

**UNITED**



**NATIONS**

**REPORT  
OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL  
TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**Covering the period from 16 July 1948 to 15 July 1949**

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OFFICIAL RECORDS: FOURTH SESSION  
SUPPLEMENT No. 2 (A/945)**

**LAKE SUCCESS**

**New York**

**1949**

was the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which had been formed as a result of free elections held all over Korea. After describing the manner in which these elections had been carried out and the progress made towards recovery in North Korea, he recalled that his delegation had repeatedly made clear that the General Assembly's resolution on Korea had been illegally adopted under the pressure of the Anglo-American bloc. The real Government of Korea was that of the Democratic People's Republic, which had jurisdiction and control over the whole country.

At the 410th meeting (16 February), the representative of the UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS submitted the following draft resolution (S/1259):

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having considered the application of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for membership of the United Nations,*

*"Resolves to refer this application to the Committee for the Admission of New Members."*

The representative of the UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC supported the views of the representative of the USSR and insisted that the application of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea be referred to the Committee on the Admission of New Members, in accordance with the rules governing such applications.

The representatives of CHINA, CUBA and CANADA opposed the USSR draft resolution.

The representatives of NORWAY and EGYPT also opposed the USSR draft resolution, but considered that making a decision of substance in the form of a decision on procedure should not be taken as a precedent as far as their delegations were concerned.

**Decision:** *At the 410th meeting on 16 February 1949 the draft resolution submitted by the representative of the USSR was rejected by 8 votes to 2 (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), with 1 abstention (Argentina).*

## E. Application of Israel

By a letter dated 29 November 1948 (S/1093) to the Secretary-General, the Foreign Minister of the Provisional Government of Israel applied, on behalf of his Government, for admission to membership in the United Nations. A declaration of acceptance of the obligations contained in the Charter was submitted with the letter.

The Security Council considered the application at the 383rd meeting (2 December 1948).

The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA supported the application and urged early approval so as to permit favourable action by the General Assembly before the end of the third session. Pointing out that the United States had extended full recognition to the State of Israel and had recognized the Provisional Government of Israel as the effective authority of the new State, the United States representative declared that, in the opinion of his Government, the State of Israel fulfilled the requirements set out in Article 4 of the Charter. Israel was clearly an independent State having a people and a territory. Both

reason and history demonstrated that the concept of territory did not necessarily include precise delimitations of the boundaries of that territory. The record of Israel's relations with the United Nations, and the repeatedly expressed willingness of the Provisional Government of Israel to negotiate on all outstanding problems between Israel and other Governments and authorities, demonstrated that the new State was peace-loving. It was clear that the State of Israel was able to carry out the obligations of the Charter.

The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM considered that the application was premature and rather doubtful. The First Committee was at that time still discussing the future of Palestine, and the State of Israel still had to prove compliance with the recent resolutions of the Security Council regarding the truce and armistice.

The representative of SYRIA expressed similar views.

The representative of FRANCE considered that no decision should be taken on the application of Israel before the First Committee of the General Assembly had been given an opportunity to complete its study of the Palestine question.

The representative of the UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS recalled that his delegation had supported General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947 as the only decision which met the fundamental national interests of the Jewish and Arab peoples of Palestine. The USSR delegation had adhered to a single position and still felt that the only correct solution of the Palestine question was the implementation of that decision. The Government of the USSR supported the application of Israel and would give the same attention to the consideration of a membership application submitted by an Arab State which might be created on the territory of Palestine pursuant to resolution 181 (II). Unfortunately, by virtue of certain circumstances, such an Arab State had not yet been created.

The representative of CANADA stated that the qualifications of Israel could be judged only in relation to whatever decision the General Assembly adopted at its third session with regard to Palestine.

**Decision:** *At the end of the meeting, the application of Israel was referred to the Committee on the Admission of New Members.*

On 7 December 1948, the Committee reported (S/1110) that it did not then possess the information necessary to enable it to come to a decision.

At the 384th meeting (15 December), the representative of FRANCE proposed that the Committee on the Admission of New Members reconsider the matter in view of resolution 194 (III) concerning Palestine adopted on 11 December by the General Assembly.

That view was opposed by the representative of SYRIA, who considered that there was nothing new in the resolution which could help the Committee come to a final decision. Pointing out that the Security Council had followed the principle that no military or political advantage should be gained by either party during the period of truce or armistice, the Syrian representative considered that a resolution recommending the admission of the Jews would represent a great political advantage gained

by them during the truce. He contended that the debate in the General Assembly had indicated that the proclamation of the Jewish State in Palestine had not been accepted. Approval of the application under discussion at that stage would destroy and frustrate the activities and chances of success of the Conciliation Commission which had been established. He urged that consideration of the application be delayed.

The representative of CHINA said that his delegation had always stood for two principles in the Palestine question: (1) that the United Nations should enforce peace in Palestine; (2) that the United Nations should try to mediate or conciliate or, in other words, that it would be unwise for the United Nations to impose a particular kind of settlement. Since the admission of Israel to the United Nations at that moment was looked upon with great disfavour by the Arab States, approval of the application would be interpreted to mean that the Security Council was partial to one side and would diminish the chances of successfully conciliating the dispute.

The representative of the UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS, stating that the Conciliation Commission had been set up not to dissolve the State of Israel but to promote a peaceful settlement of the differences between it and its neighbours, considered that a decision of the Security Council to admit the State of Israel to membership in the United Nations would expedite a peaceful settlement in Palestine. There was no reason to defer a decision on the matter.

The representative of the UNITED KINGDOM said that as soon as the major questions at issue, notably the question of the frontiers in Palestine, had been resolved under the auspices of the Conciliation Commission appointed by the General Assembly, his Government would give sympathetic consideration both to its own recognition of the Jewish State and to that State's application for membership in the United Nations. The attitude of his Government was not due to any doubts concerning the obvious fact that the Jewish State was now in process of formation and that it would continue to exist.

The Council could not, however, make a favourable recommendation on the application under discussion without first assuring itself that serious obligations which it had imposed under a number of resolutions had been satisfactorily fulfilled. The Jewish authorities had never submitted the requested account of their investigation into the assassination of Count Bernadotte and Colonel Sérot. There were also questions outstanding under the resolutions of 4 November and 16 November 1948. He therefore submitted the following draft resolution (S/1121):

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having received an application for the admission of the State of Israel to the United Nations;*

*"Noting that the General Assembly has appointed a Conciliation Commission for Palestine; and*

*"Bearing in mind that action has not yet been completed in pursuance of the Security Council's resolutions of 4 November and 16 November,*

*"Decides to postpone consideration of the above-mentioned application."*

The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA considered that it would help the Conciliation Commission in its work if the Security Council were to recommend admission of Israel to the United Nations. If the majority of the members of the Council believed that such a recommendation should be made, that fact should be made known, and should be part of the background against which the Conciliation Commission would seek to discharge its responsibilities. He did not agree that the various changes made in the text of the resolution establishing the Conciliation Commission during the General Assembly's discussion constituted an indication of the views of the General Assembly upon the question under consideration.

The representative of the UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS maintained that the territory of the State of Israel had been defined by General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, which was still in force. The State of Israel had given convincing proof of its compliance with the Security Council's decisions, and official information had been received from the representative of Israel on the murder of Count Bernadotte. It was apparent that the Government of Israel was taking steps to carry out the resolutions of 4 and 16 November 1948. Criticism which had been voiced in that respect was baseless.

At the 385th meeting (15 December), the representative of SYRIA pointed out that the vote in the First Committee of the General Assembly indicated that there were many delegations who favoured an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice regarding the Palestine question. He submitted the following draft resolution (S/1125):

*"The Security Council,*

*"Noting the contentions raised by one of the members to the effect that the application of the 'State of Israel' for admission to membership of the United Nations is not worthy of being recommended, owing to the fact that the international status of Palestine at the termination of the Mandate on 15 May 1948 is not yet established so as to permit a legitimate creation of a Jewish sovereign state in any part of that country against the wishes of the majority of its population, and the recognition of that state by certain member nations as *de facto* authority does not entitle this *de facto* authority to enjoy sovereign equality with the *de jure* authority and sovereignty of the other member States under the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations,*

*"Decides to request an advisory legal opinion of the International Court of Justice under Article 96 of the Charter and Chapter IV of the Statute of the Court on the following questions:*

*"1. Do the recommendations of the General Assembly in the resolution of 29 November 1947 for a partition plan with economic union, which was rejected by the Arabs of Palestine, create right to the Jewish minority to proclaim their separate state at the termination of the Mandate on the area assigned to them by that resolution?"*

*"2. What is the international status of Palestine at the termination of the Mandate on 15 May 1948?"*

*"3. Under the present circumstances would the Security Council be acting in conformity with the*

United Nations Charter and the international law if it recommended the admission of the State of Israel to membership in the United Nations?

"4. Is the General Assembly empowered to partition Palestine between Arabs and Jews without consulting the lawful inhabitants of the country in securing their consent?"

"The Secretary-General is requested to supply the Court with all information and documents which the Court may require to clarify the question."

The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA opposed the draft resolutions submitted by the representatives of Syria and the United Kingdom (S/1125, and S/1121).

The representative of ARGENTINA considered that Israel fulfilled the requirements of Article 4 of the Charter and stated that his delegation would support the application. He opposed the United Kingdom and Syrian draft resolutions.

The representative of FRANCE said that, in view of the difficulty of determining whether the admission of Israel at that stage would help provide a basis for reopening negotiations to re-establish peace in Palestine, it would be better to delay a decision for a month. He submitted the following draft resolution (S/1127) :

*"The Security Council,*

*"Having received from the Provisional Government of Israel, an application for the admission of the State of Israel to membership in the United Nations,*

*"Considering the situation in Palestine as a whole;*

*"Decides to postpone for one month the consideration of the above-mentioned application."*

At the 386th meeting (17 December), the representative of COLOMBIA supported the application of the Provisional Government of Israel and opposed the United Kingdom and French draft resolutions.

The representative of the UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS considered that the United Kingdom draft resolution was intended to prevent the admission of Israel to membership in the United Nations. He also opposed the Syrian draft resolution, pointing out that the General Assembly had clearly decided against such a step. He opposed postponement of a decision on the Israeli application.

**Decisions:** *At the 386th meeting on 17 December 1948, the Security Council put to the vote the three draft resolutions and the application of Israel.*

*The United Kingdom draft resolution (S/1121) was not adopted. There were 4 votes in favour (Belgium, China, Syria, United Kingdom), with 7 abstentions.*

*The French draft resolution (S/1127) was not adopted. There were 6 votes in favour, with 5 abstentions.*

*The Syrian draft resolution (S/1125) was not adopted. There were 2 votes in favour (Belgium, Syria), with 9 abstentions.*

*The Israeli application for admission to membership in the United Nations did not receive the recommendation of the Security Council. There were 5 votes in favour, 1 against (Syria), with*

*5 abstentions (Belgium, Canada, China, France, United Kingdom).*

By a letter dated 24 February 1949 (S/1267) to the Secretary-General, the representative of ISRAEL requested that renewed consideration be given to his Government's application (S/1093) for membership in the United Nations.

The Security Council resumed consideration of the application of Israel at the 413th meeting (3 March).

At the 414th meeting (4 March) the representative of the UNITED KINGDOM said that, in the absence of clarification of the Israeli Government's intentions regarding the General Assembly's recommendations concerning Jerusalem and the Arab refugees, he would not be able to support the Israeli application. As had previously been made clear, however, his delegation did not intend to use its privileged vote to block the admission of any State which obtained the requisite majority. He would therefore have to abstain when this question was put to the vote.

The representative of NORWAY said that, in principle, his Government favoured the admission of Israel and would support the application despite doubts as to the timing of the decision.

The representative of EGYPT considered that taking action on the application under discussion would not only be untimely but would be an affront to humanity. The Jews were driving three-quarters of the people of Palestine from their homes, and there were many other considerations tending against accepting the Jewish application. The people of the Middle East could hardly have great confidence in, and reverence for, the United Nations if that application was accepted and, indeed, given preferred treatment.

The representatives of CANADA and CUBA supported the application of Israel.

The representative of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA submitted a draft resolution (S/1276) which recommended to the General Assembly that it admit Israel to membership in the United Nations.

The representative of the UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS reiterated support of the Israeli application. Certain outside forces had bent numerous efforts to thwart any peaceful solution of the Palestine problem and to foil the immediate creation of independent Jewish and Arab States in accordance with General Assembly resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947; consequently, the Palestine problem was still before the Council. The USSR representative considered that the problems of the Arab refugees and of the admission of Israel were linked only in the sense that a more rapid achievement of peace in Palestine would more rapidly solve the problem of Arab refugees.

The representative of the UKRAINIAN SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLIC said that the position of his Government and that of the USSR Government had been one of consistency and of high principle from the beginning of the Palestine question. He supported the Israeli application for admission.

**Decision:** *At the 414th meeting on 4 March 1949, the United States draft resolution (S/1276) was adopted by 9 votes to 1 (Egypt), with 1 abstention (United Kingdom).*