

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1306th  
MEETING**

(Closing meeting)

Tuesday, 18 December 1962,  
at 3.25 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

## CONTENTS

### Agenda item 28:

#### *The Korean question (concluded):*

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

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

*Consideration of draft resolutions (concluded). . . . .* 303

### Agenda item 90:

*Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (concluded)*

*Consideration of draft resolutions (concluded). . . . .* 305

*Completion of the Committee's work. . . . .* 305

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

## AGENDA ITEM 28

### *The Korean question (concluded):*

- (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.322);*
- (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 and Corr.1, A/C.1/L.322, A/C.1/L.323)*

### CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.1/L.322, A/C.1/L.323) (concluded)

1. Mr. ANDRIAMAHARO (Madagascar) announced that bearing in mind the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the appeal made by the Security Council and the report of UNCURK (A/5213 and Add.1), his delegation had decided to vote for the fifteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.322), which reaffirmed that the objectives of the United Nations were to bring about the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea and the full restoration of international peace and security in the area. Those objectives could only be attained if UNCURK was allowed to continue its work. Moreover, the maintenance of the United Nations troops in South Korea represented a contribution to peace, for the result of their withdrawal would be to shake the confidence of the South Korean people and encourage North Korea to commit further aggression. His delegation would be unable to vote for the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.323) which, in its view, would not facilitate a solution of the main difficulties of the Korean question.

2. Mr. DIALLO Telli (Guinea) said that his delegation had refrained from speaking earlier in order to show its regret at the atmosphere that had pervaded the debate. The essence of the whole question, the tragic division of the Korean people, had been set aside and only the cold-war aspects allowed to remain. Besides, the debate had been vitiated from the start by the Committee's failure to invite the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take part. His delegation had the impression that no real attempt was being made to solve the Korean situation, and in view of the fact that since 1947 the General Assembly had adopted eleven resolutions without results, his delegation refused to support a twelfth resolution which proposed no realistic way of putting an end to the sufferings of the Korean people. Consequently it would abstain from voting on both draft resolutions. Moreover, as far as the fifteen-Power draft resolution was concerned, his delegation thought it regrettable that one of its sponsors was South Africa. A cause supported by a country whose official policies were based on the denial of the rights of Africans was naturally suspect to the Asian and African peoples.

3. Mr. ATHAR (Pakistan) considered that two facts must be taken into consideration in approaching the Korean problem: first, the presence of the United Nations in Korea, and second, its interest in the Korean question as a whole. His delegation knew that to vote for one draft resolution and against another was to act in a spirit of controversy, which it would have wished to avoid, appreciating as it did the spirit of the statement by the Ghanaian representative. In the present instance, however, it would vote for the fifteen-Power draft resolution, which took into account the above-mentioned two facts. The USSR draft resolution contained some constructive ideas: for example, it was obvious that the withdrawal of foreign troops from Korea or from any country was to be desired; besides, everybody would like to see a resumption of economic and cultural relations between North and South Korea. However, the Committee could not act as if the United Nations were not present in Korea, or as if a settlement could be envisaged outside the United Nations. For those reasons, his delegation would vote against the USSR draft resolution while noting that its operative paragraph 2 was based on constructive ideas.

4. Mr. MALALASEKERA (Ceylon) said that his delegation had refrained from taking part in the general debate because it thought it regrettable that such an important question should be dealt with so unconstructively. It believed the time was coming when the United Nations would have to meet the situation with determination and courage. At the present time, the United States and the Soviet Union appeared to be disposed to try to reduce world tensions and to seek a solution to the most important issues. It was there-

fore important to avoid adopting too rigid an attitude, as the sponsors of the fifteen-Power draft resolution had done. The Soviet draft resolution had the merit of proposing a new way of approaching the matter, but that new conception was too narrow and did not take into account the need for a broader agreement which a final settlement would require. The withdrawal of foreign troops could be carried out by the unilateral decision of the parties concerned; in a General Assembly resolution, however, it would constitute but one element of an over-all solution to the issue. Operative paragraph 2, on the contrary, could be isolated from a general political settlement and embodied in a separate resolution, for its present context unnecessarily complicated things. His delegation would therefore abstain from voting on both those draft resolutions. If the General Assembly was to be able to adopt a bolder attitude at its eighteenth session, much preliminary diplomatic groundwork would have to be done, particularly by the great Powers. He hoped that in the future the fate of the Korean people would be the major consideration and that the study of the Korean problem would be based not only on strategic or ideological factors, or even on a barren, legalistic interpretation of the United Nations Charter, but on the highest principles of the Charter.

5. Mr. VIRGIN (Sweden) said that he would vote for the fifteen-Power draft resolution. He noted with satisfaction that, according to the report of UNCURK (A/5213 and Add.1), political activities would again be permitted in the Republic of Korea from early in 1963 and that the opposition parties would enjoy the same treatment as the party in power. Furthermore, the Constitutional Amendments Bill referred to in the addendum to the report (A/5213/Add.1) would guarantee the rights and duties of citizens as human beings, including freedom of speech and of the Press. His delegation welcomed that fact with all the more satisfaction as the Political Activities Purification Law, the text of which appeared in annex IV of the report (A/5213), had given rise to some concern inasmuch as it seemed to leave a considerable margin for subjective interpretation.

6. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan) said that he would abstain from voting on the two draft resolutions because of the deplorably rigid positions adopted by the parties concerned, the effect of which had been to subject Korea to the consequences of the cold war. However, he approved the ideas in operative paragraph 1 of the fifteen-Power draft resolution, and those expressed in the first paragraph of the preamble and in operative paragraph 2 of the Soviet draft resolution. If the Committee should decide to put the drafts to the vote paragraph by paragraph, his delegation would vote for the paragraphs he had mentioned and abstain from voting, much to its regret, on the remaining paragraphs.

7. Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey) said that he would vote for the fifteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.322), for its aims seemed to him to be specific and capable of leading to positive results. It was obvious that the common goal was to bring about a unified, independent and democratic Korea by peaceful means, and he could not but support efforts directed to that end. His delegation was satisfied with the work of UNCURK and could see no objection to renewing its mandate—quite the contrary.

8. The Soviet draft resolution (A/C.1/L.323) gave rise to two objections regarding the withdrawal of

troops. First, they were called "foreign troops" which was an over-simplification and a distortion of the facts, since the troops concerned were only kept in Korea as a result of decisions taken by the United Nations. Second, the symbolic presence of those troops would do nothing to prevent the peaceful reunification of the two parts of Korea; clearly, all it would prevent would be reunification by force—which had been attempted by North Korea in 1950. His delegation would vote against the second preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 of the Soviet draft resolution. On the other hand, it would vote for the first preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 because, while it would have preferred more radical measures for peaceful reunification with democratic institutions, it felt that the method envisaged in operative paragraph 2 of the Soviet draft would have the merit, if it were carried out in good faith, of improving the atmosphere between the two parties and possibly thus acting as a prelude to reunification. His delegation would accordingly ask that the Soviet draft resolution be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

9. Mr. ALLOTT (United States of America) pointed out that adoption of the fifteen-Power draft resolution would enable the United Nations to continue its vital activities in Korea, whereas adoption of the Soviet draft resolution would put an end to them and at the same time ratify the present division of Korea, which the United Nations should never accept. Moreover, although the Soviet draft resolution was submitted under the sub-item relating to the withdrawal of foreign troops, it contained a paragraph which had no connexion with that question. It might well be asked whether the adoption of operative paragraph 2 of the Soviet draft resolution under agenda item 28 (b) would imply that foreign troops should be withdrawn and that the Republic of Korea should negotiate with the North Korean régime and accept its continued existence. The United States delegation was opposed to that attempt to repudiate the role of the United Nations in Korea, and could never accept the division of the country as a basis for settlement. It would therefore vote against the Soviet draft resolution.

10. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the fifteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.322).

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

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

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

**Abstaining:** Ceylon, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Indonesia, Iraq, Jamaica, Mali, Nepal, Nigeria, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Togo, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Burma, Burundi, Cambodia.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 65 votes to 11, with 26 abstentions. 1/*

11. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) noted that the draft resolution just adopted by the Committee recognized that the withdrawal of troops from South Korea was contingent upon fulfilment of the conditions which had been imposed on the United Nations by the United States and its allies; moreover, North Korea was asked to accept those conditions, and the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea was requested to continue its work. He regretted that the Committee should not have abandoned its incorrect approach to the Korean question, for what was at stake was the vital interests of a people which had suffered long from the division of its country and the presence of foreign armed forces on its soil.

12. In the circumstances, no useful purpose would be served by putting the Soviet draft resolution (A/C.1/L.323) to the vote; his delegation had therefore decided to withdraw it in the hope that, in the light of experience, Member States would recognize the futility and harmfulness of the old method and would then adopt a new method, a wish expressed by many delegations.

13. Mr. CHANDERLI (Algeria) regretted that the draft resolution just adopted had not been put to the vote paragraph by paragraph, which would have enabled his delegation to express its position regarding a delicate affair which it was anxious to help solve. He likewise regretted that the Committee had not been asked to vote on the Soviet draft resolution concerning the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea.

## AGENDA ITEM 90

**Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (A/5197, A/5200, DC/203, A/C.1/867, A/C.1/871, A/C.1/875, A/C.1/876, A/C.1/L.312/Rev.2) (concluded)\***

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.1/L.312/REV.2) (concluded)**

14. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee, pursuant to its decision at the 1280th meeting, to resume consideration of the draft resolution submitted by Bolivia, Brazil, Chile and Ecuador (A/C.1/L.312/Rev.2).

15. Mr. VELAZQUEZ (Uruguay) recalled that that draft resolution was intended to bring about a positive measure of disarmament—wherein it was perfectly in keeping with the traditions and aspirations of the Latin American peoples—and also to help to solve the crisis in the Caribbean. With regard to the latter

aspect of the draft resolution, it would be useful if the delegations concerned continued their exchanges of views in the hope that a formula acceptable to all might be arrived at.

16. He therefore proposed that a vote on the draft resolution be deferred until the Assembly's eighteenth session.

17. The CHAIRMAN said that in the absence of objection he would take it that the proposal made by the Uruguayan representative was approved by the Committee.

*It was so decided.*

18. Mr. CARVALHO SILOS (Brazil) pointed out that the sponsors were not withdrawing draft resolution A/C.1/L.312/Rev.2, but they were in agreement with the procedural decision taken by the Committee.

19. He recalled that his country's position regarding the denuclearization of Latin America had been explained in the General Assembly (1125th plenary meeting) by the head of his delegation at the start of the seventeenth session. When, as a result of the events in the Caribbean area, the balance of power was seriously menaced, the Brazilian delegation had felt that it must try to help—if only to a modest degree—to put an end to the crisis and to prevent it from recurring, at least in the Latin American area.

20. Not one delegation in the Committee had spoken against the draft resolution; it had been supported by countries from all areas of the world, aligned and non-aligned. In particular, it had received wide support among the Latin American countries, which was natural in view of the fact that it had been conceived in the spirit of the most deep-rooted legal and political traditions of Latin America.

21. As had been emphasized by the Uruguayan representative, the draft resolution had two aims: the long-term one of helping to strengthen peace and security by preventing the spread of thermo-nuclear weapons, and the more immediate goal of helping to lay the foundations for a final settlement of the Cuban crisis. Contrary to expectations, however, negotiations to that end were still going on between the Powers concerned and that fact was naturally of great importance in determining when the vote should take place. Besides, a settlement might be brought about by other means—and Brazil would be only too glad if it were. But even if that should be the case, the draft resolution would still be of permanent value. The four delegations had therefore agreed to ask for the vote to be taken at the eighteenth session.

## Completion of the Committee's work

22. The CHAIRMAN announced that the Committee had now concluded its consideration of the items referred to it by the General Assembly.

23. Mr. MATSCH (Austria) speaking on behalf of the delegations of the Western European countries, addressed his thanks and congratulations to the Chairman for the courteous and objective way in which he had guided the proceedings. He also thanked the officers of the Committee and the members of the Secretariat.

24. Mr. ZOUHIR (Tunisia), Mr. KURAL (Turkey), speaking also on behalf of Iran, Mr. SHAHA (Nepal), Mr. ZEA (Colombia), on behalf of the Latin American delegations, Mr. ZOLLNER (Dahomey), Mr. CHAN-

1/ The representative of the Congo (Leopoldville) subsequently informed the Secretariat that if he had been present when the vote was taken he would have voted for the draft resolution. The representative of Morocco subsequently informed the Secretariat that if he had been present he would have abstained.

\* Resumed from the 1280th meeting.

DERLI (Algeria), on behalf of the African group, Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland), Mr. BARRINGTON (Burma), speaking also on behalf of Afghanistan, Cambodia, India and Indonesia, Mr. OKAZAKI (Japan), speaking also on behalf of the Federation of Malaya, the Philippines and Thailand, Mr. ALLOTT (United States of America), Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), Mr. ATHAR (Pakistan) and Mr. BUDO (Albania) associated themselves with the thanks expressed by the Austrian representative.

25. The CHAIRMAN thanked the members of the Committee for the spirit of co-operation which they had displayed throughout the session and the kind

words which they had addressed to the officers of the Committee.

26. He felt that there was no cause for disappointment in the results of the Committee's work. In particular, he was convinced that the debate on nuclear tests and that on disarmament would contribute greatly to the progress of the negotiations in the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament. Regarding the peaceful uses of outer space, the agreement which had been reached during the session between the Soviet Union and the United States augured well for future international co-operation in that field.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.