

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1299th
MEETING

Tuesday, 11 December 1962,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 28:

The Korean question (continued):

(a) *Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea;*

(b) *The withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea*

Page

259

Chairman: Mr. Omar Abdel Hamid ADEEL
(Sudan).

AGENDA ITEM 28

The Korean question (continued):

(a) *Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/5213 and Add.1, A/C.1/877, A/C.1/882, A/C.1/883, A/C.1/L.321);*

(b) *The withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea (A/5140, A/C.1/869, A/C.1/877, A/C.1/882, A/C.1/883, A/C.1/884, A/C.1/L.318, A/C.1/L.321)*

1. Mr. HSUEH (China) said that the Government of the Republic of Korea had always been recognized by the United Nations as the only lawful Government of Korea, and had accepted the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the Korean question. It had always co-operated fully with the United Nations, and its representatives had made a fruitful contribution to past debates on the Korean question in the First Committee. Since there appeared to be general agreement that a representative of the Republic of Korea should once again be invited to participate in the discussion, he urged the Committee to issue the necessary invitation without delay.

2. The present partition of Korea had its origin in a temporary military arrangement made at the end of the Second World War, and the northern provinces of Korea now under Communist occupation were merely a part of the Republic of Korea. Accordingly, representatives of North Korea could not be invited to participate in the Committee's debate and placed on an equal footing with the representatives of the Republic of Korea. The argument that no serious discussion of the Korean question could take place without the participation of all interested parties did not hold water; it could even more plausibly be argued that a representative of Katanga should participate in any discussion of the Congo question. Since its two previous invitations had been contemptuously rejected by the North Korean régime, the Committee should not further impair the dignity and prestige of the United Nations by sending a third invitation.

3. In the light of the foregoing considerations, his delegation would support the United States draft reso-

lution (A/C.1/L.321). However, it felt that in the preambular paragraph, the word "Recalling" would be more appropriate than "Reaffirming".

4. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that in past discussions on the Korean question, one of great importance to all the peoples of Asia, there had been constant discrimination against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the representatives of which had been systematically excluded from the debate. Yet no satisfactory solution was possible without the participation of such representatives. At the current session, the United States was again trying to impose an illegal resolution on the Committee, in order to perpetuate the division of Korea and to further its colonialist policy in South Korea under the cover of the United Nations flag. But the Korean question was essentially a matter for the Koreans themselves to settle; every nation had the right to self-determination. Before that right could be exercised by the Korean people, foreign interference in Korea must be eliminated. The first necessity, therefore, was to secure the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of South Korea. In North Korea, as everyone knew, there were no foreign troops.

5. The United States, wishing to maintain the existing state of tension in the Korean peninsula and the neighbouring regions, was stubbornly clinging to its occupation rights in South Korea; that was why it would not countenance North Korean participation in the debate. If the United Nations really wanted to help the Korean people to reunify their country, and to reduce tension in the Far East, it must recognize the fact of the existence of two Koreas and must invite representatives of both to participate in its discussions.

6. Because it wanted to subject the Korean people to a system of political and financial slavery, the United States, together with its puppet régime in South Korea, had in 1950 instigated a war between the two parts of the country. It had covered up its aggression with the United Nations flag, using the votes of countries dependent on it and violating the procedure laid down in the Charter. Byelorussia denied the right of any country to interfere in the internal affairs of another, particularly when the United Nations was used in an attempt to give such action a guise of legality. The United States draft resolution (A/C.1/L.321) was another move of a similar kind, disregarding as it did the rights and interests of the Korean people. His delegation would vote against it.

7. The Soviet draft resolution (A/C.1/L.318), on the other hand, was free from any ulterior motives and was fully objective. The presence of foreign troops was the main obstacle to reunification, and it was therefore vital that representatives of both sides should take part in the debate on their withdrawal. His delegation held to that view despite its disapproval of the South Korean régime, and it would vote for the Soviet proposal.

8. Mr. CAMPBELL (United Kingdom) said that the question of extending invitations to Korean representatives was more than a purely procedural one, since it was the North Koreans' persistent refusal to co-operate with the United Nations that had prevented any progress towards a settlement of the Korean question. For many years, the United Nations had extended invitations to representatives of only the Republic of Korea, since the latter had co-operated with the various United Nations commissions set up to deal with the problem. At the fifteenth and sixteenth sessions of the General Assembly, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had been invited to send representatives provided that it accepted the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the Korean question; but on both occasions it had refused to do so. Since it was clear from recent statements by the North Korean Government that its attitude had not changed, to extend another invitation to that Government would be a serious mistake and would reflect upon the dignity of the United Nations. His delegation would therefore support the United States draft resolution. It would oppose the Soviet draft resolution not only for the reasons he had just indicated but also because it applied only to sub-item (b) of the item under discussion and thus seemed to imply that North Korean representatives should be invited to participate in the Committee's debate for the sole purpose of demanding the withdrawal of United Nations forces from South Korea.

9. He wished to say, in connexion with the present discussion, that the Soviet representative's contention that the United States was attempting to impose its will on the United Nations was a reflection on the sovereignty of Member States and on their ability to form their own opinions on any given issue. The decision finally taken on the present question, as on all others, would be a decision of the United Nations and not of the United States or any other country.

10. Mr. HAJEK (Czechoslovakia) said that there could be no objective and realistic discussion of any question concerned with the vital interests of Korea without the presence of the representatives of both North and South Korea, as proposed in the Soviet draft resolution. The United States draft resolution, under which only South Korean representatives would be invited, was unacceptable. Attempts had been made to justify that draft resolution by asserting that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was opposed to the United Nations. In fact, however, the position that the United Nations had no right to discuss the question of Korean unification was fully consistent with Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. Moreover, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was justified in refusing to accept any United Nations decisions made without its participation. In judicial proceedings the principle *audiatur et altera pars* was always applied. In the First Committee of the General Assembly—a political body called upon to discuss and help solve a problem affecting the preservation of peace—it was even more important that a hearing should be given to the two interested Governments.

11. The United States had tried to make the United Nations an instrument of its anti-Soviet and anti-communist policy. The United Nations had been brought into the existing relationship with Korea by the adoption of a policy founded on illegal decisions and approved by less than half the number of States now Members of the Organization. Any solution of the Korean problem would require the abandonment of that policy. His delegation

therefore opposed the United States draft resolution and fully supported the Soviet draft resolution.

12. Mr. OKAZAKI (Japan) pointed out that the question of an invitation to North and South Korean representatives to participate in the current discussion could be best understood in the historical perspective of the question, but that he would not now review the whole historical background. He recalled that at the fifteenth and sixteenth sessions of the General Assembly the First Committee had informed the North Korean régime that its representative could take part in the discussion of the Korean question if that régime would accept the competence and authority of the United Nations but that those legitimate conditions laid down by the First Committee had been rejected by the North Korean régime. Since that régime had a part to play in the question of the unification of Korea, it had been hoped that it would change its position; regrettably enough, however, there had been no sign of such a change; on the contrary, the North Korean authorities persisted in their defiant attitude and maintained that the United Nations had no right to discuss the Korean question. It would therefore be inconsistent with the wisdom and prestige of the First Committee to extend another invitation to North Korea. On the other hand, that did not apply to the Government of the Republic of Korea, the representatives of which had been invited and had participated in the First Committee's discussions on many previous occasions. His delegation therefore supported the United States draft resolution.

13. Mr. QUAISON-SACKY (Ghana) said that in his Government's view the problem of Korea should be settled by means of a general election held under the auspices of the United Nations. In any issue before the Assembly, it was essential to hear the views of those directly involved; the First Committee had to find a solution acceptable to both sides, and to do that it must be prepared to listen to both sides. In the past, the United Nations had permitted the participation in its discussions of representatives of Governments which had disputed the right of the United Nations to deal with their problems; the views expressed by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should likewise not prevent the participation of its representatives. His delegation would therefore support draft resolution A/C.1/L.318.

14. Mr. ANUMAN RAJADHON (Thailand) said that it was the duty of the United Nations to help the suffering Korean people to fulfil their aspirations for a united country. He recalled that in 1950 the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had committed an unprovoked act of armed aggression against the Republic of Korea. In response to a request of the Security Council, in its resolution of 27 June 1950,^{1/} sixteen Members of the United Nations had sent troops to combat that aggression and had succeeded in stopping it; nevertheless, the threat to peace from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and its allies continued, and the question of Korean reunification remained unsolved. The United Nations still had the responsibility of safeguarding peace and security in South Korea; and the main objective of UNCURK was to bring about a solution of the Korean question through the peaceful unification and rehabilitation of Korea.

15. Some Member States were now calling the United Nations forces in Korea foreign troops, and were demanding their withdrawal. The same Members were

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, No. 16, 474th meeting, document S/1508/Rev.1.

urging the participation of representatives of North Korea in the Assembly's discussions, although the North Korean régime had been condemned by the United Nations as an aggressor and had persistently opposed the Organization. In its memorandum of 24 November 1962 (A/C.1/884), the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had reaffirmed that opposition and had called for the immediate dissolution of UNCURK. In his delegations's view, therefore, the participation of North Korean representatives in the Committee's discussion of the Korean question would lead to disruption and disorder and would seriously damage the prestige of the United Nations.

16. No indication of any change of attitude on the part of the North Korean régime had been given by that régime or its allies. If the Democratic People's Republic of Korea wished to demonstrate such a change of attitude with regard to the United Nations, it should allow UNCURK to enter North Korea freely in order to observe the conditions prevailing there; that would be a valuable step towards the eventual unification of Korea. If the North Korean Government accepted the competence of the United Nations on the Korean question, his delegation would be willing to consider the participation of North Korean representatives in the Committee's discussions together with representatives of the Republic of Korea, though not on an equal footing with them; to extend an invitation to North Korean representatives under any other conditions would be to condone the crime of aggression and to set a precedent for further breaches of international peace.

17. The United Nations could not survive if it failed to live up to its fundamental Purposes and Principles; he was convinced that the First Committee would safeguard those Purposes and Principles in coming to its decision on the question of extending invitations to representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

18. Mr. KHOSBAYAR (Mongolia) said that since a peaceful settlement of the Korean question was not possible without the participation of representatives of both sides and any attempt to discriminate against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would serve only to intensify the cold war, his delegation supported the Soviet draft resolution.

19. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that those who had spoken in favour of the United States draft resolution, following the lead of their partner in military alliances, were obviously afraid to hear the truth from the real representatives of the Korean people. In stressing the refusal of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to accept the competence of the United Nations in the Korean question, they were deliberately confusing the issue. There were actually two problems involved in the so-called Korean question: that of reunifying the country and that of bringing about the withdrawal of foreign, i.e., United States, troops from Korea. The first of those problems was a domestic concern of the Korean people in which the United Nations had no right to interfere, while the second posed a threat to international peace and security and was clearly within the competence of the United Nations. The United States and its allies were unwilling to discuss the withdrawal of their troops from South Korea because they were seeking to use the United Nations as an instrument for imposing their will on Korea.

20. The representatives of the United Kingdom, Thailand and other countries had asserted that to reject the

United States draft resolution would be to impair the dignity of the United Nations. In reality, however, what the dignity of the United Nations required was that the Organization should not be used as a screen for the United States occupation of South Korea and that the true representatives of the Korean people should not once again be denied the right to participate in the Committee's discussion of the Korean question.

21. Mr. NORRISH (New Zealand) said that in introducing its draft resolution (A/C.1/L.318) under sub-item (b) of the Korean item, the Soviet Union appeared to be taking the position that North Korean representatives should not participate in the Committee's discussion of the core of the Korean question: the issue of reunification. Thus, the United States draft resolution (A/C.1/L.321) was the only one before the Committee that related to the entire item. It should also be noted that judging from various statements made by the Soviet delegation the latter viewed sub-item (b) of the Korean item less in relation to the problem of Korea than in relation to the question of foreign military bases. If that was so, North Korea was obviously not entitled to participate in the discussion, since it was not a Member of the United Nations and there were no United Nations forces in its territory. In the light of those considerations and of the fact that the Soviet draft resolution imposed no conditions for North Korean participation in the Committee's debate, his delegation would oppose it. It would support the United States draft resolution, which, while noting that the North Korean Government was unwilling to accept the competence and authority of the United Nations in the Korean question, left the door open for an invitation to be extended to that Government if it changed its position on the matter.

22. Mr. COULIBALY (Mali) said that since the issue under discussion was one affecting the Korean people as a whole, the Committee should hear representatives of both parts of Korea. If it decided not to invite representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Committee, far from helping to solve the Korean problem, would be making a solution more difficult. His delegation would therefore support draft resolution A/C.1/L.318.

23. Mr. CHANDERLI (Algeria) said that there must be two sides in any negotiations. The North Korean Government's refusal to recognize the competence of the United Nations in the Korean question should not prevent it from participating in the discussion; States which had refused in the past to recognize the Organization's competence had nevertheless taken part in its debates. It was true that North Korea had rejected two previous invitations, but a renewed invitation would reaffirm the Organization's determination to persist in seeking peaceful and negotiated solutions to international problems; that would surely not impair its prestige. His delegation would therefore support draft resolution A/C.1/L.318.

24. Mr. ADEBO (Nigeria) said that in the light of document A/C.1/883, which made it clear that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea still challenged the right of the United Nations to discuss the Korean question, his delegation could not support the Soviet draft resolution. At the same time, it would abstain from the vote on the United States draft resolution; although the latter was a consequence of the position taken by the North Korean Government, its adoption would have little value, since the Committee would hear only one side of the question under discussion. He hoped that if the Korean question should come before the

General Assembly at another session, the North Korean Government's friends would urge it to abandon the attitude it was now taking.

25. Mr. USHER (Ivory Coast) said that his delegation had voted at the two preceding sessions in favour of extending invitations to both Korean Governments, since the unification of Korea was impossible without their co-operation. However, any invitation to either Government must be subject to that Government's recognition of the competence of the United Nations, a requirement which had already been accepted by the Republic of Korea. Since the North Korean Government had refused to recognize the Organization's competence, there would be no point in extending an invitation to it. It was true that to invite the South Korean Government alone would not help to solve the problem, but the Committee could not refuse to hear the side which had accepted its conditions. His delegation would therefore support the United States draft resolution, while hoping that eventually the North Korean Government too would recognize the competence of the United Nations and would send a representative to explain its views.

26. The USSR draft resolution concerned sub-item (b) of the Korean item, the question of the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea. But the presence of foreign troops in the territory of the Republic of Korea was a matter for the South Korean Government alone. His delegation would therefore vote against that draft resolution; its position in that respect was that of the Union of African and Malagasy States.

27. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon) said that his delegation shared the views expressed by the representative of the Ivory Coast. Any challenge to the competence of the United Nations attacked the very foundations of the Organization. Since the North Korean Government had asserted that the General Assembly would be violating the principles of the Charter merely by discussing the Korean question, an invitation to representatives of that Government would serve no useful purpose.

28. His delegation would nevertheless have been willing to vote for the Soviet draft resolution if it had concerned the Korean problem as a whole; the United Nations had a free hand to observe conditions in South Korea for itself and it should be allowed to do the same in North Korea—in particular, to determine whether there were any foreign troops and weapons in that part of the country. It would be unjust to permit North Korea, which allowed no inspection of its territory, to express its views on activities in South Korea, which was open to United Nations observation.

29. With regard to the United States draft resolution, it appeared reasonable to hear the views of the South Korean Government concerning the situation in the territory under its control. When the time came for considering the Korean problem as a whole, the North Korean Government should also be heard, provided that it agreed that the United Nations was competent to consider the question.

30. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland) said that at previous sessions of the General Assembly the main argument advanced against inviting representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had been that the South Korean Government represented the will of the people while the North Korean Government did not. Under present circumstances, that argument could no longer convince anyone, and those who opposed the participation of North Korea in the Assembly's deliberations had therefore tried to impose conditions to be

met by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. But nothing in the United Nations Charter or in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly entitled the First Committee to lay down such conditions; his delegation therefore considered that the resolutions adopted to that end in the past were illegal and could not be regarded as a precedent for the Committee's actions. By specifying such conditions the Committee was in fact questioning the right of any sovereign Government to challenge the authority and competence of the General Assembly and the United Nations to deal with a given matter; he did not believe that that position would be accepted by any Member of the United Nations.

31. The representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were entitled to take part in the discussion of any questions which in their view affected them vitally. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that the South Korean régime had rejected the authority of the Government which claimed the right to speak on their behalf.

32. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) deplored the fact that after so many years there appeared to be no hope of a new approach which would bring about a peaceful solution of the Korean problem in the interests of the Korean people as a whole. Unfortunately, it seemed unlikely that the United Nations would be able to achieve any practical progress on the Korean question at the Assembly's current session. It was regrettable that cold war rivalries had found their way into the discussion of the so-called procedural draft resolutions.

33. He asked for a separate roll-call vote on each paragraph of both draft resolutions.

34. Mr. AUGUSTE (Haiti) said that from the legal standpoint it was doubtless desirable that representatives of both sides should be heard on the Korean question. However, the consistent refusal of the North Korean régime to recognize the competence of the United Nations in the matter made it impossible for the First Committee to extend a new invitation to North Korea. His delegation would therefore support the United States draft resolution and would vote against the USSR draft resolution.

35. Mr. TCHOBANOV (Bulgaria) said that while it was true that the North Korean Government did not recognize the competence of the United Nations to take action on the question of the unification of Korea, that did not mean that that Government had no right to participate in the discussion of the question. Indeed, it was a basic principle of law that a party which challenged the jurisdiction of a court must be heard when the question of jurisdiction was decided; to proceed in any other way would be to return to the Middle Ages, when men could be condemned to death without a hearing. Moreover, in calling upon the United Nations to order the withdrawal of United States troops from South Korea, the North Korean Government was recognizing the competence of the United Nations with regard to at least one aspect of the Korean question. His delegation would therefore vote for the Soviet draft resolution and against the United States draft resolution.

36. Mr. TARAZI (Syria) said that his delegation fully endorsed the views stated by the Algerian representative. Since there were clearly two Governments exercising authority in Korea at the present time, it would be improper to invite representatives of only one to participate in the Committee's debate. Moreover, the North Korean Government had made it clear in the

statement contained in document A/C.1/883 that it would not recognize any decision taken by the United Nations without the participation of its representative. His delegation would therefore vote for the Soviet draft resolution.

37. Mr. ALLOTT (United States of America) said that the Soviet draft resolution ignored the recent statements by the North Korean authorities contained in documents A/C.1/883 and A/C.1/884. The Soviet representative himself had made it clear that North Korea was not prepared to work towards a solution through the United Nations. It would therefore be futile, as the representatives of Cameroon, the Ivory Coast and Haiti had shown, to invite North Korea to send representatives. The representative of New Zealand had demonstrated, moreover, that the Soviet draft resolution was inadequate, being restricted to only one part of the Korean question. The United States draft resolution, on the other hand, covered the whole question and took into account the North Koreans' denial of United Nations competence. For those reasons, he moved, under rule 132 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, that the United States text should be put to the vote first. A relevant consideration was that rule 124, under which a two-thirds majority was required for reconsideration of a proposal, might be invoked whatever the outcome of the vote on the draft resolution first put to the vote.

38. In conclusion, he rejected the allegation that certain Members of the United Nations were operating on behalf of another Member, and denied that any Member was afraid to hear the North Koreans.

39. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the United States delegation was still behaving as if the Committee room was its private property. The Soviet Union did not need any advice on the content of its draft resolution, and wished it to be voted on as it stood. As he had shown at the previous meeting, the Soviet draft resolution was an objective proposal and had been submitted in accordance with the rules of procedure. The United States, however, was trying, out of fear, to prevent the Soviet proposal from being put to the vote. That scarcely indicated a love of democracy. The United States had also given warning that if its draft resolution was voted on first and adopted, it would invoke rule 124 with regard to the Soviet proposal. But rule 124 was not relevant, since it referred to reconsideration of a single proposal. The Soviet and United States text did not relate to one and the same question. In the USSR draft resolution it was proposed that the Committee should invite representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, whereas at no point did the United States text specifically state that those representatives should not be invited. The two draft resolutions should be voted on in the order in which they had been submitted, the Soviet proposal being taken first. If that was not done, he would categorically oppose the application of rule 124.

40. Mr. TCHOBANOV (Bulgaria) said that the United States delegation was trying to maintain both that its draft resolution and that of the Soviet Union related to the same question and that they did not. It was clearly engaging in a last-minute manoeuvre to prevent a vote on the Soviet text, because it was afraid that the vote would reveal the degree of support that existed in the Committee for the dispatch of an invitation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

41. Mr. ALLOTT (United States of America) said that his delegation would have no objection to the Soviet

proposal being voted upon subsequently, under the rules.

42. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the United States representative had shown what he meant by the phrase "under the rules" when he had referred to rule 124. He was not merely asking for priority to be given to the United States draft resolution, but was trying to make the vote on the Soviet proposal subject to a two-thirds majority. The Soviet delegation therefore called for a roll-call vote on the United States procedural motion.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala.

Against: Hungary, Iraq, Mali, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Syria, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Guinea.

Abstaining: India, Indonesia, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Tanganyika, United Arab Republic, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Afghanistan, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Dahomey, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon.

The motion was adopted by 42 votes to 18, with 39 abstentions.

44. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the preambular paragraph of the United States draft resolution (A/C.1/L.321).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil.

Against: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria.

Abstaining: Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Iraq, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria, Burma.

The paragraph was adopted by 65 votes to 10, with 25 abstentions.

45. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 1 of the United States draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The United Arab Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Turkey.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Tunisia.

The paragraph was adopted by 65 votes to 9, with 26 abstentions.

46. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote operative paragraph 2 of the United States draft resolution.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The United Arab Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Yugoslavia, Algeria, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Iraq, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syria, Tanganyika, Tunisia.

The paragraph was adopted by 71 votes to 9, with 19 abstentions.

47. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States draft resolution (A/C.1/L.321) as a whole.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil.

Against: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bulgaria.

Abstaining: Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Iraq, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tanganyika, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Austria.

The draft resolution was adopted by 65 votes to 9, with 26 abstentions.^{2/}

48. Mr. SULEIMAN (Sudan) appealed to the representative of Afghanistan to withdraw his request for a separate roll-call vote on each paragraph of the USSR draft resolution.

49. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan) said that he would be content with a roll-call vote on the draft resolution as a whole.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.318).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syria, Tanganyika, Tunisia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon.

Against: China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador,

^{2/} The representative of Cuba subsequently informed the Secretariat that if he had been present when the vote was taken he would have voted against the draft resolution.

Federation of Malaya, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile.

Abstaining: Congo (Leopoldville), Cyprus, Finland, India, Israel, Jordan, Liberia, Mauritania, Nigeria, Senegal, Sudan, Sweden, Yemen, Austria.

The draft resolution was rejected by 56 votes to 29, with 14 abstentions. ^{3/}

51. Mr. BAGHDELLEH (Tanganyika) said that his delegation had voted for the USSR draft resolution because it believed that the members of the Committee

^{3/} The representative of Cuba subsequently informed the Secretariat that if he had been present when the vote was taken he would have voted for the draft resolution.

should learn the views of both parties to the Korean dispute, instead of merely taking sides in the cold war. It was strengthened in that belief by the fact that the hearing of the present President of Tanganyika by the United Nations as a petitioner had helped his country to gain independence.

52. Mr. LUQMAN (Mauritania) said that his delegation had voted for the United States draft resolution because it knew that representatives of the Republic of Korea wished to be heard by the Committee, as they had been in the past. It had abstained on the Soviet draft resolution because it did not wish to become involved in a matter which smacked of the cold war; nevertheless, it considered that the possibility of inviting North Korean representatives at a later date had been left open.

53. The CHAIRMAN said that in accordance with the decision just taken by the Committee, the representative of the Republic of Korea would be invited to take a seat at the Committee table in order to participate in the discussion of the Korean question without right of vote when the Committee began its substantive discussion of the question.

The meeting rose at 7.25 p.m.