



Wednesday, 4 October 1950, at 3 p.m.

Lake Success, New York

CONTENTS

Page

The problem of the independence of Korea (<i>concluded</i>)	53
---	----

Chairman: Mr. Roberto URDANETA ARBELÁEZ (Colombia).

The problem of the independence of Korea (*concluded*)

[Item 24]*

GENERAL DISCUSSION (*concluded*)

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Rapporteur of the United Nations Commission on Korea and the representative of the Republic of Korea took their places at the Committee table.

1. Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico), referring to Mr. Vyshinsky's allusion to the anti-interventionist attitude of the United States and Mexico in the case of French military action in Mexico in 1862 and 1867, pointed out that his government had constantly and without exception opposed all foreign military intervention in the internal affairs of a State. His government had protested in the League of Nations against the occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Nazis, against Italian aggression in Ethiopia and against Japanese intervention in Manchuria. Moreover, Mexico had always supported the principle of the right of nations to self-determination, and its policy regarding Korea was prompted by the same principle.

2. United Nations action in Korea had two aspects which deserved consideration: (a) the military and (b) the political. As regards the first, his country had shown by its actions and the statements of its President that it stood firmly by the decisions of the Security Council.

3. As regards the General Assembly's political action aimed at achieving the independence and unification of a democratic and free Korea, his country felt that the draft resolution of the eight Powers (A/C.1/558) could achieve that aim. Indeed the Members of the General Assembly had, by their earlier attitude, already tacitly approved all the points of that draft resolution which was, moreover, based on the principles underlying the

Cairo, Potsdam and Moscow declarations and the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in 1947, 1948 and 1949 (resolutions 112 (II), 195 (III) and 293 (IV)).

4. Under that draft resolution, the United Nations Organization and its Members solemnly undertook not to seek in Korea any economic privileges or strategic advantages.

5. The United Nations would have to continue to deal with the Korean problem until such time as stable and peaceful conditions could be established and a unified and truly democratic Korean government set up, for it could not leave unfinished the task entrusted to it.

6. Mexico did not share the doubts sometimes expressed by some delegations concerning the General Assembly's competence to deal with problems affecting the independence of a territory or people as, for example, the appointment of a United Nations Commissioner and an Advisory Council for Libya. Mexico had approved the establishment of the Temporary Commission on Korea and the United Nations Commission on Korea, whose report to the General Assembly (A/1350) it regarded as authoritative. As to the new United Nations commission for Korea proposed in the draft resolution of the eight Powers, it must first of all assume the functions so far exercised by the existing Commission. Naturally the General Assembly resolutions of 1947, 1948 and 1949 would remain in force, at any rate in spirit.

7. The new committee would have to see that the inhabitants of both South and North Korea were free to vote without any pressure whatsoever on any questions on which they were consulted; it would also be its duty to see that the Northern population was represented in the government to be set up.

8. Mr. Padillo Nervo then recalled the following principles enumerated in a letter despatched by him in

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

1948, as Chairman of the Interim Committee, to the Chairman of the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea¹ in reply to a request from that Commission for an advisory opinion: (a) elections should be held in an atmosphere of complete freedom supervised by the Commission; (b) representatives elected to the National Assembly should be free to consult with the Temporary Commission and Korean political groups which had not taken part in the elections, in order to decide upon the form of the government to be set up and the future participation of those groups in that government. The Interim Committee had hoped that the representatives elected to the Korean National Assembly would be able, through such consultations, to achieve the unification of Korea. Although the present situation was different, his delegation believed that the spirit which had prevailed in the Interim Committee during the drafting of those recommendations should be maintained.

9. As regards sub-paragraph (b) of the draft resolution of the eight Powers (A/C.1/558), which laid down that consultations should take place between the interim committee for Korea and the United Nations Unified Command, his government felt that that text did not imply any military obligations other than those already accepted in the Security Council's resolution.

10. There were two omissions, doubtless unintentional, in the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/558): no mention was made of the organ to which the United Nations Commission for Korea was to submit its reports, and it did not provide for consultation between the Commission and the Interim Committee of the General Assembly. His delegation therefore proposed that a paragraph similar to sub-paragraph 2 (f) of General Assembly resolution 293 (IV)² should be added.

11. The draft resolution of the five delegations (A/C.1/567) appeared to have been inspired by the same spirit as that of the eight Powers. It provided for the independence and unification of Korea and for the possibility that its people should settle their own affairs. However, the means by which those ends were to be attained differed essentially from those suggested by the eight Powers. For those and other reasons already set forth by other representatives, his delegation could not support the draft resolution of the five delegations.

12. Mr. Vyshinsky's theory that the war in Korea was a civil war and therefore rendered any United Nations intervention illegal, was invalid for the following reasons: (a) North Korea had a government which was recognized and supported by the USSR. Its admission to the United Nations had even been proposed in the Security Council; (b) South Korea had a government which had been set up under the auspices of the United Nations and recognized by the General Assembly. In the face of a conflict between the authorities of North Korea and the accepted Government of the Republic of Korea, it had to be admitted that the

problem went far beyond a mere question of definition. The United Nations had taken swift and effective action, as it had seen clearly that if such action was not taken, the world might be involved in a general conflict. It was surely the essential and basic duty of the United Nations to take all necessary steps to settle such serious disputes as the war in Korea.

13. His delegation would not oppose the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of India (A/C.1/572), which proposed the appointment of a sub-committee. The Mexican delegation's attitude regarding that resolution was in conformity with the principles upheld by Mexico in the past. The Indian draft resolution had been inspired by the same spirit which underlay General Assembly resolution 190 (III) entitled "Appeal to the great Powers etc. . ." submitted by Mexico during the General Assembly's third session. Even if fresh attempts at reconciliation seemed unlikely to succeed, no effort should be spared in trying to reach a peaceful settlement of the dispute, as it was the duty of the United Nations to create, in collaboration with all the peace-loving peoples of the world, a new order governed by law, which would assure peace, security, freedom and prosperity for all.

14. The CHAIRMAN announced that there were no more names on his list of speakers, and that the debate on the question of Korean independence was closed.

15. The Secretary-General of the United Nations had forwarded to him a communication (A/C.1/565) dealing with a statement concerning the Secretariat made by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR at the Committee's 351st meeting.

16. At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. PROTITCH (Secretary of the First Committee) read the communication in question, in which the Secretary-General stated that neither he nor any member of the Secretariat had at any time made any commitment to the Korean representative with regard to the personnel of the secretariat of the United Nations Commission in Korea. The members of the staff of any commission were always selected on the basis of their efficiency and competence and in harmony with their pledge of loyalty to the Organization. With regard to the selection of the members of the Commission, no suggestion had ever been made by the Secretariat that steps should be taken to replace Syria by Turkey, or generally speaking, to replace any country by another on the Commission.

17. The CHAIRMAN said that before taking the vote he would give representatives who wished to explain their votes or proposals permission to speak.

18. Mr. DE FREITAS VALLE (Brazil) said that as a result of the sensible suggestion made by the representative of El Salvador at the preceding meeting, his delegation had decided that reference should be made in the eight-Power resolution (A/C.1/558) to the services rendered by the Commission on Korea in the performance of its task. It therefore submitted an amendment to add at the end of the draft resolution (A/C.1/558) the following new paragraph (A/C.1-571):

"Expresses its appreciation of the services rendered by the members of the United Nations Commis-

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Supplement No. 9*, vol. I, chapter IV, para. 22.

² Sub-paragraph 2 (f) reads as follows:

"Shall render a report to the next regular session of the General Assembly and to any prior special session which might be called to consider the subject matter of the present resolution, and shall render such interim reports as it may deem appropriate to the Secretary-General for transmission to Members."

sion on Korea in the performance of their important and difficult task.”

19. Sir Benegal RAU (India) explained that his draft resolution for the setting up of a sub-committee (A/C.1/572) did not contain the names of the members because he had not had time to consult the various delegations. That sub-committee would have to make a recommendation before 6 October, in order not to delay the work of the Committee. It would examine all the proposals which had been or which might be made. The draft resolution read as follows (A/C.1/572):

“The First Committee

“Decides to appoint a sub-committee of seven members (of which three shall be Asian countries) to be designated by the Chairman of the Committee, to take into consideration all draft resolutions, proposals and suggestions concerning the problem of the independence of Korea which have been or may be presented before the Committee or the sub-committee and to recommend to the Committee a draft resolution on the subject commanding the largest measure of agreement.

“The sub-committee shall submit its recommendation before 6 October 1950.”

20. In view of the fact that it was essential above all to reach a solution which was acceptable to all Member States, the Indian delegation expressed the hope that its proposal would be accepted.

21. Mr. CHAUVEL (France) observed that his delegation had not wished to delay the settlement of the Korean question by intervening in the general discussion. However, he was anxious to explain the way in which his delegation would vote on the various proposals that had been submitted.

22. It would not be able to vote for the draft resolution of the five Powers (A/C.1/567), since that resolution not only ignored the fundamental facts but denied them. In fact, the proposal placed on an equal footing the Governments of North and South Korea, whereas in the eyes of the United Nations there had been an essential difference in the status of those two entities even before 25 June 1950, and particularly since the aggression by North Korea. Moreover, the resolution was based on the fallacy that it would be sufficient to effect the withdrawal of the United Nations forces, i.e., to re-establish the *status quo ante*, in order to settle the Korean problem, whereas it was precisely because there had been no United Nations troops in Korea on 25 June that hostilities had broken out.

23. Although the draft resolution contained some praiseworthy points, it was of no practical value because it was false and unreal. It provided no opportunity for putting into effect conditions which would secure free elections and the formation of an independent, unified and democratic State. The most that it would do would be to create chaos.

24. The French delegation would vote in favour of the eight-Power joint proposal (A/C.1/558), as that proposal took reality into account and set up machinery which would make it possible to find adequate solutions for the problems that would arise.

25. The proposal submitted by the Indian delegation (A/C.1/572) was not realistic, since it was designed to achieve a compromise between two proposals, one of which was based on the real facts and the other of which was impracticable. Moreover, its adoption would only delay a decision which seemed to be of the utmost urgency. The French delegation would therefore vote against that draft resolution.

26. The CHAIRMAN recalled that from the point of view of procedure, the Indian proposal (A/C.1/572) had priority over the other proposals.

27. Mahmoud FAWZI Bey (Egypt) congratulated the Indian delegation on the wise and courageous attitude which it had adopted in submitting its draft resolution. He believed that it would not be too much to devote one further day to an effort at conciliation. His delegation wholeheartedly supported the Indian proposal.

28. Mr. AUSTIN (United States of America) appreciated the efforts of the Indian representative which he was sure were inspired by the noblest motives. Nevertheless, he drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the fact that if that resolution was adopted, it could not fail to delay the work of the Political Committee and of the General Assembly which might result in endangering the lives of hundreds of men and permitting the aggressor to prolong his activities.

29. It was obvious, as Mr. Vyshinsky himself had remarked, that the eight-Power joint proposal (A/C.1/558) and the proposal of the five Powers (A/C.1/567) were irreconcilable. The sub-committee envisaged in the Indian proposal would be incapable of bringing about an agreement and might, as a result, delay the Committee considerably.

30. It emerged from the discussion that the USSR delegation claimed that the war in Korea was a civil war. The USSR delegation opposed the conclusions of the Security Council according to which North Korea was an aggressor and was defying the United Nations. It requested the withdrawal of United Nations troops even before the aggressor was repelled and peace restored. That was the best way of enabling North Korea to launch a new aggression in the future.

31. The attitude of the North Koreans had found a skilled advocate within the Political Committee. The settlement of the problem would not be furthered by a prolongation of the discussion. On the contrary, any delay would be favourable to the aggressor, which so far had shown no sign of any desire to get in touch with the Commander of the United Nations forces in Korea in order to benefit from the proposals made by the United Nations. The United States delegation would therefore be obliged to vote against the Indian proposal.

32. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that he had never adopted the attitude imputed to him by the representative of the United States. In his speech he had explained why his delegation had joined with four others in submitting a draft resolution (A/C.1/567) and why the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/558) was unacceptable, for it envisaged the occupation of the whole of Korea.

33. However, a new situation had been created by the submission of the Indian proposal (A/C.1/572) which

sought to find grounds for agreement. It was true that at first sight that was a difficult task, but that was no reason for shirking it. The USSR delegation believed that every possible effort should be made to bring about a conciliation by peaceful means. The statement of the United States representative proved that his government had no desire to adopt such a procedure.

34. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Indian proposal (A/C.1/572).

The proposal was rejected by 32 votes to 24, with 3 abstentions.

35. Mr. CASTRO (El Salvador) said that since the purpose of the proposal submitted by the Brazilian delegation (A/C.1/571) was the same as that of the Salvadorean delegation's amendment (A/C.1/570), the latter would be withdrawn.

36. The CHAIRMAN said that as the Salvadorean delegation's amendment had been withdrawn, and the amendments of the Chilean delegation (A/C.1/564), the United Kingdom delegation (A/C.1/566) and the Brazilian delegation (A/C.1/571) had been accepted by the authors of the eight-Power proposal (A/C.1/558), the amendments would not be put to the vote separately as they were incorporated in the text of the proposal.

37. Mr. SHARETT (Israel) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the Indian delegation's resolution (A/C.1/572) in the hope that even if the two extreme arguments could not be reconciled, it would at least be possible to modify the majority resolution in such a way that it would receive a larger number of votes.

38. The representative of Israel regretted that the Indian proposal had been rejected. However, under the circumstances, he proposed an amendment (A/C.1/573) to the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/558). The provisions of the new sub-paragraph indicated the chief aim of the body to be appointed by the General Assembly, which would be to bring about conciliation by securing the co-operation of the bodies representing the population of North and South Korea. The proposed amendment read as follows:

"On page 2 (A/C.1/558), sub-paragraph (c), insert the following new sub-paragraph:

" '(c) That all sections and representative bodies of the population of Korea, South and North, be invited to co-operate with the organs of the United Nations in the restoration of peace, in the holding of elections and in the establishment of a unified government,'

"Former sub-paragraphs (c) and (d) become sub-paragraphs (d) and (e) respectively."

39. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Israeli delegation's amendments (A/C.1/573).

The amendment was approved by 29 votes to 2, with 22 abstentions.

40. Mr. AL JAMALI (Iraq) explained that he had voted against the Israeli amendment because he considered it superfluous. It was obvious that the United Nations Commission in Korea would co-operate with all representative bodies of the population.

41. He said that he had voted in favour of the Indian proposal without any conviction that it might be possible to reconcile the points of view of the United States and the USSR, but because he had hoped that certain questions raised at the preceding meeting by the representative of Syria might receive consideration by the Sub-Committee. He therefore suggested that the representative of Syria should re-state his point of view.

42. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to vote on the eight-Power joint proposal (A/C.1/558).

43. Mr. SARPER (Turkey) would vote in favour of the proposal, which was based on fundamental principles which his country had always upheld.

44. Mahmoud FAWZI Bey (Egypt) requested that the draft resolution should be voted on paragraph by paragraph.

45. Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) recalled his proposal to add to the text of the draft resolution a paragraph identical with sub-paragraph 2 (f) of the General Assembly's resolution 293 (IV) of 21 October 1949, which provided that the United Nations Commission on Korea should render a report to the General Assembly.

46. Mr. YOUNGER (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the eight Powers sponsoring the draft resolution, accepted the amendment proposed by the Mexican delegation.

47. Faris EL-KHOURI Bey (Syria) pointed out that under the terms of sub-paragraph (a) (i) of the operative part of the draft resolution, it would automatically be incumbent upon the new Commission to report to the General Assembly.

48. He added that the deficiencies in the text to which he had drawn attention at the preceding meeting should have been studied by a sub-committee. It would be useless to endeavour to remedy them by adding a word here and there. The consequences of those deficiencies would undoubtedly become manifest later on but, as things stood, it was not possible to remedy them.

49. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) said that he would be unable to take part in the vote, since his government, recently re-constituted, desired to ensure the support of Parliament before making public its foreign policy. The delegation of Indonesia had, however, voted in favour of the Indian proposal (A/C.1/572) because that proposal was clearly in line with the policy of the Indonesian Government.

50. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia would be in New York in the near future and would then be able to take an official position on all questions under consideration by the United Nations.

51. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first paragraph of the preamble of the eight-Power joint draft resolution (A/C.1/558).

The paragraph was approved by 51 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions.

52. Mr. SHARETT (Israel) suggested that the second and third paragraphs of the preamble should be voted on together, and that the first part of the fourth

paragraph, ending with the words "... the people of Korea reside ..." should then be voted on separately from the remainder of the paragraph. He pointed out that although the fourth paragraph merely recalled the provisions of a previous resolution of the General Assembly, the latter part of the paragraph might give the impression that the Government of Syngman Rhee had been approved by the newly-elected National Assembly and enjoyed its confidence; such an affirmation would be premature in view of the fact that that Assembly had not yet been able to meet and had not had an opportunity either to express confidence in the present government or to establish a new one.

53. The CHAIRMAN put to vote the second and third paragraphs of the preamble of the resolution.

The paragraphs were approved by 52 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

54. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the first part of the fourth paragraph of the preamble, ending with the words "people of Korea reside".

The first part of the paragraph was approved by 52 votes to 6, with one abstention.

55. The CHAIRMAN put to vote the remainder of the fourth paragraph.

56. As a result of errors in the counting of the votes, Mr. SARPÉR (Turkey) requested that a roll-call vote should be taken. He subsequently agreed to withdraw his proposal, at the request of Sir Carl BERENDSEN (New Zealand). He explained that his proposal had arisen merely from a desire to avoid any possible future doubt about the legality of the vote.

The second part of the fourth paragraph was approved by 46 votes to 6, with 7 abstentions.

57. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the fifth and sixth paragraphs of the preamble.

The paragraphs were approved by 50 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

58. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (a) of the recommendation.

Sub-paragraph (a) was approved by 47 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions.

59. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (b) of the recommendation.

Sub-paragraph (b) was approved by 53 votes to 5, with one abstention.

60. The CHAIRMAN recalled that the amendment proposed by the delegation of Israel (A/C.1/573) had already been adopted and would become sub-paragraph (c) of the section under consideration. The present sub-paragraphs (c) and (d) would thus become, respectively, sub-paragraphs (d) and (e). He then put to the vote the former sub-paragraph (c).

Sub-paragraph (c) was approved by 50 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

61. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the former sub-paragraph (d) of the recommendation.

Sub-paragraph (d) was approved by 54 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

62. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Commission would be composed of seven members, namely, Australia, Chile, the Netherlands, Pakistan, the Philippines, Turkey, and a seventh member to be designated by the General Assembly.

63. He then put to the vote sub-paragraph (a) of the operative part of the draft resolution.

Sub-paragraph (a) was approved by 53 votes to 5, with one abstention.

64. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (b) of the operative part.

Sub-paragraph (b) was approved by 53 votes to 5, with one abstention.

65. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the Mexican amendment, which reproduced sub-paragraph 2 (f) of General Assembly resolution 293 (IV) of 21 October 1949, which required the Commission to submit a report to the General Assembly. The paragraph would become sub-paragraph (c) of the operative part.

The new sub-paragraph (c) was approved by 53 votes to 5, with one abstention.

66. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the last two paragraphs of the draft resolution.

The paragraphs were approved by 54 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

67. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Chilean amendment (A/C.1/564).

The amendment was approved by 53 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

68. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Brazilian amendment (A/C.1/571).

The amendment was approved by 50 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

69. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United Kingdom amendment (A/C.1/566).

The amendment was approved by 54 votes to 5.

70. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole, as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was approved by 47 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions.

71. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by five Powers (A/C.1/567).

72. Mr. BARANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) requested a roll-call vote, paragraph by paragraph.

73. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first paragraph.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first:

In favour: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Poland,

Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: Belgium, Bolivia.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa.

Not participating: Indonesia.

The first paragraph was approved by 17 votes to 2, with 40 abstentions.

74. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second paragraph.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Peru, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia.

Against: Belgium, Bolivia.

Abstaining: Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay.

Not participating: Indonesia.

The second paragraph was approved by 18 votes to 2, with 39 abstentions.

75. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the third paragraph.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Turkey, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, India, Lebanon, Liberia, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

Against: Belgium, Bolivia.

Abstaining: Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic,

Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand.

Not participating: Indonesia.

The third paragraph was approved by 15 votes to 2, with 42 abstentions.

76. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 1 of the operative part.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Thailand, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland.

Against: Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Israel, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden.

Abstaining: Union of South Africa, Yemen, Afghanistan, Burma, Egypt, India, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

Not participating: Indonesia.

Paragraph 1 of the operative part was rejected by 43 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions.

77. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 2 of the operative part.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Pakistan, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

Against: Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway.

Abstaining: Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Egypt, India, Lebanon.

Not participating: Indonesia.

Paragraph 2 of the operative part was rejected by 46 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

78. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 3 of the operative part.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Belgium, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia.

Abstaining: Burma, Ethiopia, India, Israel, Lebanon, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan.

Not participating: Indonesia.

Paragraph 3 of the operative part was rejected by 43 votes to 7, with 9 abstentions.

79. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first sentence of paragraph 4 of the operative part, ending with the words "the National Assembly of all Korea".

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Union of South Africa, having been chosen by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Against: Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey.

Abstaining: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Egypt, India, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

Not participating: Indonesia.

The first sentence of paragraph 4 of the operative part was rejected by 46 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

80. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second sentence of paragraph 4 of the operative part.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Lebanon, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

Against: Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Israel.

Abstaining: Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Egypt, India.

Not participating: Indonesia.

The second sentence of paragraph 4 of the operative part was rejected by 45 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

81. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 5 of the operative part.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Union of South Africa, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Against: Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey.

Abstaining: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Burma, Egypt, India, Israel, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria.

Not participating: Indonesia.

Paragraph 5 of the operative part was rejected by 43 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions.

82. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 6 of the operative part.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Burma, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan.

Against: Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Liberia, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil.

Abstaining: El Salvador, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Union of South Africa, Argentina.

Not participating: Indonesia.

Paragraph 6 of the operative part was rejected by 33 votes to 16, with 10 abstentions.

83. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 7 of the operative part.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Guatemala, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Mexico, Philippines, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Egypt.

Against: Liberia, Thailand, United States of America, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador.

Abstaining: Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Sweden, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece.

Not participating: Indonesia.

Paragraph 7 of the operative part was approved by 18 votes to 10, with 31 abstentions.

84. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Greece, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

Against: Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France.

Abstaining: India, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Egypt.

Not participating: Indonesia.

The draft resolution as a whole was rejected by 46 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

85. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the following draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (document (A/C.1/568).

"The General Assembly,

"Having examined the protest of the Korean People's Democratic Republic against the inhuman and barbarous bombing of the peaceful inhabitants and peaceful towns and inhabited centres carried out by the United States Air Force in Korea;

"Recognizing that the bombing of Korean towns and villages by United States armed forces, resulting in their destruction and the mass extermination of the peaceful civilian population, is a flagrant violation of the generally accepted rules of international law,

"Resolves:

"To call upon the Government of the United States of America to terminate and to prohibit in the future the bombing of towns and inhabited centres by aircraft and other means, as well as the machine-gunning from the air of the peaceful inhabitants of Korea."

86. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) requested a roll-call vote paragraph by paragraph.

87. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 1 of the draft resolution (A/C.1/568).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Burma, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Against: Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil.

Abstaining: Burma, Yemen, Yugoslavia.

Not participating: Indonesia.

Paragraph 1 was rejected by 51 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

88. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 2.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Union of South Africa, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Against: Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxem-

bourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey.

Abstaining: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Burma.

Not participating: Indonesia.

Paragraph 2 was rejected by 51 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

89. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 3.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Peru, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia.

Against: Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay.

Abstaining: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Burma.

Not participating: Indonesia.

Paragraph 3 was rejected by 51 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

90. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (A/C.1/569).

"The General Assembly,

"Taking into consideration that the United Nations Commission on Korea was illegally established in violation of the Charter and by its activities helped to stir up civil war in Korea,

"Resolves to disband the United Nations Commission on Korea."

The draft resolution was rejected by 54 votes to 5.

91. Mahmoud FAWZI Bey (Egypt) stated that he had voted in favour of most of the paragraphs con-

tained in the draft resolution submitted by the eight Powers (A/C.1/558) and in the draft resolution submitted by the five Powers (A/C.1/567). He had abstained from voting on some paragraphs in both resolutions. Hence, he had abstained when the draft resolutions as a whole were put to the vote since his delegation felt that both contained interesting points and both had certain shortcomings.

92. Although the Egyptian delegation had not voted in favour of sub-paragraph (a) of the recommendation contained in the draft resolution submitted by the eight Powers (A/C.1/558), it had cast its vote in support of sub-paragraphs (c) and (d) of that recommendation. The Egyptian Government had consistently expressed its support for the liberation of countries subject to foreign occupation. It hoped that foreign troops would not remain in Korea longer than necessary.

93. In conclusion, the Egyptian delegation had voted against the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.1/568) in which the United States was censured, for that censure had been uttered without prior investigation, evidence or proof. If the draft resolution in question had been adopted it would have constituted a most dangerous precedent.

94. Mr. DULLES (United States of America) suggested that at its next meeting the Committee should consider the proposal submitted by the United States with respect to united action for peace (A/1377).

95. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said the Committee should consider in what order the remaining items on its agenda should be dealt with. He had no objection to the United States proposal being considered first but suggested that the draft declaration on the removal of the threat of a new war (A/1376), submitted by the USSR, should be taken up thereafter.

96. Mr. DULLES (United States of America) said that his delegation had no objection to the Soviet Union's proposal being considered immediately after the item proposed by the United States.

97. The CHAIRMAN accordingly announced that the Committee would first consider the United States proposal (A/1377) and then proceed to consider the USSR proposal (A/1376). If there were no objections he would arrange the Committee's next meeting for 10.45 a.m. on Monday, 9 October.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.