

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**
 FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE 438th

MEETING

Tuesday, 30 January 1951, at 8.30 p.m.

Lake Success, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
Intervention of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea (<i>concluded</i>)	599
Point raised by the representative of the USSR	603

Chairman: Mr. Roberto URDANETA ARBELÁEZ (Colombia).

Intervention of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea (*concluded*)

[Item 76]*

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS AND AMENDMENTS (*concluded*)

USSR amendments (A/C.1/657, A/C.1./658, A/C.1/655)

1. The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to proceed to a vote on the USSR amendment (A/C.1/657)¹ to the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/642/Rev.2).

2. FAWZI Bey (Egypt) recalled that, in the course of the discussion, the co-sponsors of the draft resolution submitted by the twelve Asian and Arab Powers had indicated their preference for postponing the voting on that USSR amendment until the following day. Nevertheless, since the Committee had decided otherwise (437th meeting), the Arab-Asian group had considered the matter and had found itself unable to participate in the voting on the USSR amendment owing to lack of instructions from their respective governments. For that reason, his delegation would not participate in the voting on the USSR amendment and would reserve its right to express its views on the United States draft resolution (A/C.1/654) in due course.

3. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) wished to explain, for the moment, the position of the delegation of Poland on the USSR amendment, and reserved his delegation's right to explain later its views with respect to other proposals after they had been voted upon.

4. His delegation would support the USSR amendment, which it regarded as an attempt to improve the twelve-Power draft resolution. The amendment would

place the principal Far Eastern problems squarely before the conference called for under the terms of that draft resolution. Moreover, the amendment would make it clear that all Far Eastern issues were to be treated jointly since they were closely interconnected, and that a cease-fire, if one was agreed upon, had to be of such a nature that no military advantage would accrue to either side. Such an arrangement for a cease-fire had also to take into consideration the interests and attitudes of the governments of both the People's Republic of China and the People's Democratic Republic of Korea.

5. Mr. Katz-Suchy believed that the basic principles contained in the USSR amendment were not new to the Committee and that the great majority of representatives had, in the course of the discussion, agreed to those principles. They concerned the agreement on the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea; the settlement of Korea's domestic affairs by the Korean people themselves; the withdrawal of United States troops from Taiwan (Formosa) and the Taiwan Straits, as well as the settlement of the problem of Taiwan in accordance with the Cairo and Potsdam agreements and subsequent United States declarations which had made it clear that Taiwan was an integral part of China. If that amendment were adopted, it would therefore give the proposed conference an agenda on which it could start its work, an agenda outlining a programme which would assure the peaceful solution of all the Far Eastern problems.

6. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) wished the Committee to vote upon the two USSR amendments in document A/C.1/655, which had been submitted before the USSR amendment reproduced in document A/C.1/657.

7. The CHAIRMAN stated that, after the Committee had voted upon the USSR amendment reproduced in document A/C.1/657—which, in his opinion, was farthest removed in substance from the twelve-Power

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

¹ The text of the amendment is incorporated in the summary record of the 437th meeting, paragraph 7.

draft resolution—he would put to the vote the other USSR amendments (A/C.1/655).

8. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) recalled that his delegation had repeatedly stated its support for any proposal which would lead to a peaceful settlement of the Korean question and related Far Eastern problems. On the other hand, his delegation had made sufficiently clear why it was opposed to the United States draft resolution and would vote against it.

9. The Organization had two alternatives before it: one was to yield to the pressure of the United States and follow its war policy, thus becoming involved in a possible catastrophe; the other was to follow the road of peace, which was supported by one and one-half billion people throughout the world. The USSR amendment was in full conformity with the principles and aims of the Charter as well as with the peaceful aims of the People's Republic of China. Accordingly, the Czechoslovak delegation would vote in favour of the USSR amendment.

10. Sir Benegal RAU (India), in explaining the votes which he would cast on the USSR amendments, said that his delegation considered that the two amendments in document A/C.1/655 were unnecessary; moreover, amendment 2 might make a conference impossible if all the participants did not agree. Therefore, he would abstain on those amendments.

11. As regards the other USSR amendment (A/C.1/657) he reminded the Committee that his delegation had, along with others, requested a recess with a view to obtaining instructions. Since the Committee had not acceded to that request, his delegation would be compelled not to participate in the voting. Such action, however, should not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of that amendment. The representative of India reserved the right to express the position of his delegation whenever instructions were received.

12. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR amendment (A/C.1/657) to the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/642/Rev.2).

The amendment was rejected by 38 votes to 5, with 6 abstentions.

13. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed his delegation's regret over the rejection of its amendment. It had been submitted because, after an additional point had been inserted in the first revision of the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/642/Rev.1), the delegation of the USSR had believed it necessary to submit supplementary proposals which would reflect the contents of the answer of the Government of the People's Republic of China in order to enable the draft resolution to secure a speedy and peaceful settlement of the Korean question and other Far Eastern problems.

14. Since that amendment had not been adopted, and since, moreover, the delegation of the Soviet Union wished to improve the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/642/Rev.2) in a manner that would enable the delegation to support that draft, Mr. Tsarapkin

proposed a new amendment (A/C.1/658)² calling for insertion of the word "temporary" between "appropriate" and "cease-fire" in the last sentence of the fifth paragraph of the twelve-Power draft.

15. The representative of the USSR declared that, in view of the rejection of the USSR amendment (A/C.1/657), his delegation deemed it necessary to state that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, which did not participate in the discussions of the First Committee, retained the right to propose to the conference provided for under that draft resolution the discussion of additional questions.

16. Sir Benegal RAU (India) pointed out that it was difficult for the twelve co-sponsors, at a moment's notice, to decide upon a uniform policy on the proposed amendment. Since all these countries could not act except according to instructions, he suggested that the USSR might introduce its amendment in the plenary meeting, thereby giving enough time for delegations to consult their respective governments. Should the matter be pressed, however, he would be unable to participate in the voting.

17. Faris EL-KHOURI Bey (Syria) saw no point in the last USSR amendment, since the proposed cease-fire would in any event be temporary.

18. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment just moved by the USSR (A/C.1/658).

The amendment was rejected by 33 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

19. The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to vote on the two USSR amendments (A/C.1/655)³ to the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/642/Rev.1).

20. Mr. DE ARAOZ HERRASTI (Mexico) requested a separate vote on each of those amendments.

21. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote amendment 1 (A/C.1/655).

Amendment 1 was rejected by 42 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.

22. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote amendment 2 (A/C.1/655).

Amendment 2 was rejected by 35 votes to 5, with 18 abstentions.

Revised twelve-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/642/Rev.2)

23. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) requested, in view of the rejection of all his delegation's amendments, that the last sentence in the fifth paragraph of the revised twelve-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/642/Rev.2) be voted upon separately.

24. Sir Benegal RAU (India) declared that whatever might be the fate of the revised draft resolution, submitted by the twelve Powers, the latter wished it to go on record that when the world had, in their view, been marching towards disaster, most of the Asian

² The amendment was proposed orally and subsequently reproduced as a document under that symbol.

³ The text of the amendments is incorporated in the summary record of the 431st meeting, paragraph 52.

Powers had done all they could to halt the march. They might fail, but the true failure would have been a failure to try. He only hoped that members would ponder carefully what the position would be if that draft resolution was defeated, namely, no early cease-fire; every Far Eastern problem unsolved; a vitiation of the atmosphere for successful negotiations; and a perpetuation of the tension in the Far East.

25. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part of the fifth paragraph of the twelve-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/642/Rev.2) ending with the words "and other Far Eastern problems".

The first part of the fifth paragraph of the draft resolution was rejected by 27 votes to 18, with 14 abstentions.

26. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the remainder of the fifth paragraph.

The remainder of the fifth paragraph was rejected by 32 votes to 14, with 14 abstentions.

27. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the remainder of the twelve-Power draft resolution.

28. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark) saw no reason for such a vote. In his opinion, the main part of the text had disappeared.

The remainder of the draft resolution was rejected by 28 votes to 17, with 13 abstentions.

29. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark) explained that, for the reason he had already mentioned, he had not taken part in the voting.

30. Mr. GONZALEZ (Venezuela) requested a vote by roll-call on the revised twelve-Power draft resolution as a whole.

31. Mr. MUÑOZ (Argentina), supported by Mr. LACOSTE (France), saw no necessity to vote on the whole of the draft resolution since its three parts had been rejected.

32. The CHAIRMAN shared the views of the representatives of Argentina and France, but explained that the representative of Venezuela had insisted on a roll-call vote.

33. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark) considered that the last sentence of rule 128 of the rules of procedure should apply. That sentence stated that if all operative parts of a proposal or of an amendment had been rejected, the proposal or the amendment should be considered to have been rejected as a whole.

34. Mr. GONZALEZ (Venezuela) withdrew his request for a roll-call vote.

United States draft resolution (A/C.1/654)

35. The CHAIRMAN requested the Committee to vote on the United States draft resolution as amended by Lebanon, the two amendments (A/C.1/656)⁴ having been accepted by the representative of the United States.

⁴ The text of the Lebanese amendments is incorporated in the summary record of the 435th meeting, paragraphs 5 and 6.

36. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) said that his delegation had sincerely hoped that the twelve-Power draft resolution would be accepted and that another opportunity would be given to test the good faith of the Chinese communist régime. Now that the joint draft resolution had been rejected, his delegation had no other alternative than to vote for the United States draft resolution as amended. The United States draft, although differing from the Arab-Asian draft in temperament, did not differ in its aims and principles, especially with the inclusion of Lebanese amendments, which would authorize the committee on collective measures to defer its report if the good offices committee reported satisfactory progress in its efforts. In that connexion, he sincerely hoped that the good offices committee would achieve all the objectives which had been sought through the twelve-Power draft resolution.

37. The delegation of Iraq was gratified by the unequivocal United States declaration of 27 January (433rd meeting) regarding the aims and intentions of the United States draft resolution. His delegation would vote for that draft in the earnest hope that, by wise and prudent implementation of its terms, the aims and purposes of the Charter would be realized in Korea and that it would be clearly understood by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China that the intention of the United Nations was to bring about peace in Korea rather than to permit a widening of the area of conflict. It was in that spirit alone that his delegation would vote for the United States draft resolution as amended.

38. Mr. EBAN (Israel) recalled that on 26 January 1951 (432nd meeting) his delegation had made a series of suggestions with a view to meeting some of the comments made with reference to the United States draft resolution. Those suggestions had, in the course of the debate, found a favourable echo in the statements of a number of delegations and two of them constituted the basis for the Lebanese amendments (A/C.1/656). Since the first of those amendments conformed entirely both with his delegation's views and with those expressed by the delegation of Australia (430th meeting), he would support it.

39. The second of the two Lebanese amendments was, however, of greater consequence and introduced an important modification into the text of the eighth paragraph of the United States draft dealing with the procedure for the study of collective measures. No matter how constructive the proposed change was, it did not, in the view of the delegation of Israel, go far enough. His delegation had suggested that, assuming a finding by the First Committee of aggressive action in the past, it would nevertheless be appropriate to defer any consideration of collective measures until the results of the conciliation effort contemplated in the final paragraph of the United States draft resolution had become known. Lebanese amendment 2 would authorize the committee on collective measures to defer its report if the good offices committee reported satisfactory progress. His delegation would have preferred a formulation which would specifically require a definite order of sequence, so that only after a failure of the efforts of the good offices committee would there be any consideration of additional measures. For that reason, his delegation had urged (432nd meeting) the transposi-

tion of the order of the final and penultimate paragraphs of the United States draft resolution.

40. In the circumstances, the delegation of Israel would abstain from voting on the eighth paragraph, as amended. At the same time it found itself in general accord with other parts of the draft resolution, especially with the action proposed for the establishment of means for the further pursuit of an agreed settlement. In the light of the final paragraph and of the important interpretation given on 27 January (433rd meeting) by the United States representative, his delegation would vote in favour of the United States draft resolution as a whole.

41. In saying that, however, the delegation of Israel still hoped that the good offices committee would give consideration and effect to the proposals of the representative of Canada (432nd meeting), with a view to implementing the principles approved by the First Committee on 13 January 1951 (425th meeting) as well as embarking upon a serious and objective study of all recent communications from Peking.

42. Mr. Eban said that much interest and difficulty had been caused in the debate by the sporadic announcements of messages from Peking, the interpretation of which had not been easy and the authority for which had not been clear. That obscurity as to whether the Central People's Government was committed to the idea of a cease-fire before the consideration of other items had made it difficult for his delegation to render active support to the twelve-Power draft resolution at that stage. If those messages were to have any effect, it would be helpful if Peking would communicate a straightforward, clear and authoritative statement of its views on the question directly to the United Nations at an early stage, preferably before the General Assembly met to take action on the report of the First Committee.

43. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) declared that the United States draft resolution was designed to oppose any peaceful settlement, through negotiation, of the Korean question and of other Far Eastern problems. The aim of that draft resolution was to conceal and cover up further aggression by the United States against the Korean people and the People's Republic of China. For those reasons, his delegation would vote against the United States draft resolution.

44. Mr. TSIANG (China) said that he had understood the Chairman to have considered that the Lebanese amendments had been accepted and that, therefore, he intended to put the United States draft resolution as amended to the vote. If that were the case, Mr. Tsiang requested that the second part of the eighth paragraph, namely, Lebanese amendment 2, be put to the vote separately. He also requested that the second part of the ninth paragraph, beginning with the words "and requests the President", should be put to the vote separately.

45. Mr. EBAN (Israel) requested a separate vote on the eighth paragraph of the United States draft resolution, whether amended or in its original form.

46. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first seven paragraphs of the United States draft resolution

(A/C.1/654) as amended by Lebanon (A/C.1/656, amendment 1).

The first seven paragraphs of the draft resolution, as amended, were approved by 44 votes to 7, with 7 abstentions.

47. Sir Gladwyn JEBB (United Kingdom) wished to make it clear that, if the Lebanese amendment to the eighth paragraph was not carried, his delegation would be compelled to vote against the United States draft resolution as a whole.

48. Mr. AUSTIN (United States of America) stated that his delegation had definitely accepted the Lebanese amendments.

49. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the Lebanese amendment (A/C.1/656, amendment 2) to the eighth paragraph of the United States draft resolution.

The Lebanese amendment was adopted by 42 votes to 7, with 9 abstentions.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the eighth paragraph of the United States draft resolution as amended.

The eighth paragraph, as amended, was approved by 42 votes to 7, with 10 abstentions.

51. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the ninth paragraph, requesting the Committee to vote on it in two parts, as had been requested by the representative of China.

The first part of the ninth paragraph ending with the words "peaceful means" was approved by 46 votes to 5, with 7 abstentions.

The remainder of the ninth paragraph was approved by 43 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions.

52. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States draft resolution as amended, as a whole. At the request of the representative of Bolivia, the vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: 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, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Thailand.

Against: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, India, Poland.

Abstaining: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Egypt, Indonesia, Pakistan, Sweden, Syria.

Saudi Arabia did not participate in the voting.

The United States draft resolution, as amended, was approved by 44 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions.

53. The CHAIRMAN inquired whether the USSR representative wished to have the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/640) put to the vote.

54. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) replied in the negative.

55. Mr. QUEVEDO (Ecuador) declared that since the United Nations itself had been called an aggressor, the fact that the Organization now would declare the People's Republic of China as an aggressor in Korea should not logically prevent the United Nations from prosecuting its peaceful efforts. For the same reason, he believed that the last paragraph of the United States draft was consistent with the preceding parts, since it did not prevent the Organization from carrying on its conciliatory efforts.

56. The representative of Ecuador had voted against the twelve-Power draft resolution because, while recognizing the honest effort which those Powers had made to maintain peace, he considered that that draft resolution had included almost completely the conditions presented by Peking in its replies and clarifications. Moreover, he wished to have it placed on record that, in his opinion, the fundamental ideas which existed in that draft resolution were not dead merely because that draft had been rejected.

57. Mr. Quevedo hoped that the group on good offices called for in the ninth paragraph of the United States draft resolution would study and consider the fundamental principles set forth in the twelve-Power draft resolution.

58. Mr. HALIQ (Saudi Arabia) declared that his delegation had pursued a clear and consistent attitude with regard to the Korean problem, an attitude compatible with its obligations as a Member of the Organization. His delegation had been a co-sponsor of the twelve-Power draft resolution, the objective of which had been to continue the concerted efforts of the Organization with a view to resolving Far Eastern problems by peaceful means. To that end, his delegation could have cast a vote in favour of the ninth paragraph of the United States draft resolution which affirmed the policy of the Organization to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea and the achievement of its objectives by peaceful means. Moreover, those objectives called for the establishment of a unified sovereign State in the whole of Korea and the rendering by the Organization of economic and technical assistance for its rehabilitation. It had been with that goal in view that his delegation had contributed to the Korean Relief Assistance Fund of the United Nations.

59. His delegation still maintained that international disputes should be settled by peaceful means. However, in the course of the afternoon (437th meeting), some important information had been given by the rep-

resentative of India that indicated that further steps should be taken to reach a peaceful settlement. His delegation considered that information of great significance and had, therefore, wished to ascertain the wishes of its government thereon. Due to the absence of instructions, the delegation of Saudi Arabia had not been in a position to participate in the voting.

60. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) declared that his delegation had voted against the United States draft resolution because it considered that draft to be aimed at spreading the war and settling the Korean problem and other outstanding Far Eastern problems by force, through the imposition of United States domination.

61. Mr. TSIANG (China) said that his delegation, having considered that the United States draft resolution, although only a half measure, was nevertheless consistent with the principles of the Charter, had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

62. His delegation, being of the opinion that the Lebanese amendment to the eighth paragraph deprived the United States draft of its main force, had therefore voted against that amendment. As to the last paragraph, since his delegation considered that the method of selecting the proposed group of three was not the best one possible, it had abstained on the last part of that paragraph.

63. Faris EL-KHOURI Bey (Syria) said that his delegation had abstained on the United States draft resolution because of its apprehension of what might follow after the condemnation of the People's Republic of China as an aggressor.

Point raised by the representative of the USSR

64. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) reminded the Committee that, while it had completed discussion of the first item on its current agenda, there remained on that agenda two other items: "Complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding aggression against China by the United States of America" (item 70) and "The question of Formosa" (item 71). His delegation insisted that the Committee should begin discussion of those items as soon as possible. He requested the Chairman to inform the Committee of the date of its future meeting to consider those two items.

65. The CHAIRMAN replied that the members of the Committee would be duly informed of the next meeting of the Committee.

The meeting rose at 10.25 p.m.