

Some objections have been made to the admission of certain applicants on the grounds that they might not fully qualify as states and that they might not be able to carry out their obligations as members of the Organization. We are entering here a field where there is bound to be controversy. Unless there is willingness to compromise to take a moderate view, again the prospects of progress are likely to be jeopardized indefinitely. For our part, we consider that new candidates should not be required to meet stricter standards than those which have been applied in the past in dealing with this problem.

I submit that we must interpret the Charter in a spirit which is compatible with the Organization as it exists and as it has developed since its foundation. The United Nations is not and it never has been the preserve of countries all of whom are inclined to give similar interpretations to Article 4(1) or any other. We could of course have formed a United Nations of this kind with membership exclusive to those who see alike on most things. When we rejected such a conception of the United Nations we accepted by implication a broad interpretation of the terms of the Charter.

In the view of my Delegation there has never been any doubt as to the infinitely greater value of a United Nations which embraces all the major traditions and contemporary philosophies of government than of one confined to those who are unlikely to quarrel with each other over anything serious. Having accepted this view as one more likely to bring about peace and harmony in the world, we are obliged, I think, to accept its implications. One of those implications is that we ought not to use the Charter to bar from membership countries whose policies and points of view resemble closely those of other states which are Charter members.

It is by the principle of ensuring the broad representative character of the United Nations that we have justified the position taken in our draft resolution. It may be thought that this is a principle which is contrary to the strict letter of the Charter. If one accepts, however, the argument that I have put forward above, I do not think that there is a contradiction involved. My argument is that the principles of the Charter must be interpreted in the light of the intended world-wide nature of our membership. If the United Nations were confined entirely to peoples of one tradition, then we might be justified in a more limited interpretation of Article 4. Given the fact, however, that it includes members of many different traditions, that it is in a sense, therefore, virtually universal, we must understand its provisions in those terms.

Members of the committee will have noted that the draft resolution refers to the pending application for membership of all those countries about which no problem of unification arises. It will be understood that the resolution refers to unification for purposes of membership in the U.N. only, and that it is not intended to exclude from membership, now or later, applicants which have problems of this nature in other contexts.