, which had received orders from its Government to favour the admission of Israel on the basis of the strict fulfilment by Israel of the General Assembly resolutions relating to the internationalization of Jerusalem and the question of Arab refugees, would therefore be regretfully compelled to abstain from voting on the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's recommendation.

Mr. ABBAS (Iraq) quoted paragraph 6 of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's report, which dealt with the Iraqi delegation's proposal that an inquiry should be sent to the Security Council regarding the validity of the vote taken on the application of Israel, and that an advisory opinion should be sought from the International Court of Justice upon the nature of that vote. Paragraph 7 of the report referred to the United Kingdom representative's statement on the matter, and paragraph 8 referred, to the fact that the representative of Iraq had subsequently withdrawn his proposal, reserving the right to raise the matter again either in the Committee or in the General Assembly.

Without wishing to submit a formal motion, Mr. Abbas wished to put the matter of the validity of the Security Council's vote before the General Assembly, he pointed out that he did not contend that the abstention of one of the permanent members of the Security Council constituted a veto. According to Article 27, paragraph 3 of the Charter, however, decisions of the Security Council must be adopted by an affirmative vote of seven members, including the concurring votes of the permanent members. An abstention clearly did not constitute an affirmative vote. Mr. Abbas believed that the Assembly would do well to clarify that point in order to be sure that it was on solid legal ground.

It had been argued that the General Assembly was not competent to question decisions of the Security Council. The matter under consideration, however, was subject to joint decision by the Security Council and the General Assembly. The latter was therefore entitled and indeed obliged to ascertain that the Council's recommendation, which served as the basis of its own decision, had been adopted in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. Mr. Abbas maintained that that recommendation was invalid and that the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's subsequent decision was, in consequence, null and void. He recalled that it had been suggested once before that a matter connected with the Palestine question, namely, the General Assembly's decision on partition, should be submitted to the International Court of Justice.[¹/ See A/AC14/32, resolution I.] On that occasion, too, recourse to the International Court had been refused.[²/ See *Official Records of the second session of the General Assembly, Ad Hoc Committee on the Palestinian question, 32nd meeting.*] Mr. Abbas reiterated his request that the General Assembly should consult the International Court of Justice on the matter of the Security Council's recommendation and remarked that, by rejecting that request, the Assembly would tacitly admit that its course of action was illegal.

Turning to the question of Arab refugees, Mr. Abbas remarked that the representative of the applicant State had given no reply which might help to solve that problem. The General Assembly, which owed allegiance to the high humanitarian principles of the Charter and which had only recently adopted the Convention on Genocide and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, should be mindful of the plight of three-quarters of a million human beings.

The statements of the representative of the applicant State on the status of Jerusalem and the Holy Places had clearly been in opposition to General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948. His assurances had been vague and evasive, and their execution was by no means guaranteed. Should the General Assembly content itself with mere promises and ignore its own previous decisions?

With regard to the assassination of the late United Nations Mediator, other delegations which were more directly concerned in the matter had already stated their dissatisfaction with the replies received. The delegation of Iraq could only express-its own sympathy and concern in that very serious matter.

Apart from those issues, was it possible to maintain that the applicant State was eligible for membership under Article 4 of the Charter? The replies of the representative of that State, as well as the behaviour of his Government with regard to the relevant decisions of the General Assembly, led to the conclusion that Israel had not fulfilled and still did not fulfil the requirements of that Article. Furthermore, was the Assembly satisfied that the applicant State had definite boundaries within which it exercised its jurisdiction? Mr. Abbas stressed that, in putting those considerations before the Assembly, he was merely asking it to be fair and impartial in its judgment

Attempts were being made to effect Israel's admission before a full report had been received from the Conciliation Commission, which had been set up to consider many of the points raised in the course of the current discussion. Pressure had been exerted in order to force a hasty decision upon the General Assembly. Mr. Abbas felt that such a decision would not be in the interests of Israel or of the United Nations as a whole.

The delegation of Iraq considered that the whole question of Palestine had been treated in a manner contrary to the principles of the Charter and of international law and to the ancient principle whereby every country was allotted to the people who inhabited it. In view of those considerations, the delegation of Iraq was of the opinion that the admission of Israel to the United Nations would be the highest consummation of injustice and would drive another nail into the coffin of the United Nations.

FAWZI Bey (Egypt) recalled that the views of his Government had already been given by the representative of Egypt before the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

The President and other representatives who displayed a keen interest in the Palestine question, although their countries were very far from Palestine, would doubtless appreciate Egypt's preoccupation with the fate of that country, which was its close neighbour and its next of kin.

The frontiers of the State applying for membership in the United Nations were as yet undefined. Moreover, the status of the area in and around Jerusalem and of the Holy Places all over Palestine, which were to have come under direct and effective United Nations control, was not yet determined.

The representative of the applicant State had failed to give satisfactory answers on any of the three main issues raised in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. It was clear that the applicant State intended to do practically nothing in connexion with the fate of the displaced Arabs. Equally, it had done nothing substantial in the matter of the assassination of the late United Nations Mediator. In that connexion, Fawzi Bey remarked that certain statements in the report (S/1315) submitted by the applicant State to the Security Council on that matter were incorrect. He also observed that he understood that the reputed assassins were to be decorated by their Government.

The Committee had decided, contrary to long-established practice, to invite the representative of the applicant State to participate in the discussion. Even before that representative had completed his statements and replies, however, a joint resolution had been submitted recommending the admission of Israel to the United Nations, thus showing that the statements of the representative of the applicant State could have had but little effect on the intentions of the sponsors of the resolution. The resolution was in favour of admitting the applicant State to membership in the United Nations, but not of admitting the Arab refugees to their own homes. Were those refugees not human beings? Did not a Universal Declaration of Human Rights exist? The displaced Arabs continued to suffer from starvation and disease, they received bad food under the cloak of international charity, they were refused enjoyment of their rights as members of a nation, as human beings and as owners of property. Who would make good the humiliations they were suffering? What restitution would be offered for the death of their children? Who would compensate them for the loss of their property and their country? Fawzi Bey did not believe that any of those things would be done by the delegations which favoured the admission of Israel, or by the Jews themselves, who had systematically driven a whole nation out of their native land.

Lastly, the representative of Egypt remarked that, if a resolution were to be adopted admitting the so-called State of Israel to membership in the United Nations, the preamble to that resolution should read as follows:

"*Considering* that the applicant has invaded Palestine, driven its people from their homes, deprived them of their possessions, blocked their return, and refused even to pay compensation,

"*Considering* that the applicant has desecrated the Holy Places and still endangers them and the peace in the Middle East,

"*Considering* the assassination of the United Nations Mediator by people belonging to the applicant who are, however, not prosecuted for their crime,

"*Considering* that the applicant has in the preceding and other ways defied and undermined the United Nations,

"*Considering* at the same time the pervading intrigues of the applicant, the delay in bringing into force Article 4 of the United Nations Charter, and the failure of the Powers referred to in Article 106 to discharge their obligations as stipulated in that Article,

"*Considering* in this respect the consequent helplessness of the United Nations, "*The General Assembly* resolves . . ."

In conclusion, the representative of Egypt expressed the hope that the decision which the General Assembly would adopt would not bring everlasting shame and humiliation upon it, but would be in keeping with the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the dictates of peace in the Middle East and all over the world.

Mr. AUSTIN (United-States of America) stated that, after a careful and thorough consideration of the Security Council's recommendation that Israel should be admitted to membership in the United Nations, the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had by a large majority approved that recommendation. The United States had been a co-sponsor of the draft resolution before the General Assembly. The long discussion of Israel's application was evidence of the general deep-rooted desire for a just solution of questions relating to Palestine, and especially those of Jerusalem and the Arab refugees. Moreover, it had clarified the views of Member Governments and of the Government of Israel itself on those problems. The United States representative was confident that the Government of Israel was fully cognizant of the universal desire for an early settlement of those problems and that it would take into consideration the views expressed by many representatives, including some of those who had voted in favour of the joint draft resolution.

The General Assembly, however, was not directly concerned with definitive settlement of the questions of Jerusalem or of the Arab refugees. The Palestine question as such had been discussed during the first part of the current session, and resolution 194 (III) had been adopted on 11 December 1948.[1/ See *Official Records of the Security Council*, Third Year, Nos. 125 and 137.] The United States had actively supported that resolution and was intensely interested in its implementation. As a member of the Conciliation Commission, it would continue to work for a peaceful settlement of all outstanding Palestine issues on the basis of that resolution.

The point at issue in the current discussion was whether the State of Israel was eligible for membership under Article 4 of the Charter. The United States delegation, together with the large majority of members of the Security Council and of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, considered that Israel fulfilled the requirements of that Article.

A solid foundation for peace and stability in Palestine had been laid by the armistice agreements concluded between Israel and most of the Arab States under the guidance of the Acting Mediator, in pursuance of the relevant Security Council resolutions. [1/ See *Official Records of the Security Council*, Third Year, Nos. 125 and 137.] Those agreements had created a propitious atmosphere for carrying to a successful conclusion the tasks of the Conciliation Commission. An armistice agreement between Israel and Syria was still in process of negotiation. It was to be hoped that that agreement would be concluded in the near future, thereby bringing to a close the truce period in Palestine and inaugurating an era of peace and stability.

The Conciliation Commission and the parties concerned were gathered at Lausanne to settle outstanding differences. They would no doubt profit by the recent discussion in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. The responsibility for bringing about the peaceful settlement of the Palestine question, however, rested with the Conciliation Commission and not with the General Assembly. The latter would have full opportunity to discuss the substantive aspects of the Palestine settlement, including the questions of Jerusalem and the Arab refugees, when it considered the report of the Conciliation Commission at its fourth session.

As far as the question of Jerusalem was concerned—a matter of very great consequence to the Assembly and to the great world religions—the part of the preamble to the draft resolution before the Assembly which recalled the General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 and 194 (III) of 11 December 1948 gave important significance to the operative clauses of those resolutions. Furthermore, paragraphs 15, 16 and 17 of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's report set forth the Committee's wishes with regard to the internationalization of Jerusalem. The representative of the United States believed that the Conciliation Commission and the parties to the Lausanne Conference would implement those resolutions in the light of current conditions and in the light of all developments. There could be no doubt whatever but that the General Assembly would realistically apply those resolutions.

Israel had solemnly pledged its word to carry out the obligations of the Charter; those pledges had been reiterated by the representative of Israel before the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. The United States Government believed that Israel would be a valuable Member of the United Nations and should be admitted to the Organization. The United States delegation would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution before the General Assembly.

Mr. ASHA (Syria) stated that his delegation would vote against the admission of the applicant State, the creation of which had been made possible only by the use of force against the Arabs in Palestine. Syria would never accept or condone that fact; it did not regard the applicant State as peace-loving, in view of the circumstances in which it had come into being. Evidence of a love of peace must be sought not only in promises for the future but also in past and current actions. In the case of the applicant State, such evidence was altogether lacking.

The case before the Assembly was unique, because never before in history had the forcible invasion of a country and the expulsion of its original inhabitants been welcomed by countries professing their attachment to justice and peace. It would not be a happy omen for the United Nations if it were to reward aggression by approval and admit to membership a Government which had not only disregarded the wishes of the United Nations, but had also indicated its intention to continue to do so.

The responsibility for the life or death of hundreds of thousands of Arabs rested with those representatives who contemplated casting their votes in favour of the admission of the applicant State. History would not judge them lightly. It would not take into account the political pretexts or private excuses which they offered in justification of their action. History would record that they had sacrificed the life of a whole population and surrendered a land and a city for which their own ancestors had fought and died, for the sake of political advantage conceived in the narrowest and least moral form; that they had erected a State by force and called it peace-loving; that they had rewarded violence with praise and forgotten its victims.

Mr. SNOUCK HURGRONJE (Netherlands) recalled that, before approving the joint draft resolution in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, his delegation had expressed its hope and confidence that a satisfactory solution of all outstanding questions relating to the problem of Palestine, including especially the safeguarding of the Holy Places, would be reached. He wished to stress once again that his delegation expected Israel to give its full co-operation to the solution of those problems, and particularly of those of the Arab refugees and the Holy Places in Palestine. The latter question commanded the lively interest of the faithful of several world religions.

The Netherlands delegation believed that the admission of Israel, involving as it did the acceptance of and compliance with the obligations of the Charter by that State, would promote a generally acceptable solution of the outstanding problems. It would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

Mr. C. MAUK (Lebanon) recalled the view he had expressed in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, namely, that it could not be fairly held that the conditions laid down in Article 4 of the Charter were the only determining factors for the admission of Israel to membership in the United Nations. Israel was too intimately related to the Organization and too deeply indebted to it for Members to deny the relevance of previous decisions to the paramount question of its admission.

An objective examination of the evidence revealed that in its structure, acts and declared intentions, Israel did not yet seem to conform to those earlier United Nations wishes and decisions. While those considerations were admittedly outside the scope of Article 4, the interpretation of that Article rendered by the International Court of Justice [1/ See *Admission of a State to the United Nations (Charter, Article 4), Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1948, page 57.*] supported the view that they were relevant to its application in the case before the Assembly. If they had been allowed to take effect in the minds of the members of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, the Lebanese proposal to defer action on the admission of Israel until the fourth session of the Assembly would have prevailed.

On two important questions, namely, the return of the Arab refugees and the internationalization of Jerusalem, the Lebanese delegation could draw no satisfactory conclusions from the statements made by the representatives and leaders of Israel. It could not conclude that the refugees would be permitted to return to their homes, if they so desired, to live in peace with their neighbours, nor could it conclude that Israel would not incorporate into its territory the New City of Jerusalem. Yet both those requirements had been specifically laid down by General Assembly resolutions 181 (II) and 194 (III). To admit Israel at that juncture would be to encourage it to continue to disregard the decisions taken on those two cardinal points.

It was a sad commentary on the United Nations if it could not make events conform to its wishes and if its decisions served merely as starting points for a course of events which it could not subsequently control or keep within the bounds of those decisions. It presented a prospect of perpetual meetings for the purpose not of bringing reality into conformity with the will of the United Nations, but of revising and transforming that will in order to adapt it to the independently developing reality. Thus the United Nations could only stand by helplessly and take note of events; it remained powerless to determine them.

In connexion with the problem of the Arab refugees, it should be noted that the International Refugee Organization was spending millions of dollars on the resettlement of Jews in Palestine. By that very act, it was contributing to the unsettling of as many Arabs outside Palestine. Surely that agency could devote some of its zeal to the urgent problem of resettling the Arab refugees. It should also be borne in mind that the same act whereby a radical dynamism was being created and consolidated in Palestine was generating in the adjacent area social, economic and spiritual unrest which was bound to become a fertile soil for radicalism in the future. Thus the Near East was again becoming a vital factor in the historical development of the world, not as a result of the natural ripening of its own genius, but under the aegis of two alien radicalisms, with incalculable consequences for the future.

The crucial human problem, however, was that of the fate of Jerusalem. Was the Holy City to be partitioned or preserved? The Lebanese delegation deemed it its duty to emphasize the significance of that decision for the Christian, Moslem and Jewish communities.

There could be no doubt but that the Arab and Moslem peoples constituted the more permanent and abiding factor in the Middle East. It was of the utmost historical significance that those peoples after more than a thousand years, were announcing to the Western Christian world that they agreed to the internationalization of Jerusalem. That agreement offered an unprecedented opportunity which ought not recur for centuries. If the Christian West failed to take advantage of it, its statesmanship would not be judged favourably by history. It was that quality of statesmanship which was pre-eminently at stake.

The overwhelming importance of the fate of Jerusalem to the Western Christian world had been demonstrated by the fact that the Pope had published two encyclicals on the subject in the space of a few months, several outstanding Catholic dignitaries had issued a statement in the same [...], the Archbishop of Canterbury had joined their pleas for the internationalization of the Holy City and the General Assembly itself had decreed it twice in less than a year and a half.

Nevertheless, the statements and acts of responsible authorities and spokesmen of the Government of Israel seemed to indicate unmistakably that it was the intention of that Government to incorporate rather than to internationalize Jerusalem. Unless the United Nations took every precaution and obtained every assurance that the Holy City would be internationalized before Israel was admitted to membership, Jerusalem would in fact be partitioned. In the circumstances, no Member State could cast its vote lightheartedly.

The question of the future of Jerusalem transcended narrow political considerations. It was to be regretted that certain members of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had imputed political motives to the Lebanese delegation. In point of fact, the latter considered the question entirely divorced from such considerations and was guided only by religious and humanitarian principles.

If the Western Christian world failed to take advantage of the opportunity offered by the consent of the Moslems to live in peace, equality and freedom with the Christians and Jews in Jerusalem under an international regime, history would record another tragedy which could have been avoided.

Mr. NISOT (Belgium) said that his delegation deemed it desirable to admit Israel to the United Nations and would have liked to vote in favour of its admission at that time. Inasmuch, however, as it did not feel that the statement of the representative of Israel before the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee had offered an adequate explanation of the outstanding issues, the Belgian delegation would be compelled to abstain.

Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada) said that his Government based its position in respect of the admission of Israel on Article 4 of the Charter. It would welcome Israel as a new Member and hoped the Assembly would take a decision to that effect. It trusted that Israel would recognize the responsibilities and obligations of Member States under the Charter to live in peace with other nations and settle disputes by pacific means. Its admission would mark a significant stage in its political growth. The Canadian delegation looked forward to the contributions Israel could make towards the full realization of the purposes and principles of the Charter, and would vote in favour of its admission.

Mr. IBRAHIM (Yemen) said that power politics had overshadowed all other considerations in determining the evolution of the Palestine problem. Palestine had been made an instrument for bargaining, in total disregard of the rights of its people. Since the outbreak of the First World War, its history had been characterized by a singular lack of justice and many shocking contradictions.

At that time, the people of Palestine had contributed to the war effort together with the peoples of the other Arab countries, and had looked forward to the fulfilment of their inherent rights of independence and self-determination. As a result of secret manoeuvres, however, those legitimate rights had been infringed, first by the proclamation of the illegal Balfour Declaration and then by the imposition of the Mandate in contravention of the provisions of Article 22 of the League of Nations Covenant.

At the time of the drafting of the Covenant, 7 per-cent of the total population of Palestine had been Jewish Arabs. Article 22 had clearly established the rights of what at the time had been the people of Palestine, and had recognized its existence as an independent nation. The purpose of the Mandate had been to give administrative advice and to assist the nation towards the attainment of self-government, and the people of Palestine were to have been consulted in the selection of the Mandatory Power. Thus the Covenant had made the well-being and development of the people of Palestine a sacred trust of civilization. That trust had been violated in every respect, and Palestine had become a prey to the acts of violence of terrorist groups brought in from outside. In an effort to restrain that terrorism, the Mandatory Power had been forced to impose restrictions on immigration, as set forth in its White Paper of 1939. Finally, the Mandatory Power had been forced to express its desire to end its role in the country and to submit *the* case to the United Nations for a just decision.

When the problem had been brought before the United Nations, the people of Palestine had looked with renewed faith towards the restoration of their rights and a reparation of the injustices from which they had suffered. They had fervently hoped that the solution of the problem would be based on the tenets of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Charter, and not on the exigencies of power politics, political expediency and the confirmation of aggression. Unfortunately, the United Nations recommendations had

been determined by those very factors and had been characterized by numerous irregularities and illegal violations.

The terms of reference of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine had entirely disregarded the legal aspects of the case and had included irrelevant matters such as the visit to the displaced persons camps in Europe. When the Committee had recommended partition,[¹/ See *Official Records of the second session of the General Assembly*, Supplement No. 11, Volume I, page 47.] many representatives had raised the preliminary question of the General Assembly's competence to partition any country. Although twenty members had supported a proposal to request an advisory opinion on the matter from the International Court of Justice,[²/ *Ibid.*, *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Palestinian Question, 32nd meeting.] and six members of the Security Council [³/ See *Official Records of the Security Council*, Third Year, No. 98, 340th meeting.] had endorsed a similar proposal (S/894), the United Nations had refused to consider the suggestion for a more ample clarification of the matter to dispel the serious doubts thus manifested and had arbitrarily disposed of it.

From the outset, the deliberations of the United Nations on the Palestine problem had been marked by political manoeuvres. As early as the first special session in the spring of 1947, before the creation of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, some representatives had already stated that they would support partition if the Arabs and Jews should fail to reach agreement. It would be naive, to interpret that statement as a casual remark.

At the second session, when the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Palestinian question had established three Sub-Committees at its 19th meeting to deal respectively with the partition plan, the plans for an Arab State and the prospects of conciliation, there had been other manoeuvres. The first Subcommittee had been adequately equipped for its work. The membership of the second, however, had been confined to the Arab States and their request for the addition of other members had been ignored. The manoeuvres which had taken place in the third Sub-Committee during the period immediately preceding the partition decision were well-known.

When the General Assembly had adopted its injudicious decision to recommend partition, the people of Palestine had refused to accept it. Indeed, many Member States which had supported the partition plan had later reached the conclusion that it was invalid and unworkable. Accordingly, the General Assembly had convened in a second special session in April 1948. Disregarding the fact that the case was before the Assembly, and that the Assembly had appointed a Mediator to bring about a peaceful solution, the Zionist authorities had proclaimed their State. Their terrorist gangs had committed atrocities against the inhabitants of Palestine; in that connexion, the fate of Haifa would not be forgotten. That had been followed by constant violations of the truces ordered by the Security Council, and by the continuous and shameless smuggling into Palestine of armed men and ammunition. Manifestly, those actions had not been in conformity with the United Nations decisions.

Whatever the decision of the General Assembly regarding the admission of Israel, it would not change the verdict of history. The record would always reveal the true facts. The League of Nations and later the United Nations had sanctioned the invasion of Palestine by immigrants who had set up gangs to terrorize the legitimate inhabitants. They had sanctioned aggression against an innocent people, disappointed their natural aspirations and violated their inherent rights. The United Nations, by admitting Israel, would be offering shelter to a group which had not only imposed its rule by force on the people Palestine, but which had also driven from their homes almost a million of those people. A recent report in the *New York Times* had revealed that many of those who had attempted to return had been fired at. Finally, the Zionists had not respected the resolutions of the General Assembly and had given no definite assurances that they would do so in the future. They felt that they were absolved of such assurances because under the shield of power politics they would always find excuses and apologies. They had planned to realize their aggressive designs by invoking three pretexts: the establishment of a national home, the solution of the problem of the European displaced persons and the final *fait accompli*. In view of the historical precedents, the United Nations must realize that the recognition of accomplished facts meant the sanctioning of aggression and injustice.

The United Nations should not encourage the Zionists in their disregard of the rights of the displaced Arab refugees. The fate of those unfortunate people would be prejudiced by a premature decision of the General Assembly to approve the recommendation of the Security Council to admit Israel to membership.

Mr. GARCÍA BAUER (Guatemala) recalled that his Government had consistently supported the cause of the Jewish people throughout the deliberations of the General Assembly on the question of Palestine and had been among the first to recognize the new State created in virtue of General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947.

The Guatemalan delegation had given careful study to the four main issues on which objections had been raised in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee: the internationalization of Jerusalem, the plight of the Arab refugees, the punishment of those responsible for the assassination of the late Mediator and the delimitation of boundaries. It had reached the conclusion that while those matters were exceedingly important and deserved the serious consideration of the United Nations, they were not directly relevant to the decision on the admission of Israel. They should be resolved by the normal procedure set forth in General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948, namely, through the good offices of the Conciliation Commission to which appropriate instructions had been issued. The Commission had been instructed to exert every effort to facilitate the rapid repatriation and the economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees. It had been asked to obtain the necessary guarantees for the protection of the Holy Places in Jerusalem and free access thereto under effective United Nations control. It was to present to the Assembly at its fourth session detailed proposals regarding a permanent international regime for Jerusalem which would ensure to the various religious groups the maximum local autonomy compatible with Jerusalem's legal international status. In its report to the fourth session, all those matters would be dealt with and at that time it would be appropriate to enter into detailed discussion of them.

The delegation of Guatemala had also given serious consideration to the objections raised to the admission of Israel on the grounds that its Government had offered no satisfactory explanation concerning the assassination of Count Bernadotte and Colonel Sérot and the punishment of the criminals responsible for that act. Accordingly, Guatemala had supported the proposal of El Salvador to permit the representative of Israel to furnish more adequate clarification on that subject. It had been entirely satisfied with the explanations given in Committee.

Taking the view that the admission of Israel was a separate issue, quite independent of the four questions which were being dealt with by the Conciliation Commission, Guatemala had joined sponsoring the draft resolution favouring admission. It believed that the presence of Israel as the fifty-ninth Member of the United Nations would contribute greatly to the solution of the problems not only of the Arab States and the Middle East, but of the whole world. Israel was equipped in many ways to fulfil the obligations incumbent upon Members under the Charter and to aid in the peaceful settlement of current and future difficulties.

For those reasons, the delegation of Guatemala would vote for the admission of Israel to membership in the Organization.

Mr. CHAUVEL (France) recalled that, during the discussion in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee of Israel's application for membership, France had been especially concerned with the intentions of the Government of Israel in respect to the protection of the Holy Places. It had not wished to call for a definite commitment on that question as a prior condition for admission; indeed, to require compliance with such a condition would not only be contrary to the established practice of the United Nations in the admission of new Members, but it would have the practical disadvantage of confusing two separate issues which were being dealt with under two distinct authorities: the General Assembly itself on the one hand, and the Conciliation Commission on the other. The success of the negotiations proceeding under the auspices of the Conciliation Commission in Lausanne called for much caution and patience and for an atmosphere of calm deliberation. The matters dealt with by the Commission could not be brought before the Assembly. Nothing would be gained by requiring one of the parties to make definite commitments, unilaterally, on matters of detail.

The French Government was well aware of the difficulties of the situation and understood the reluctance of the Government of Israel to commit itself before the outcome of the Lausanne negotiations had become

certain. It considered it important, however, before associating itself in the solemn act of sanctioning the admission of the new State, to obtain full assurance that Israel would fulfil its obligations under the Charter on a matter which directly affected so many people various races and religions, namely, the protection of the Holy Places in Jerusalem.

Accordingly, the French delegation had carefully considered the various statements and explanations given by the representative of Israel. It had noted that some had referred to an international regime having territorial powers but limited to the Old City of Jerusalem and the surrounding Holy Places; others had alluded to a juridical status for the Holy Places, embracing a more extensive geographical area, but in practice restricted to the protection and control of the Holy Places. The French Government had made a critical analysis of those statements and had been convinced that, while Israel was not prepared at that juncture to bind itself to a definite formula, it was prepared, if its administrative rights were recognized, to concede that the protection of the Holy Places provided for in General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948 should be under the effective control of the United Nations without prejudice to Israeli administration of the area.

In the circumstances the French Government would not hesitate to vote in favour of the admission of Israel to membership. It was gratified at the prospect that Israel would be able to participate in the Lausanne negotiations with full political maturity, conscious of the rights and duties conferred upon it by its acceptance into the family of nations.

In that solemn moment, the thoughts of many inevitably turned to those who had suffered persecution throughout the long years under the yoke of totalitarian regimes, France could not forget its strong attachment to the countries of the Middle East. Those ancient bonds had made it possible for France to understand, perhaps better than others, the great currents of passion, intelligence and faith which had left their trace in that part of the world. It had been pained to see the recent strife which had threatened to obliterate those irreplaceable vestiges of a glorious past and promises of an equally bright future. The lull which had taken place in that strife, the meetings which were proceeding, most contribute to shaping that future. Israel was offered the opportunity to exercise its responsibilities. Its adventure would not be complete unless, after suffering pain and violence, it demonstrated that it could also exercise charity. No human accomplishment was lasting unless it was built on love. No nation was better equipped to show its generosity and sense of justice than the very people which had suffered so long from injustice and hatred.

The appeal for charity which he was making to Israel was the best contribution that the representative of France could offer to the tribute paid at that historic moment to the people of Israel.

Sir Carl BEBENDSEN (New Zealand) said that his delegation would vote in favour of Israel's admission to the United Nations. It would, however, expect from the Government of Israel the same respect for the decisions of the Organization as that which devolved upon all Member States. In the existing case, the pertinent decisions were those concerning the repatriation of the Arab refugees and the establishment of an international regime in those areas of Jerusalem specified in resolution 194 (III) of the General Assembly.

The New Zealand Government congratulated the State of Israel. It anticipated a long unbroken period of peaceful and fruitful collaboration with the new State.

Seikh Ahmed JABBAR (Saudi Arabia) said that his delegation would not expatiate upon the political pressures of certain democratic States which had led to the adoption of the partition plan in November 1947. Those same Powers, using the same tactics, were pressing for the mission to the United Nations of a State artificially created through terrorism and aggression. There was no limit to prejudice when certain great powers found it expedient to adopt a policy regardless of whether or not it was in conformity with the principles of the Charter. Experience had shown that that policy was not directed towards achieving peace and justice in Palestine. Nevertheless the representative of Saudi Arabia appealed to those nations which were aware of the political machinations that had been used in the United Nations to strike at the very heart of Arab national existence. He pointed out that unless power politics were replaced by a line of conduct calculated to preserve the inalienable rights of the lawful inhabitants of the whole of Palestine, it would be futile to waste time and energy in international conferences while the road to further conflict was being prepared.

It would be unwise to admit an artificially created State with a record of systematic aggression and flagrant violation of the basic principles of the Charter. The Zionists had driven from their homes some 900,000 Arabs and had committed atrocities not unlike those perpetrated by the Nazis. They had carried out those acts of terrorism at the very moment when certain democratic States were promoting the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and were about to sign the Convention on Genocide. The Arab refugees were dying from starvation and disease, while their homes had been occupied by immigrants and their land had been prepared for colonization. Despite those facts, some Members still considered the applicant a peace-loving State. They seemed to have forgotten the atrocities which proved that the policy of that artificial State was one of murder and usurpation.

The representative of Saudi Arabia deplored the unethical behaviour of certain high officials of the United Nations who had exerted every effort to speed the admission to membership of an artificial Jewish State, while several other applicant States which had sought admission had been categorically rejected. The United States Press had reported the unabashed promises publicly made by those officials. They and their Zionist cohorts were responsible for the illegal procedures which had been adopted in dealing with the Palestine problem.

The efforts to force the admission of the Jewish State to the United Nations had been led by the Government of a great Power which had feigned friendship for the Arab people while striking at the very roots of their national existence. It had helped to introduce an alien people into their land in order to achieve its own political ends. Despite the pledges made by all Member States when they had signed the United Nations Charter at San Francisco, some of the big Powers continued to indulge in such shameful intrigues and to impose their will upon others. In the circumstances, it was no wonder that the United Nations had failed to solve so many political problems. Nevertheless, their actions could not escape the judgment of history.

The delegation of Saudi Arabia had no choice but to vote against the admission of the so-called State of Israel to membership in the United Nations.

Mr. RODRÍGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) recalled that the Palestine question had been brought before the United Nations by the Mandatory Power and that the problem had passed through various stages, including war, to the final stage of the consideration of Israel for membership in the United Nations. The representative of Uruguay referred to resolution 106 (S-1) adopted by the General Assembly in May 1947, establishing the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, and the adoption on 29 November 1947 of General Assembly resolution 181 (II) which provided for the end of the Mandate, the independence of both communities in Palestine and a special regime for the Holy Places in Jerusalem. The General Assembly, by its resolution 186 (S-2) had subsequently appointed a Mediator for the conflict in Palestine.

In the interval, the State of Israel had proclaimed its independence and Uruguay had been one of the first of forty nations to recognize Israel. On the first anniversary of General Assembly resolution 181 (II) providing for partition, the Provisional Government of the State of Israel had presented its application for admission, an application which was before the General Assembly after having been approved by the Security Council.

Mr. Rodríguez Fabregat stated that although Uruguay had not voted in favour of referring the application for admission to the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, it recognized that that step had served a useful purpose, since the Committee had presented a draft resolution which had been approved by 33 votes to 11, with 13 abstentions.

The important debate on the admission of Israel had had as its fundamental basis the consideration of the application of Israel in strict accordance with the requirements set forth in Article 4 of the Charter and the consideration of important auxiliary questions, in particular the problem of the Holy Places, the Arab refugees and the question of the boundaries of the new State.

The Uruguayan delegation had joined the Committee in considering the application for admission from the only standpoint appropriate for the consideration of any application, namely, a juridical standpoint based on a study undertaken in the light of Article 4 of the Charter, which stipulated specific conditions. The Uruguayan delegation, together with the majority of the members of the Committee and of the Security Council, had

considered that the requirements for the admission of the State of Israel to the United Nations had been completely satisfied.

The action of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, however, had not ended there; it was useless to disregard reality, even when that reality was beyond the scope of Article 4 of the Charter. The peculiar character of Palestine as the religious centre for three world religions had given rise to exceptional problems. Those problems had been taken into account in General Assembly resolutions 181 (II) and 194 (III) of 29 November 1947 and 11 December 1948 respectively, and were being studied by the Conciliation Commission which was working in Lausanne. Although perhaps no consideration could or should be added to the stipulations of Article 4 of the Charter, there had been requests to hear the representative of Israel. The Uruguayan delegation considered the explanation the latter had given satisfactory, but the Committee had gone further and had incorporated in its report references to the Holy Places in Palestine. It had also agreed to include in its draft resolution a reference to the resolutions previously adopted by the General Assembly. It was important, however, that the efforts of the Conciliation Commission should not be interfered with and the peace talks among the former conflicting parties in Palestine should not be hindered.

The guarantee of a special regime for the Holy Places in Jerusalem and in Palestine had been adequately requested and adequately assured. The General Assembly would make a final decision in connexion with the reports of the Conciliation Commission at its fourth session.

The General Assembly resolution of 29 November 1947 had wisely provided for the sympathetic consideration of an application for membership in the United Nations, in accordance with Article 4 of the Charter, from either of the two independent States which were to be the outcome of that resolution. The Assembly had taken care that the State it had created, on the basis of justice and not of arbitrary force, should follow the juridical and orderly procedures set forth in the Charter.

Unfortunately, conflict had broken out in Palestine, although the resolution of 29 November 1947, establishing the independence of both communities, had certainly sought not war but peace, co-operation and solidarity. Subsequent action by the General Assembly and the Security Council had been divided into three clear stages: mediation, armistice and pacification. In spite of the death of the Mediator, mediation had continued and a truce had finally been proclaimed and later an armistice signed. Peace was at hand.

Both parties concerned had observed the provisions of General Assembly resolution 181 (II). One of them — the State of Israel — wished to assume the rights and responsibilities enunciated in the Charter, and the Uruguayan delegation would vote in favour of the admission of that State to the United Nations.

In addition to the legal considerations, Mr. Rodriguez Fabregat pointed out that six million Jews had died at the hands of the Nazis merely because they were Jews and that their example testified to the horror of discrimination among men. All the old problems of persecution, pogroms, ghettos, stateless persons, religious segregation and racial discrimination would disappear with the advent of the State of Israel as a nation with its own law and its own culture.

From that point of view, the United Nations had not worked in vain. In the Palestine question it had provided for the procedure that the Uruguayan delegation had consistently advocated: first, solution of the territorial problems of the Jews; secondly, establishment of independence in Palestine; thirdly, a special regime for the Old City and for the Holy Places of Palestine; fourthly, social re-organization to eliminate all discrimination. The other problems relating to Jerusalem and the Arab refugees would go before the fourth session of the General Assembly.

The Uruguayan delegation would vote in favour of the admission of Israel to membership in the United Nations.

Mr. ANZE MATIENZO (Bolivia) stated that the Bolivian delegation, which had fully co-operated in the solution of the Palestine question within the framework of the United Nations, had abstained from voting in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee both on the joint draft resolution and on the Lebanese draft resolution. Those

abstentions were an expression of its desire to see the resolutions of the General Assembly regarding the internationalization of Jerusalem, and the treatment of Arab refugees scrupulously implemented.

In the period since the vote in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, the Government of Israel had reiterated to the Bolivian delegation its firm desire to fulfil the resolutions of the General Assembly and its decision to continue to co-operate with the Conciliation Commission and with the General Assembly at its fourth session to satisfy the desires of the Members of the United Nations. The Bolivian delegation had received guarantees that Israel would safeguard the Holy Places in Jerusalem and outside Jerusalem and would establish a system of internationalization of the entire area of Jerusalem under United Nations supervision with free access to the Holy Places guaranteed. Moreover, the statement requested by the Argentine representative had been inserted in paragraph 15 of the Committee's report. Those assurances had allayed the fears of the Bolivian people.

The Bolivian Government felt that the State of Israel fulfilled the conditions set forth in Article 4 of the Charter and had accordingly instructed the Bolivian delegation to vote in favour of the admission of Israel to membership in the United Nations.

Mr. ZAYDIN (Cuba) said that, in addressing the General Assembly for the first time, he would explain certain points connected with the position of the Cuban Government on the question of the admission of Israel.

Mr. Zaydin recalled that the Cuban delegation had actively participated in the discussions of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee regarding questions of procedure and of substance in connexion with the application of Israel, and that the representative of Cuba had served as President of the Security Council when the Council had adopted its resolution recommending the admission of Israel. Cuba was thus particularly interested in the question.

The recommendation of the Security Council was legal and violated no Article of the Charter or the rules of procedure. In the opinion of the representative of Cuba, the nations which had the right to exercise the so-called veto also had the right to abstain. The interpretation of any legal precept was always contingent upon precedents. The Security Council was not a court of justice but a political organ which, according to the opinion handed down by the International Court of Justice, was governed by the Charter. The Security Council, therefore, had the right to interpret all rules governing its procedure. The interpretation given by the representative of Cuba, as President of the Security Council,[1/ See *Official Records of the Security Council*, Fourth Year, No. 17.] with regard to the abstention of the United Kingdom was in conformity with the interpretation given in thirty-six previous cases in the Security Council. The President had therefore adopted a legal and valid procedure in interpreting the abstention of the United Kingdom as not constituting an obstacle to the recommendation for the admission of Israel.

In the discussions in the Interim Committee, the representative of Iraq had expressed the view that the admission of new Members was a procedural matter and that the affirmative votes of seven members of the Security Council, not necessarily including the five permanent members; were sufficient to ensure a recommendation by the Council in accordance with the Charter. The General Assembly, however, had disagreed with that finding and, by its resolution 267 (III), had advised the permanent members of the Security Council to find a more elastic interpretation of the system of voting.

Accordingly, in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee,[2/ See *Official Records of the third session of the General Assembly. Part II, Ad Hoc Political Committee. 43rd meeting.*] the representative of the United Kingdom had explained that his delegation had abstained in order to avoid placing obstacles in the path of those members of the Security Council who felt that the admission of Israel should be recommended. The opponents of the veto had accepted that procedure because it provided a means of allowing the permanent members of the Security Council to abstain when they could not vote in favour of a given proposal, without thereby blocking action by the United Nations.

Mr. Zaydin went on to refer to the legal opinion of the International Court of Justice to the effect that the five conditions laid down in Article 4, paragraph 1 of the Charter were the only conditions to be considered in deciding on admission to membership in the United Nations. Despite that opinion, there had been a tendency,

in discussing the application of Israel, to make those conditions contingent upon other considerations. While it was true that the General Assembly could discuss other matters in order to help members to reach a decision, it could not be said that Article 4 must be conditioned by circumstantial factors. The representative of Cuba on the Security Council had accordingly voted, on 4 March 1949, in favour of the admission of Israel to membership in the United Nations. Later, in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, the representative of Cuba had voted in favour of the joint draft resolution recommending the admission of Israel.

The interpretation of a number of representatives to the effect that the admission of Israel would render inoperative the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council on other problems within their jurisdiction, could not be accepted by the representative of Cuba, who felt that two entirely separate matters were involved. The question of the admission of Israel to membership was completely divorced from other resolutions referring to such matters as the internationalization of Jerusalem and the surrounding areas, the problem of Arab refugees and the problem of boundaries, for the settlement of which a Conciliation Commission had been established by General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948. In considering whether the conditions of Article 4 had been fulfilled, it was permissible to discuss those other questions, but such questions could not be allowed to determine a position or justify the statement that the admission of Israel would impair the legal validity of those resolutions.

The Cuban delegation considered those resolutions to have the same legal effect and the same validity as the decision which the General Assembly might take to admit the State of Israel to membership, because Israel's legal position and structure as an organized State were based on General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947. The sole question on the agenda was the application of Israel for membership. It was therefore inappropriate to consider other aspects of the problem.

In order to clarify its point of view, the Cuban delegation had put questions to the representative of Israel in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee in connexion with the resolution of 29 November 1947. Mr. Zaydin paid tribute to the ability and diplomacy displayed by the representative of Israel in answering those questions.

If the procedure outlined in the resolution of 29 November 1947 had been carried out, the United Nations would not have been confronted with a *fait accompli* created by hostilities in Palestine. The resolution of 29 November 1947 was, in a sense, Israel's birth certificate in that it legalized the existence of Israel, a State which would otherwise be a product of force and territorial conquest and could not be recognized by the General Assembly. In its Constitution, Israel recognized certain principles and rights enunciated in the resolution of 29 November 1947. Moreover, the representative of Israel had expressed his country's acceptance of the resolution which had given it birth as well as of the other resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Thus Israel was proving its love of peace and its willingness and ability to fulfil the obligations prescribed by the Charter.

Mr. Zaydin expressed his Government's sympathy with the Arab refugees and its fervent desire to see their problem solved equitably and practically in accordance with the procedures set forth in the resolution of 11 December 1948 or by negotiation. The Government of Cuba was also concerned with the problem of boundaries. It felt, however, that in both cases the jurisdiction of the General Assembly and the Security Council must be maintained.

The question of the internationalization of Jerusalem, the Holy City of the three most important religions in the world, was of primary importance. In recommending an international regime for Jerusalem, the United Nations was attempting to continue a historical tradition and thus safeguard its Holy Places. Two encyclicals issued recently by the Pope had stressed the need for safeguarding the Holy Places through internationalization.

The concern of Cuba was based on its desire to live in peace with its neighbours and to see the ideals of understanding, peace and social justice carried out all over the world. Realizing that religious questions were of critical importance, the Cuban delegation had voted in the *Ad Hoc* political Committee in favour of the admission of Israel on the basis of the statements of President Weizmann, Mr. Eban and an explicit letter to the Cuban delegation testifying to the responsible spirit of Israel. Moreover, a people which had suffered untold persecution, which had wandered homeless over the face of the earth and of which six million had

been exterminated would not create a State hostile to social justice and human welfare. The representative of Israel had repeatedly indicated his nation's desire to co-operate with the United Nations. The application of Israel for membership was proof of that desire. Once Israel was admitted to the United Nations, it would have to submit to the jurisdiction and the sovereignty of the United Nations and to fulfil the decisions of the Organization.

The Cuban delegation would vote in favour of the admission of Israel because it knew that the Government of Israel would not forget the promises it had made and because it believed in the principles of goodwill and peace.

Mr. THORS (Iceland) stated that the delegation of Iceland had not participated in the debate in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee on the question of the admission of Israel; it had seen no reason to do so, since Iceland had from the beginning supported the case of the Jewish people before the United Nations.

The delegation of Iceland had voted for the admission of Israel in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and would vote for it in the General Assembly. Iceland had no doubt that the Government and the people of Israel would fulfil the assurances they had given with regard to Jerusalem, the Arab refugees and the investigation of the assassination of Count Bernadotte. The delegation of Iceland believed that the intelligent and energetic participation of Israel would strengthen the United Nations and contribute to the successful solution of current and future problems. Israel should therefore be welcomed as a Member of the United Nations.

Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) stated that the concern of the Peruvian Government for the Holy Places, the situation of Arab refugees and peace in the Middle East explained its attitude with regard to General Assembly resolutions 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 and 194 (III) of 11 December 1948. Peru's participation in the work of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine and its support of the report recommending partition were well known. The Peruvian Government still desired the inclusion in the General Assembly resolution of a provision regarding internationalization, and had instructed its representative to obtain full guarantees with regard to Arab refugees.

The question had been carefully discussed in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and the delegation of Peru was pleased to note the inclusion in the report of an Argentine recommendation to the effect that the Conciliation Commission should consider the views of the Holy See and other religious authorities on the status of Jerusalem. The representatives of Colombia and Bolivia had received assurances and guarantees that free access would be given to the Holy Places and that an international system of control would be established in Jerusalem. Mr. Belaunde concurred in the view of the representative of France that the Conciliation Commission could count on co-operation from Israel with greater assurance if Israel were a Member of the United Nations than if it remained outside the Organization.

The Peruvian delegation would therefore vote, as it had voted in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, in favour of the admission of Israel, with the understanding that the vote for the admission of Israel would in no way alter the powers of the General Assembly or the meaning of the resolution of 29 November 1947. Once Israel was admitted to the United Nations, it would be under greater moral obligation to accept the recommendations of the Conciliation Commission. It was to be hoped that the admission of Israel would signify a meeting of two great cultures and would aid in the maintenance of peace in the Middle East and throughout the world.

The PRESIDENT stated that before putting the draft resolution recommended by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee (A/855) to the vote, he wished to explain the manner in which the question of the admission of Israel had come before the General Assembly for decision.

In accordance with the provisions of Article 4 of the Charter, the Security Council had formally recommended the admission of Israel to membership in the United Nations (A/818). Referring to the suggestion that the General Assembly might discuss the question of the vote which had taken place in the Security Council, the President ruled that the manner in which the recommendation of the Security Council had been adopted concerned the internal government and procedure of the Security Council and must be accepted by the General Assembly as a recommendation of the Security Council within the meaning of the Charter. The President did not doubt that the ruling of the Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee was

correct. The matter therefore came before the General Assembly in a recommendation of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, presented in document A/855.

A vote was taken by roll-call, as follows:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, hoping been drawn by lot by the President, voted first.

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Byelorussia Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa.

Against: Yemen, Afghanistan, Burma, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

Abstaining: United Kingdom, Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, El Salvador, Greece, Siam, Sweden, Turkey.

The result of the vote was 37 in favour, 12 against, and 9 abstentions. The resolution was adopted, having obtained the required two-thirds majority.

The PRESIDENT stated that since every Member of the United Nations was present and voting, the requirement of the Charter, for a two-thirds majority was satisfied. He therefore formally declared Israel admitted to membership in the United Nations.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Sharett, representative of Israel, took his seat on the platform.

On behalf of the United Nations and the General Assembly, the PRESIDENT welcomed the new Member of the United Nations. He considered that the very important debate had been well conducted and that the matter had been democratically considered and democratically put to the vote.

The United Nations would give Israel friendship and co-operation in the achievement of the common purposes set forth in the Charter. In return, the Organization knew that it would obtain loyalty and co-operation from Israel in achieving the common objectives of all Members.

He would go even further and state — and he was sure all the Members of the Organization would agree — that he looked forward to the time when the wounds of the peoples of the Middle East would be healed and when co-operation, friendship and comradeship would prevail between all peoples of the Middle East in accordance with the best interests of that region and the great principles of the Charter.

He therefore took great pleasure in welcoming Israel, through its Foreign Minister, to membership in the United Nations.

Mr. HENRÍQUEZUREÑA (Dominican Republic) welcomed the State of Israel to the international community of nations and stated that, after centuries of uncertainty and suffering, the aspirations of the Jewish people for a State of their own were realized. Hitherto the Jewish people had been a nation without a territory but with a common consciousness of past sufferings. The guiding principle of a desire for their own country would help that people to maintain the republic which had been founded in Palestine and which must be a model of democracy, progress and civilization.

The new republic would be a nation without any trace of religious intolerance, because in a territory in which the Holy Places of three great religions were located, there could be nothing but the greatest respect for all freedoms and all religions.

The Jewish people would have an opportunity to exercise power through their desire for peace. Israel's desire for peace was responsible for its emergence and its recognition as a sovereign State and for its admission to the United Nations as a peace-loving State.

The representative of the Dominican Republic stated that, as part of the Arab world, Israel must maintain sincere and close friendship with its neighbours, who deserved the utmost sympathy. It was universally hoped that the two racial groups in Palestine would be able to live together and work together in defence of peace. Israel should be welcomed as a new champion of democracy, progress and civilization.

Mr. SHARETT (Israel) thanked the President for his generous words of welcome, which were particularly appreciated in view of the President's distinguished position in international councils and in the national life of Australia, and his outstanding role in the decisive stages of the treatment of the problem of Israel by the United Nations. Mr. Sharett also thanked the representative of the Dominican Republic most warmly for his welcome.

The admission of Israel was a great moment for the new State and for the Jewish people throughout the world. The responsibility entailed was awesome; the vision for the future was uplifting.

The admission of Israel was the consummation of a people's transition from political anonymity to clear identity, from inferiority to equal status, from mere passive protest to active responsibility, from exclusion to membership in the family of nations.

At the historic juncture of its admission, the first thoughts of Israel were for the Jews of all countries. The State of Israel claimed no allegiance from Jews in other lands. As a sovereign entity it rested on the loyalty of its own citizens and was alone responsible for its actions and policies. Yet Israel expressed fervent wishes for the security, dignified existence and equality of rights of Jews everywhere. Deeply and reverently conscious of its mission in Jewish life, Israel would strive to keep the Jewish name high and to live up to the noble record of Jewish tradition. Israel would regard it as a most sacred trust to keep its doors open to all Jews in need of a home.

Mr. Sharett expressed deep gratitude to those nations which, at a time when the Jews had had no voice in world councils, had championed from the international platform, whether in the League of Nations or in the organs of the United Nations, the rights and aspirations of the Jewish people and their claim to nationhood in Palestine. In particular, he expressed the profound and everlasting thankfulness of the Jewish people to all nations whose delegations on 29 November 1947 had supported the historic resolution providing for the establishment of the Jewish State and to those whose delegations had voted for Israel's admission to the United Nations.

The representative of Israel reported that fifty-four Governments, including forty-five Members of the United Nations, had recognized Israel.

The Jewish State had arisen because, in the words of Theodor Herzl, who had envisaged its creation fifty years ago, it had become a world necessity. Two historic trends had converged to bring it about: catastrophe in Europe and achievement in Zion.

At no stage in the tribulations of the Jewish people had its basic insecurity been more tragically laid bare than in the Second World War, when three out of every four Jews in Europe, one out of every three Jews in the world, had been put to death. It should not be forgotten that the United Nations in its origin represented an anti-nazi coalition born in common battle against the darkest forces of evil that had ever menaced the destiny of civilized mankind. It should also be remembered that in that titanic and victorious struggle the Jews of all the Allied nations had taken a full part and the Jews of Palestine had borne their share as a nation in arms. Allied victory would have missed one of its essential objectives, although perhaps unperceived at that time, and the triumph of the United Nations over the scourge of humanity would have remained incomplete if the Jewish people, as a people, had still remained homeless without a country of their own.

In their ancestral home, the Jews had laboured long and hard to achieve that goal. By the time the Mandate had terminated they had achieved statehood in everything but name. They had claimed the right of self-determination. In the framework of an emancipated Middle East, where one country after another had achieved sovereign status, the denial of independence to the Jewish people would have been a flagrant anomaly and a grievous wrong. When the hour had come, the Jews had known that their own survival and

freedom in their own country, as well as the fulfilment of the hopes of countless generations, were at stake. In that conviction had lain their ability, outnumbered and with inferior arms, to defend themselves and to uphold their independence.

Mankind's revulsion against the European tragedy and a deep insight into the realities of Palestine had found joint expression in the historic resolution of 29 November 1947. It had been an act of faith, of international justice and of creative statesmanship. Having once set that course, the Assembly had never swerved. On two notable occasions it had refused to endorse retreats from that policy which would either have annulled the independence of Israel or crippled its territory. By admitting Israel into its fold it did no more than sanction the final application of its own decree.

The fact that Israel's rapid integration in the international structure was due to a deliberate decision of the United Nations had far-reaching implications. Israel's organic connexion with the United Nations had combined with its own compelling interest in dictating its course of action in international affairs — a course of undivided loyalty to the Charter of the United Nations and of consecration to the cause of peace.

The pursuit of peace was a treasured part of the Jewish heritage. The ideal of peace would guide Israel in shaping the relations between State and citizen, between man and his neighbour, between the State and other countries. Israel yearned for peace both in its own vital interest and out of its concern for the survival of the Jewish people. Scattered as they were in all lands, the Jews had suffered incomparably more than any other people from the last war. None, therefore dreaded another war more than Israel. Moreover, peace was the very breath of Israel's existence and an indispensable condition for its growth and development.

Israel entered an international arena beclouded by grave conflict, though happily its entry came at a moment when it might be hoped that the agreement on Berlin, which was about to enter into force, would lead to a significant diminution of tension in great Power relationships. The acceptance of Israel into the family of nations was of itself a not unhopeful omen. Both the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were among those Powers which had joined hands in welcoming Israel into the world. Among the States which had recognized Israel, all the five permanent members of the Security Council were included.

For its own part, and in its modest capacity, Israel extended a hand of true friendship to all peace-loving nations, pledging its co-operation, under the auspices of the United Nations, in the preservation and defence of universal peace and progress.

That pledge became an earnest and urgent appeal when addressed to Israel's closest neighbours, the Arab States, and other nations of the Middle East. Israel was deeply aware of the common destiny uniting it with them forever. Once its own place and status had been secured, Israel had no higher ambition or more urgent task than to attain a relationship of good neighbourliness and friendly collaboration with the peoples of that vital area. The Middle East had played an outstanding role in man's progress in ancient and medieval times. Its contribution to culture and civilization had been of eternal effect. In the current age it was well capable of taking its place in the great march of modern progress. The task called for a pooling of efforts and experience on the part of all and for the mutual emulation of constructive examples. Israel was eager to contribute to that common endeavour.

Israel was not aware of any serious conflict between itself and its neighbours which could not be resolved by peaceful negotiations. The recent direct armistice agreements between Israel on the one hand and Egypt, Lebanon and Transjordan, respectively, on the other hand — agreements in which the sponsorship and mediation of the United Nations had proved so effective — strengthened that belief.

Israel's membership in the United Nations, bringing it within a common forum with six Arab States, ought facilitate progress towards understanding. The war against Israel and the aftermath of that war had changed some elements of the pattern envisaged in the resolution of 29 November 1947. The changes must perforce find their expression in the future peace settlement. There was no intrinsic reason why those modifications, based on new realities, should not become the subject of general consent.

The Israeli Government had taken careful note of the discussions in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee on certain problems still outstanding between Israel and its neighbours on the one hand and between Israel and the United Nations on the other. It would pursue its steadfast efforts to assist in the earliest possible settlement of those issues by discussions between Israel and the neighbouring States and through the good offices of the United Nations. It would certainly strive to take a constructive and responsible part in whatever discussions might take place on those objects at the following session of the General Assembly.

The specific problems created by the emergence of Israel would not alone engage the attention of the Government of Israel. Its efforts would be Directed to the absorption of the large scale immigration currently in progress, a veritable in-gathering of the exiles, and to the development of the country's resources for the benefit of all its inhabitants.

Israel was fully conscious of the fact that poverty and ignorance were hereditary enemies of lasting peace. The Government of Israel was determined to do all it could to root out those twin evils, to raise the standard of living of the common man, without distinction of race or creed, to ensure equal rights to all, to safeguard the equality of status of men and women, to raise the dignity of labour, to guarantee freedom of enterprise, individual and collective, within the framework of a progressive State, to ensure full religious freedom and to add its proof that true democracy could be as fully operative for the commonwealth in Asia as in any other part of the world.

Those were in the main objects to which the Government and people of Israel were pledged. Mr. Sharett quoted from a statement of policy made by the Prime Minister of Israel on the basis of which the Government in office had secured a vote of confidence from the legislature.

The foreign policy of Israel shall be based on the following principles:

- "1. Loyalty to the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and friendship with all peace-loving States, especially with the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;
2. Efforts to achieve an Arab-Jewish alliance based on economic, social, cultural and political co-operation with the neighbouring countries. This alliance must be within the framework of the United Nations and cannot be directed against any of the Members;
3. Support for all measures which strengthen peace, guarantee the rights of men and the equality of nations, and enhance the authority and effectiveness of the United Nations;
4. The right of all Jews who wish to resettle in their historic homeland to leave the countries of their present abode;
5. The effective preservation of the complete independence and sovereignty of Israel."

Whatever share Israel might have in the counsels of the United Nations would be devoted wholly to strengthening peace in the world, to furthering the brotherhood of peoples, and to safeguarding the equality and dignity of men.

Israel was a young nation, but an ancient people. Though beginners in the art of statecraft, the Israelis had the privilege and responsibility of being able to draw upon a rich and varied stock of universal experience. Israel entered the General Assembly, which represented the collective statesmanship of the world, in a spirit of humility, anxious for guidance and enlightenment. It hoped that its ability to learn might be enhanced by the ancient teachings and the age-old aspirations of the Jewish people.

Mr. Sharett recalled that on the most solemn day in the Jewish calendar his people prayed for the day when all the peoples of the earth would unite in one fraternity to seek the salvation of mankind, and that it was the prophets of Israel who had bequeathed to the world the vision of a time when "nation shall not lift up a sword against nation; neither shall they learn war any more" (*Lo yisa goy el goy herev velo yilmedu od milhama*).

At the invitation of the President, the delegation of Israel took its place in the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 8 p.m.