

**BILSEMMUN'26**

# **Historical UNSC Study Guide**

**Under Secretary Generals**

**Saniyar Safari & Berf Elbir**

**Academic Assistant**

**Bera Musab Dağ**

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Letter from the Secretary-General.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. Letter from the Co-Under-Secretaries-General.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Letter from the Academic Assistant.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4. Introduction to the Committee: United Nations Security Council.....</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1. Mandate.....	5
4.2. Structure.....	5
4.3. Functions and Power.....	6
4.4. Key Terms and Definitions.....	7
4.5. Structure Regarding the Agenda Item.....	7
<b>5. Introduction to the Agenda Item: The Spanish Question.....</b>	<b>7</b>
5.1. Key Terms and Definitions.....	7
5.2. Historical Background.....	9
5.3. Timeline of Key Events.....	10
5.4. International Policies.....	11
5.4.1. Australia.....	11
5.4.2. Brazil.....	11
5.4.3. China (Republic of China).....	11
5.4.4. Egypt.....	12
5.4.5. France.....	12
5.4.6. Germany (Allied Occupation Authorities).....	13
5.4.7. Italy.....	14
5.4.8. Mexico.....	14
5.4.9. Netherlands.....	15
5.4.10. Poland.....	15
5.4.11. Portugal.....	15
5.4.12. Soviet Union.....	16
5.4.13. Spain.....	16
5.4.14. United Kingdom.....	17
5.4.15. United States.....	18
<b>6. Questions to be Answered.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>7. Bibliography.....</b>	<b>19</b>

## **1. Letter from the Secretary-General**

Dear Delegates,

It is with great pride and genuine excitement that I welcome you to BILSEM-MUN 2026. As Secretary-General, I have the honour of opening the doors of this conference to each of you whether you are stepping into a committee room for the very first time or returning as a seasoned diplomat.

Model United Nations is far more than a simulation. It is a space where ideas are tested, where the courage to speak meets the discipline to listen, and where young people discover that the world's hardest problems are rarely solved by a single voice. Over these days you will negotiate, you will disagree, you will compromise, and I hope you will surprise yourselves with what you are capable of.

This study guide is your starting point, not your finish line. Read it closely, question it, and then go further: study your country's position, understand the perspectives you will meet across the table, and arrive ready not merely to defend an argument but to build something with the people around you. The most memorable moments in any committee come from delegates who prepared deeply and then dared to think on their feet.

To our committee directors and the entire BILSEM-MUN team, thank you for the countless hours that make a conference like this possible. And to you, our delegates: this conference is yours. Fill it with sharp debate, bold ideas, and the kind of diplomacy that reminds us why we gather here in the first place.

I look forward to meeting you all and to the gavel that begins it all.

Warm regards,

Emir Mücteba Özsiğınan

Secretary-General, BILSEM-MUN 2026

**2. Letter from the Co-Under-Secretaries-General**

**3. Letter from the Academic Assistant**

#### **4. Introduction to the Committee: United Nations Security Council**

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) is responsible for maintaining international peace and security, as outlined in Article 24 of the United Nations Charter. The UNSC is one of the six main organs of the United Nations and was established in 1945 in response to the devastation caused by World War II. The primary responsibility of the UNSC is to address threats to international peace and security and to take action to prevent conflict or resolve it when it occurs.

##### **4.1. Mandate**

The Security Council has in its mandate to furnish matters pertaining to disarmament, peacekeeping missions, protection of human rights, political deliberations and humanitarian crises.<sup>1</sup> Currently, the mandate of the United Nations Security Council has been modified, especially after inculcating the 2030 Agenda of Sustainable Development (2030 Agenda) to discuss the parallel between sustainability, peace and security.<sup>2</sup> The same has been discussed at the meeting on 17 November 2015 as the Security Council focused upon refining its goals post 2015 Sustainable Development Goals.<sup>3</sup> United Nations Security Council mainly discusses issues relevant to sustainable development, protection of human rights and protection of civilians during conflict zones, prevention of conflict and prevail peace through protecting humanitarian rights<sup>4</sup>. Security Council decisions are obligatory in nature as Article 25 of the United Nations Charter gives power to the Security Council to draft binding resolutions which become a requisite to be necessarily followed by all the member states or concerned member states<sup>5</sup>. The Council's position may be addressed by the President of the Security Council through Press Release<sup>6</sup> to address essential concerns and recommend possible solutions concerning the current situation or crisis<sup>7</sup>.

##### **4.2. Structure**

The United Nations Security Council consists of 15 members. Out of these 5 are permanent members, they are also known as "Veto Owners" or "P5 Nations". These permanent members are: the USA, France, China, Russia and the UK. Alongside these 5 member states, there are 10 non-permanent member states appointed for the tenure of 2 years by the United Nations General Assembly. These nations represent their region and foreign policies exhibiting leadership on an international platform. The presidency of the Security Council is held by each member for one month in alphabetical order. The Security Council can be convened anytime by the president at the request of the member states. Consequently, the president also holds the power to call upon member states for a meeting in an urgent crisis, emergency or dispute situation. The member states could extend an invitation to the observer nations who are not allowed to vote but could submit their proposals or draft resolutions. The observers are also welcomed to apprise the council regarding any contemporary issue ongoing in their territory.

---

1: Council on Foreign Relations, CFR Backlanders: The UN Security Council, 2015; Encyclopaedia Britannica, United Nations Security Council, 2014. 2: UN General Assembly, Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (A/RES/70/1), 2015; UN DPA, Politically Speaking, Sustaining peace, Conflict Prevention, Human Rights and Sustainable Development High on Agenda for New Security Council Members, 2018. 3: Lebeda, UN Security Council Discusses Links with 2030 Agenda, SDG Knowledge Hub, 2015. 4: UN DPA, Politically Speaking, Sustaining Peace, Conflict Prevention, Human Rights and Sustainable Development High on Agenda for New Security Council Members, 2018. 5: UN Security Council, What is the Security Council? 2018; Charter of the United Nations, 1945, Art. 25. 6: NGO Working Group on Women, Peace and Security, Mapping Women, Peace and Security in the United Nations Security Council: Report of the NGOWG Monthly Action Points, 2009-2010, 2010, p. 11. 7: *ibid.* p.15.

The United Nations Security Council has established various subsidiary bodies under Article 29 of the UN Charter comprising: the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, sanctions committees, and ad hoc committees, such as the Ad Hoc Sub-Committee on Namibia, etc. The Security Council is also responsible for the supervision of the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC). Each nation is granted one vote, and it requires a special majority (2/3) to pass a resolution. However, if any P5 nation says no, the resolution won't pass, this is known as the exercise of "Veto Power".

### **4.3. Functions and Power**

Knowing the functions and powers are extremely important to know what and in which manner could the Security Council perform in order to drive the required possible solution which must also be considered while delegates write their draft resolution. The powers and functions of UNSC are mentioned in Chapter V, VI, VII, VIII and XII of the UN Charter. These could be understood as follows;

- Submit a special annual report to UNGA for consideration to maintain international peace and security. (Art. 24)
- UNSC could investigate any issue which might endanger maintenance of international peace and security. (Art. 34)
- UNSC could call upon the parties to settle disputes amicably through alternative dispute mechanisms, the procedure for such adjustments could also be provided by UNSC. (Art. 33 & 36(1)) The case could again be referred to UNSC and if the dispute still persists, the parties could settle as it may be considered appropriate. (Art. 37)
- UNSC shall determine and make recommendations for threat to peace, breach of peace and act of aggression. (Art.39) UNSC would also ensure the adherence to such measures. (Art. 41) without the use of arms but would include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations. (Art. 41) In case of further failure UNSC could take actions such as demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations. (Art. 42)
- UNSC may deliberate upon any dispute occurring, and has been reported by member or non-member nations. (Art. 35)
- UNSC could refer legal disputes to the International Court of Justice. (Art. 36)
- Member states of the UN could facilitate UNSC with special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including right of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. (Art. 43)
- UNSC is responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in Article 47, plans to be submitted to the Members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments. (Art.26)
- Member states could assist UNSC for employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces in case of necessity of use of force (Art. 44). UNSC could also take Military Measures and application of Armed Forces with assistance from the Military Staff Committee. (Art. 45,46 & 47)
- UNSC could make recommendations for pacific settlement by itself or by regional agencies of dispute in case alternative dispute settlement or legal settlement is not available. (Art. 38 & 52)

- UNSC shall approve the terms of Trusteeship agreements and assist the Trusteeship Council, in return the Trusteeship Council would undertake its obligation towards UNSC. (Art. 83 & 84)
- UNSC could utilize regional arrangements or agencies for their enforcement and ascertain information in such regards to maintain international peace and security. (Art 53 & 54)

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) stands as a paramount force on the global stage, holding significant influence in matters concerning international peace and security. Established as a central organ under the United Nations Charter, the UNSC plays a pivotal role in addressing complex geopolitical challenges. With its inception dating back to the foundation of the United Nations, the UNSC is steadfast in its dedication to maintaining global stability, preventing conflicts, and fostering sustainable development. Covering a spectrum of issues, including diplomatic resolutions, peacekeeping operations, and crisis management, the UNSC strives to uphold its fundamental objective, ensuring peace and security worldwide through collaborative and decisive action.

#### **4.4. Key Terms and Definitions**

**Security Council:** The principal organ of the United Nations responsible for maintaining international peace and security.

**Permanent Members (P5):** The five countries with permanent seats on the UNSC - the United States, Russia, China, France, and the United Kingdom.

**Veto Power:** The authority of any of the P5 members to block a substantive resolution, regardless of the level of international support for it.

**Peacekeepers:** Individuals or groups that are tasked with maintaining peace and security in conflict zones through monitoring, protection, and support activities.

#### **4.5. Structure Regarding the Agenda Item**

During the time in which our committee takes place, in 1946, the recently-established Council consisted of five permanent and six non-permanent members giving a total of 11 member states. Republic of China, French Fourth Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were the permanent members and Commonwealth of Australia, United States of Brazil, United Mexican States, Kingdom of the Netherlands, Republic of Poland and Kingdom of Egypt were the non-permanent. In addition to these member states, our committee also includes the Spanish State, Portuguese Republic, Italian Republic and Germany (Allied Occupation Authorities) as observers. Observers do not have voting rights, however the other abilities proceed as regular (e.g. delivering speeches, proposing motions, taking points of information).

### **5. Introduction to the Agenda Item: The Spanish Question**

#### **5.1. Key Terms and Definitions**

##### **Key Terms and Definitions**

**Allied Powers:** The coalition of states that opposed the Axis Powers during the Second World War, principally including the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, China, and France. Following the defeat of the Axis, the Allied Powers played a decisive role in shaping the post-war international order and the creation of the United Nations.

**Axis Powers:** The alliance led by Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Imperial Japan during the Second World War. Their military, political, and ideological support for General Francisco Franco during the Spanish Civil War became a central factor in later United Nations discussions regarding Spain's international legitimacy.

**Fascism:** An authoritarian and nationalist political ideology characterized by centralized power, suppression of political opposition, militarism, and the rejection of liberal democratic principles. Following the Second World War, fascism became widely associated with aggression, dictatorship, and violations of fundamental freedoms.

**General Francisco Franco:** Spanish military leader and head of state who emerged victorious in the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939). Franco established an authoritarian regime that remained in power until his death in 1975. His government became the subject of international controversy due to its origins, political structure, and wartime associations.

**Francoist Spain:** The Spanish State governed by General Francisco Franco following the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War. The regime was characterized by authoritarian rule, political repression, strong anti-communism, and the concentration of power in the executive.

**Non-Belligerency:** A political position adopted by a state that does not formally enter a war but demonstrates sympathy or provides varying degrees of support to one side of a conflict. During the Second World War, Spain described its position as one of non-belligerency rather than strict neutrality.

**Blue Division:** A unit of Spanish volunteers authorized by the Franco government to fight alongside German forces against the Soviet Union on the Eastern Front during the Second World War. Its deployment became one of the principal arguments used by critics of the Franco regime to challenge Spain's claims of neutrality.

**UNGA Resolution 32(I):** Adopted on 9 February 1946, the General Assembly reaffirmed that the UN Charter does not apply to regimes imposed with Axis support and recalled Allied declarations at the San Francisco and Potsdam Conferences, rejecting Spain's UN admission due to the Franco government being fascist both in origin and conduct, and lacking legitimacy. It recommended that UN member states align their future relations with Spain with these principles, acting in accordance with the Allied condemnations.

**UNSC Resolution 10:** Adopted on 4 November 1946, the Council decided that the situation in Spain be taken off the list of matters of which the Council is seized, and that all records and documents of the case be put at the disposal of the General Assembly.

**UNGA Resolution 39(I):** Adopted on 12 December 1946, the General Assembly condemned the Franco regime in Spain as a fascist government created with the support of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy and found that it had provided substantial assistance to the Axis during World War II, including the deployment of the Blue Division against the Soviet Union and actions that hindered Allied operations. The General Assembly determined that Franco's government did not represent the will of

the Spanish people and that its continued rule prevented Spain's participation in the international community. Consequently, the Assembly recommended that Spain be excluded from UN membership and UN-related agencies, that all UN member states recall their ambassadors from Madrid, and that Spain be barred from UN conferences and activities until a new, representative government was formed. The resolution further urged that, if such a government was not established within a reasonable time through free elections and respect for fundamental freedoms, the Security Council would consider appropriate measures. At the same time, the UN expressed sympathy for the Spanish people and affirmed that Spain would be welcomed into the UN once acceptable political conditions were met.

**Diplomatic Isolation:** The deliberate reduction or suspension of diplomatic relations with a state in order to express political disapproval, apply pressure, or discourage certain policies. Diplomatic isolation formed the basis of many proposals directed toward Francoist Spain after 1945.

**Cold War:** The emerging geopolitical rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union that began shortly after the Second World War. The development of Cold War tensions increasingly influenced international attitudes toward Spain and altered the priorities of several major powers.

**Legitimacy of Government:** The degree to which a government is recognized as possessing lawful and political authority by its population and by the international community. Questions regarding the legitimacy of Franco's government were central to debates surrounding Spain's international status.

## 5.2. Historical Background

From 1936 to 1939, war tore through Spain - rooted in sharp splits across politics, class, and belief systems. Though local at first, eyes around the world soon turned toward it. On one side stood Franco's Nationalists, backed heavily by Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy. Meanwhile, aid for the Republicans came unevenly: Moscow offered help, and fighters arrived from abroad. When April 1939 brought final triumph to the Nationalists, a strict rule took hold under Franco. Power became tightly held; dissent was silenced without delay.

Later that year, when the Second World War started, Spain did not join any side. As Axis powers gained ground in Europe, Franco's regime shifted toward non-belligerency instead. Close political links with Germany and Italy continued during this period. Despite staying out of official conflict, support for the Axis still emerged in different ways. The sending of the Blue Division to aid German troops on the Eastern Front stood out clearly. This move made several Allied nations doubt how neutral Spain truly was.

After 1945, losing the war reshaped how nations saw Spain. Built on values tied to defeating tyranny, the new United Nations excluded regimes seen as threats to peace. Because of its past backing of fascist powers, several states questioned whether Franco's government deserved equal standing among nations. Talks in San Francisco set the stage; then at Potsdam, key figures confirmed resistance toward welcoming Spanish authorities into the global body.

That year, 1946, saw growing attention on the matter. Backed by prior Allied statements about Spain, Resolution 32(I) was passed by the General Assembly, guiding members to shape ties with Spain around those standards. Not long after, Warsaw raised concerns at the Security Council, stating Franco's government fueled tensions between nations, stirring unease over global stability.

Later, the Security Council set up a smaller group to look into events on the ground. Though this team found no clear reason for urgent measures under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, it noted troubling aspects tied to how Franco came to power, what his rule stood for, and how his government operated. In time, responsibility shifted to the General Assembly, leading to the approval of Resolution 39(I) by year's end in 1946. That decision criticized the regime openly, urged nations to limit ties, while pushing for Spain's removal from agencies linked to the United Nations until democratic structures took root.

Among global concerns at the time, Spain's position stood out. Because of its ties to wartime regimes, questions emerged about national authority versus collective duty. Whether governance under Franco aligned with foundational UN values became a point of discussion. One issue involved how deeply political legitimacy should depend on past alliances. Another looked at whether international bodies had tools to respond when former Axis associates remained in power. Responses varied, shaped by views on intervention and peacekeeping roles. What followed depended less on borders than on interpretations of cooperation after conflict.

### **5.3. Timeline of Key Events**

**1936–1939:** The Spanish Civil War takes place with General Francisco Franco's Nationalists defeating the Republicans with Axis support (Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy).

**1939–1945:** During World War II Spain remains officially neutral but politically sympathetic to Axis powers and Franco maintains authoritarian rule.

**24 October 1945:** The United Nations was founded, Spain is not invited to join due to its fascist government and Axis ties.

**9 February 1946:** UNGA Resolution 32(I) was adopted, rejecting Spain's UN membership application in principle, but the General Assembly had not yet formally condemned or isolated it. This means that Spain could be invited as an observer state to speak and explain its case, though it would not have voting rights.

**4 November 1946:** The Security Council adopts UNSC Resolution 10, deciding not to investigate Spain directly and refers the issue to the General Assembly for consideration.

**12 December 1946:** UNGA Resolution 39(I) was adopted condemning Franco's regime as fascist and incompatible with UN principles. It recommended withdrawal of ambassadors and exclusion of Spain from UN agencies, and encouraged the diplomatic isolation of the fascist regime, basically disallowing Spain's presence in any UN-related body, and that if a free government respecting fundamental freedoms is not established, the UNSC may consider appropriate measures.

**Post-1946:** Spain remains isolated diplomatically, though it continues under Franco's rule. UNSC authority is retained in principle, but no immediate action is taken.

## **5.4. International Policies**

### **5.4.1. Australia**

Australia approaches the Spanish Question primarily from the perspective of its commitment to the Allied victory in World War II and its broader support for a rules-based international order under the newly established United Nations. As a state that fought extensively against the Axis powers and aligned closely with the United Kingdom and the United States, Australia views the continuation of fascist regimes in the post-war period as fundamentally incompatible with the principles upon which the United Nations was founded.

Although geographically distant from Europe, Australia considers the legitimacy of governments and the rejection of fascism to be matters of global concern rather than regional issues. From this standpoint, the Franco regime's origins in Axis support during the Spanish Civil War and its ideological alignment during World War II undermine its claim to neutrality and legitimacy. Australia therefore supports the conclusions reached by the General Assembly in Resolution 39(I), seeing diplomatic isolation as a justified response to a regime that contradicts the values of collective security, self-determination, and political freedom. At the same time, Australia tends to favor multilateral and institutional approaches over unilateral pressure, supporting the handling of the issue through the General Assembly rather than aggressive Security Council action. Its policy reflects a balance between moral opposition to fascism and caution against destabilizing measures, emphasizing that Spain's eventual reintegration into the international community should depend on clear political reform and alignment with democratic principles.

### **5.4.2. Brazil**

Brazil's position on the Spanish Question is shaped by its experience as a Latin American state that actively supported the Allied cause during World War II while also maintaining a tradition of caution regarding intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign states. Having sent troops to fight in the Italian Campaign, Brazil views the defeat of fascism as a defining outcome of the war and recognizes that Franco's regime stands in contradiction to the ideological direction of the post-war international system. Brazil acknowledges that the Franco government was established with Axis assistance and that Spain's wartime conduct, including its cooperation with Axis forces, weakens claims of strict neutrality.

As a result, Brazil does not oppose the General Assembly's condemnation of the Franco regime and supports diplomatic distancing as a legitimate expression of collective disapproval. However, Brazil remains wary of framing the Spanish Question as a direct threat to international peace that would justify extensive Security Council involvement. Its policy reflects an effort to reconcile opposition to authoritarianism with respect for state sovereignty and regional stability. Brazil therefore favors a gradual, diplomatic approach that signals the unacceptability of fascist governance while avoiding coercive measures that could set precedents for interference elsewhere. Within the UN framework, Brazil supports conditional exclusion, maintaining that Spain's return to full international participation should depend on meaningful political change rather than external imposition.

### **5.4.3. China (Republic of China)**

The Republic of China approaches the Spanish Question with a strong emphasis on the moral and political lessons drawn from the Second World War. Having endured prolonged aggression, occupation, and large-scale civilian suffering during the conflict, China places particular importance on the principle that regimes associated with fascism and militarism should not be legitimized in the post-war international system. From this perspective, the origins of Franco's rule, established with decisive military assistance from Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy during the Spanish Civil War, fundamentally undermine the regime's claim to international legitimacy. China views the continued

existence of such a government as incompatible with the founding values of the United Nations, which were shaped directly by the collective struggle against Axis aggression.

China's policy is further influenced by Spain's conduct during World War II. Although Spain maintained a formal stance of non-belligerency, the Republic of China considers this position largely symbolic. The political alignment of Franco's government with Axis powers, combined with the deployment of the Blue Division to fight alongside German forces, demonstrates, in China's view, that Spain materially and ideologically supported the Axis war effort. These actions strengthen China's support for the General Assembly's determination, particularly in Resolution 39(I), that the Franco regime does not represent the will of the Spanish people and cannot be reconciled with the principles of collective security and popular sovereignty.

At the same time, China remains attentive to the institutional balance within the United Nations. While firmly supporting diplomatic isolation and exclusion from UN-related bodies, it accepts the Security Council's decision under Resolution 10 to refer the matter primarily to the General Assembly rather than escalate it as a direct enforcement issue. China's stance reflects a belief that international legitimacy must be denied to fascist regimes through coordinated diplomatic pressure, while allowing political transformation to emerge internally. Until such transformation occurs, China maintains that Spain's participation in the international community would weaken the credibility of the United Nations and its commitment to opposing authoritarian rule born out of aggression.

#### **5.4.4. Egypt**

Egypt's position on the Spanish Question is shaped by its status as a newly prominent actor in international diplomacy and its sensitivity to questions of sovereignty and non-intervention. While Egypt did not play a central role in the European theater of World War II, it aligns itself with the broader Allied conclusion that fascist regimes are incompatible with the principles of the post-war order. Egypt recognizes that Franco's government emerged directly from a civil war heavily influenced by Axis intervention and that Spain's wartime conduct cannot be fully separated from the broader fascist camp. As such, Egypt does not dispute the General Assembly's characterization of the Franco regime as lacking democratic legitimacy. Nevertheless, Egypt approaches the issue with a degree of caution. As a state that has experienced external influence and intervention in its own political affairs, Egypt is wary of setting precedents that might legitimize excessive international involvement in domestic governance. This concern informs its relatively restrained attitude toward Security Council action, favoring diplomatic measures over coercive enforcement. Egypt supports the use of political and diplomatic isolation as a means of expressing collective disapproval while stopping short of endorsing actions that could destabilize Spain internally or expand the scope of Security Council authority too broadly.

Within the United Nations, Egypt therefore accepts the transfer of the issue to the General Assembly under Resolution 10 and views General Assembly resolutions as the appropriate forum for addressing questions of legitimacy and representation. Egypt's policy reflects a balance between opposition to fascism and respect for sovereign equality, emphasizing that Spain's reintegration into international institutions should be conditional upon clear political reform, but achieved without direct interference by external powers.

#### **5.4.5. France**

France adopts one of the strongest and most uncompromising positions on the Spanish Question, shaped decisively by its experience during World War II and its proximity to Spain. Having suffered occupation, collaborationist rule, and significant internal division as a result of fascist aggression,

France views the survival of the Franco regime as a direct contradiction of the political outcome of the war. For French policymakers, Francoist Spain represents a lingering extension of Axis ideology on the European continent, one that poses both a symbolic and practical challenge to post-war stability. France's hostility toward the Franco regime is reinforced by historical memory of the Spanish Civil War, during which France witnessed the consequences of Axis intervention firsthand. The use of German and Italian military support to secure Franco's victory, followed by Spain's political alignment with the Axis during World War II, convinces France that Franco's claim to neutrality is fundamentally unconvincing. The deployment of the Blue Division against the Soviet Union further solidifies France's position that Spain contributed to the Axis war effort in a manner inconsistent with international norms. Within the United Nations, France strongly supports the conclusions of UNGA Resolution 39(I) and actively endorses diplomatic isolation as a necessary measure to prevent the normalization of fascist governance. Unlike more cautious states, France is willing to treat the Spanish Question as a matter with clear implications for European security, particularly given Spain's geographic proximity and historical ties. While accepting the procedural decision reflected in UNSC Resolution 10, France maintains that sustained pressure must be applied until a representative government is established in Spain. From the French perspective, Spain's exclusion from the international community is not punitive but corrective, serving as a clear signal that regimes founded on fascist principles have no place in the post-war European order.

#### **5.4.6. Germany (Allied Occupation Authorities)**

Germany, represented in the Security Council through the Allied Occupation Authorities, occupies a unique and highly symbolic position in the Spanish Question. Having been the principal Axis power responsible for the devastation of Europe, Germany in 1946 does not speak as a sovereign state but as a territory under Allied control, tasked with confronting the consequences of fascism. This context strongly shapes its relevance to the debate on Francoist Spain. The Allied authorities governing Germany broadly accept the principle that fascist regimes must not be allowed to survive or regain legitimacy in the post-war international order, as such regimes are viewed as direct sources of instability and aggression.

From this standpoint, the Franco regime is widely perceived by the Allied authorities as ideologically aligned with the very system that led Europe into catastrophe. Nazi Germany's extensive support for Franco during the Spanish Civil War, including military intervention and strategic assistance, is recognized as a key factor in Franco's rise to power. The persistence of that regime after 1945 is therefore seen as inconsistent with the broader Allied effort to dismantle fascism and prevent its re-emergence in any form. Spain's wartime conduct, including its political sympathy toward the Axis and the deployment of the Blue Division, further reinforces the view that Francoist Spain cannot be treated as a neutral or detached actor.

Within the UN framework, the Allied Occupation Authorities support the diplomatic isolation of Spain as outlined in the General Assembly resolutions, particularly Resolution 39(I). The German case itself serves as a reference point for the argument that international supervision and pressure are sometimes necessary to ensure a clear break from fascist governance. While Germany is not in a position to advocate independent policy, its occupied status underscores the broader Allied consensus that regimes born of fascist aggression must be excluded from international legitimacy until meaningful political transformation occurs.

#### **5.4.7. Italy**

Italy's position on the Spanish Question is shaped by its own recent political transformation and its desire to distance itself from its fascist past. Having emerged from World War II as a defeated Axis power that had overthrown Mussolini's regime and begun the process of democratization, Italy views Francoist Spain through a lens of both responsibility and contrast. Unlike Spain, Italy underwent regime change and accepted international supervision and reform, which allows it to present itself as a state that has broken with fascism rather than preserved it. Italian policymakers recognize that Fascist Italy played a decisive role in Franco's victory during the Spanish Civil War, providing extensive military and material support. This historical involvement creates a moral incentive for Italy to support international condemnation of the Franco regime, as continued tolerance of Francoist Spain would implicitly legitimize Italy's own past actions. Italy therefore aligns itself with the General Assembly's determination that the Franco government lacks democratic legitimacy and remains incompatible with the principles of the United Nations.

At the same time, Italy approaches the issue with a degree of pragmatism. As a Mediterranean state undergoing reconstruction and political stabilization, Italy is sensitive to the risks of prolonged regional instability. While supporting diplomatic isolation and exclusion from UN institutions, Italy is cautious about framing the issue as one requiring coercive Security Council measures. Its policy emphasizes the importance of political reform within Spain, drawing implicit comparisons between Spain's continued authoritarianism and Italy's own post-war transition. Italy's stance ultimately reflects an effort to reinforce the norm that reintegration into the international community must be earned through clear rejection of fascism and acceptance of democratic governance.

#### **5.4.8. Mexico**

Mexico adopts one of the most principled and ideologically consistent positions on the Spanish Question, rooted in its longstanding support for the Spanish Republican cause. During the Spanish Civil War, Mexico openly backed the Republican government and provided diplomatic and material assistance, a stance that sharply distinguished it from many other states. This historical commitment continues to define Mexico's policy in 1946, making it one of the strongest opponents of Francoist Spain within the United Nations.

From Mexico's perspective, the Franco regime represents the illegitimate outcome of foreign intervention and authoritarian repression rather than the genuine will of the Spanish people. Mexico rejects any attempt to portray Francoist Spain as neutral or politically acceptable, emphasizing the decisive role played by Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy in securing Franco's victory. Spain's subsequent alignment with the Axis during World War II, including the deployment of the Blue Division, is seen as further confirmation that the regime stands in direct contradiction to the principles of sovereignty, self-determination, and anti-fascism.

Within the United Nations, Mexico strongly supports the General Assembly's condemnation of Francoist Spain and views diplomatic isolation not merely as a policy option but as a moral obligation. Unlike more cautious states, Mexico is less concerned about the implications of non-intervention when faced with what it considers a clear case of illegitimate governance. Mexico consistently emphasizes that the Spanish people themselves were denied the opportunity to determine their political future and argues that the international community has a responsibility to withhold recognition until that situation changes. As a result, Mexico supports Spain's exclusion from UN bodies until a representative government is established through free political processes.

#### **5.4.9. Netherlands**

The Netherlands approaches the Spanish Question as a state that has only recently regained its sovereignty after years of occupation and war. This experience strongly informs Dutch sensitivity toward authoritarian governance and the long-term risks posed by regimes rooted in fascist ideology. From the Dutch perspective, the post-war international order must rest on the clear rejection of political systems that contributed to the outbreak and prolongation of World War II. Francoist Spain, having emerged from the Spanish Civil War with decisive Axis support, is therefore viewed as inconsistent with the values upon which the United Nations was founded. While Spain remained formally non-belligerent during World War II, the Netherlands does not consider this sufficient to establish political neutrality. The ideological orientation of the Franco regime, its close political ties to Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, and the deployment of the Blue Division to fight alongside Axis forces undermine any claim that Spain remained detached from the conflict.

As a result, the Netherlands supports the General Assembly's conclusion that the Franco government lacks democratic legitimacy and cannot be treated as a normal member of the international community. At the same time, Dutch policy reflects a preference for cautious, institutionally grounded responses. The Netherlands supports diplomatic isolation and exclusion from UN-related bodies as proportionate measures but remains reluctant to endorse more forceful Security Council action. It accepts the referral of the issue to the General Assembly under Resolution 10 and emphasizes that Spain's eventual reintegration should depend on demonstrable political reform rather than external pressure alone.

#### **5.4.10. Poland**

Poland adopts a firm and ideologically driven stance on the Spanish Question, shaped by its catastrophic experience during World War II and its alignment with broader anti-fascist objectives. Having been invaded, occupied, and devastated by Axis powers, Poland views the continued existence of fascist regimes as a direct threat to the credibility of the post-war international system. From this standpoint, Francoist Spain is perceived not as a neutral state, but as a surviving extension of the political forces that plunged Europe into war.

Poland places significant emphasis on the origins of Franco's regime in the Spanish Civil War, during which Axis intervention played a decisive role. This historical reality, combined with Spain's wartime cooperation with Nazi Germany through the Blue Division, reinforces Poland's view that Francoist Spain cannot be separated from the broader Axis legacy. Poland therefore strongly supports the General Assembly's condemnation of the Franco regime and the recommendation that Spain be excluded from UN membership and related institutions.

Within the United Nations, Poland favors sustained diplomatic pressure to prevent the normalization of fascist governance. While accepting the procedural decision to refer the issue to the General Assembly, Poland consistently argues that failure to act decisively would undermine the UN's stated commitment to opposing aggression and authoritarianism. Poland maintains that Spain's reintegration into the international community must be contingent upon the establishment of a representative government that reflects the will of the Spanish people.

#### **5.4.11. Portugal**

Portugal's position on the Spanish Question is shaped by its geographic proximity to Spain and the nature of its own political system. Governed by the authoritarian Estado Novo regime under António de Oliveira Salazar, Portugal approaches the issue with caution and a strong emphasis on

non-intervention. While Portugal does not deny the fascist origins of the Franco regime or its ideological alignment during the Spanish Civil War, it remains reluctant to support measures that could legitimize external involvement in domestic political arrangements.

Portugal places considerable weight on Spain's official non-belligerency during World War II, presenting it as evidence that the Franco regime did not pose a direct military threat to international peace. From the Portuguese perspective, the Spanish Question is primarily a matter of internal governance rather than collective security. As a result, Portugal is skeptical of framing the issue in terms of Security Council enforcement and favors handling it through diplomatic discussion rather than institutional exclusion.

Nevertheless, Portugal cannot fully distance itself from the broader international consensus condemning fascism. While it does not actively oppose General Assembly resolutions addressing Spain, it adopts a reserved posture that seeks to limit their practical impact. Portugal's policy reflects a desire to preserve regional stability on the Iberian Peninsula and to avoid precedents that could later be applied to its own domestic political system, emphasizing gradual change and diplomatic engagement over isolation.

#### **5.4.12. Soviet Union**

The Soviet Union approaches the Spanish Question as a fundamental ideological and security issue rather than a narrow diplomatic dispute. Having borne the heaviest human and material losses during World War II, the USSR views the survival of any fascist regime in post-war Europe as a direct challenge to the principles upon which the United Nations was established. From the Soviet perspective, Francoist Spain represents an unresolved remnant of the Axis order, one that contradicts the collective victory over fascism and threatens the credibility of the emerging international system. The roots of Soviet hostility toward the Franco regime lie in the Spanish Civil War, during which the USSR supported the Republican government against Franco's Nationalists, who received decisive backing from Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. This experience entrenched the view that Franco's rule was not an internal Spanish development, but the product of foreign fascist intervention. Spain's conduct during World War II further reinforces this perception. Although officially non-belligerent, Spain's ideological alignment with the Axis and the deployment of the Blue Division against Soviet forces are regarded in Moscow as clear evidence of participation in the broader fascist war effort. Within the United Nations, the Soviet Union strongly supports the General Assembly's condemnation of the Franco regime and argues that diplomatic isolation is a necessary safeguard against the normalization of fascism. The USSR maintains that recognizing or reintegrating Spain without substantial political change would undermine the moral authority of the UN and weaken its commitment to opposing aggression and authoritarianism. Soviet policy emphasizes that the issue extends beyond Spain itself, as tolerating Franco's regime could encourage the persistence of similar governments elsewhere.

At the same time, the Soviet Union is attentive to the strategic implications of the Spanish Question in the context of emerging East–West tensions. Moscow expresses concern that a rehabilitated Francoist Spain could become aligned with Western powers and serve as a strategic foothold hostile to Soviet interests. Consequently, the USSR insists that only the establishment of a genuinely representative government, formed through free political processes and respecting fundamental freedoms, could justify reconsideration of Spain's international status.

#### **5.4.13. Spain**

The Spanish State, represented by the Franco regime, rejects the characterization of its government as illegitimate and incompatible with the principles of the United Nations. Spain presents its position by

emphasizing the outcome of the Spanish Civil War as a domestic conflict resolved through military victory rather than foreign imposition. From the Franco government's perspective, its rule constitutes a restoration of order and stability following years of political polarization and violence, and therefore represents the sovereign will of the Spanish state rather than an externally imposed regime.

Spain strongly defends its wartime policy of non-belligerency, arguing that it remained outside the formal hostilities of World War II and did not declare war on any Allied power. The Franco regime minimizes the significance of ideological alignment with the Axis and frames actions such as the deployment of the Blue Division as voluntary and limited, rather than state-directed participation in the war. Spanish representatives assert that these actions should not be interpreted as evidence of aggression or a threat to international peace.

In response to the General Assembly's condemnation, Spain portrays diplomatic isolation as unjust and discriminatory, arguing that it punishes the Spanish people rather than the government. The regime maintains that exclusion from international institutions violates the principle of sovereign equality and exceeds the proper mandate of the United Nations. Spain also warns that continued isolation risks economic hardship and social instability, which could have broader regional consequences.

Spain's position ultimately centers on the claim that questions of internal political organization fall outside the legitimate scope of international intervention. While expressing willingness to engage diplomatically, the Franco government rejects any conditionality tied to regime change, insisting that Spain's political system should evolve independently, free from external pressure or coercion.

#### **5.4.14. United Kingdom**

The United Kingdom adopts a measured and pragmatic approach to the Spanish Question, balancing ideological opposition to fascism with a longstanding commitment to stability and non-intervention. As a victorious Allied power and a permanent member of the Security Council, the UK acknowledges that the Franco regime originated with Axis support and that its political character stands in tension with the democratic values promoted by the United Nations. British officials do not contest the General Assembly's assessment that Francoist Spain lacks democratic legitimacy.

At the same time, the United Kingdom remains cautious about expanding the role of the Security Council into matters of internal governance. British policy emphasizes that while diplomatic disapproval is appropriate, the UN should avoid actions that could destabilize Spain or establish precedents for intrusive intervention. This cautious outlook contributes to the UK's acceptance of UNSC Resolution 10 and the decision to refer the issue primarily to the General Assembly rather than pursue enforcement measures.

Strategic considerations also shape British policy. Spain's geographic position at the entrance to the Mediterranean gives it long-term importance for European security and maritime stability. The UK is therefore attentive to the risks that prolonged isolation might drive Spain toward greater political rigidity or unintended alignment with a single ideological bloc. Britain favors a policy that maintains pressure on the Franco regime while leaving open the possibility of gradual normalization should political conditions evolve.

Ultimately, the United Kingdom supports Spain's exclusion from UN membership and agencies as a temporary measure, viewing it as a means of encouraging reform rather than an end in itself. British policy stresses that Spain's eventual reintegration should be contingent upon clear political change, but achieved through sustained diplomatic signaling rather than coercion.

### **5.4.15. United States**

The United States approaches the Spanish Question with a combination of ideological opposition to fascism and strategic caution shaped by the evolving post-war environment. As a principal architect of the United Nations and a leading force in the Allied victory, the United States recognizes that the Franco regime was established with Axis support and conflicts with the democratic principles promoted by the UN Charter. This recognition underlies American support for the General Assembly's condemnation of Francoist Spain.

However, the United States is more reluctant than some other powers to frame the Spanish Question as an immediate threat to international peace. American policymakers distinguish between moral condemnation and Security Council enforcement, favoring diplomatic pressure over coercive measures. This perspective is reflected in the acceptance of UNSC Resolution 10, which limits the Council's direct involvement and places greater responsibility on the General Assembly.

American policy is also influenced by concerns over stability in Western Europe and the Mediterranean. The United States prioritizes reconstruction, economic recovery, and the prevention of renewed conflict in the aftermath of World War II. There is apprehension that excessive pressure on Spain could provoke internal unrest or undermine regional stability, outcomes viewed as counterproductive to broader post-war goals.

At the same time, early Cold War considerations increasingly shape American calculations. While not yet fully articulated, concerns about the expansion of Soviet influence contribute to a more cautious approach toward isolating an explicitly anti-communist regime. Nevertheless, within the UN framework, the United States maintains that Spain's return to the international community must be conditional upon political reform, respect for fundamental freedoms, and a demonstrable break from its fascist origins.

## **6. Questions to be Answered**

1. Does the Franco regime constitute a threat to international peace and security, or is it primarily a domestic political matter outside the scope of Security Council action?
2. To what extent should the origins of a government influence its legitimacy within the international community?
3. Should Spain's cooperation with Axis Powers during the Second World War justify diplomatic isolation after the war has ended?
4. What role should the United Nations play in addressing governments perceived as authoritarian or unrepresentative?
5. Are diplomatic measures such as ambassadorial withdrawal and exclusion from international organizations effective tools for encouraging political change?
6. How can the United Nations balance the principles of state sovereignty and non-intervention with its commitment to promoting peace, security, and fundamental freedoms?
7. Should Spain's participation in international institutions be conditioned upon political reform, free elections, or guarantees of civil liberties?
8. What measures, if any, should the Security Council recommend regarding the future relationship between the United Nations and Francoist Spain?
9. How can the international community express opposition to a government without negatively affecting the civilian population of that state?
10. What precedent might Security Council action on the Spanish Question establish for future cases involving disputed governments and regime legitimacy?

**7. Bibliography**

- [https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/32\(I\)](https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/32(I))
- [https://docs.un.org/en/S/RES/10\(1946\)](https://docs.un.org/en/S/RES/10(1946))
- [https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/39\(I\)](https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/39(I))