

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PLENARY MEETING



Sunday, 21 December 1952, at 8.30 p.m.

SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

Headquarters, New York

CONTENTS

Table with 2 columns: Item description and Page number. Items include: Request of the Government of China for revision of the Chinese text of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide; Economic development of under-developed countries; Report of the Economic and Social Council; Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda; Complaint of the mass murder of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war; Communication by the President.

President: Mr. Lester B. PEARSON (Canada).

Request of the Government of China for revision of the Chinese text of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide: report of the Sixth Committee (A/2351)

[Agenda item 56]

The President presented the report of the Sixth Committee (A/2351).

- 1. Mr. T. F. GREEN (United States of America): The United States supports the draft resolution [A/2351] concerning the revision of the Chinese text of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide...
2. The proposal for revising the Chinese text of this convention has been the subject of a study by the United Nations Secretariat and of a debate in the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly...
3. For the reasons which I have stated, my delegation will vote for the draft resolution which has been presented to this Assembly by the Sixth Committee.

4. Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The USSR delegation feels obliged to explain its vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Sixth Committee concerning the revision of the Chinese text of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

5. In the General Committee, in the General Assembly and in the Sixth Committee, the Soviet Union delegation, as we know, objected to the proposal that the United Nations should give consideration to the Kuomintang clique's request for a revision of the Chinese text of the Convention, on the grounds that the General Assembly could not entertain any request by private individuals who represented no one in the United Nations.

6. The USSR delegation continues to feel that a request for the revision of the Chinese text of the Convention on genocide could be considered by the General Assembly only if it were submitted by the sole legal government of China, which is the Government of the People's Republic of China. This point of view was supported in the Sixth Committee by a number of delegations. Thus, sixteen delegations voted against the draft resolution now submitted by the Sixth Committee. And that is not surprising, since the adoption of any decision to change the Chinese text of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in pursuance of a request by the Kuomintang clique would clearly be illegal and of no value.

7. For these reasons the USSR delegation took no part in the discussion on the substance of this question in the Sixth Committee and voted against the draft resolution approved by the Committee. My delegation considers that the Sixth Committee's decision is illegal and has no legal force, and that this also applies to any other decisions on this question which may be adopted on the basis of a request by the Kuomintang clique.

8. We shall vote against the Sixth Committee's draft resolution concerning the revision of the Chinese text of the Convention, and we shall not recognize that decision as having any legal force.

9. Mr. IBRAHIM KHAN (Pakistan): I feel that I need to say a word on the manner in which my delegation proposes to exercise its option of voting on the subject of the request of the Government of China for a revision of the Chinese text of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

10. My delegation was clearly in opposition to the draft resolution as originally submitted in the Sixth Committee by the representative of China since, in our opinion, the Chinese proposal sought to introduce into the concept of genocide two new elements, by injecting "ruthlessness" as an inseparable attribute of the crime and by including any kind of human group in the existing definition. If the reading of my delegation is correct, the proposed Chinese revision would in effect change the essence of the concept of genocide. My delegation was against such a change then, as it is against it now. In the course of the debate, however, the representative of China explained away a part of the misgivings. Further, other representatives made a number of valuable and constructive suggestions and, in a spirit of reasonableness and accommodation, the representative of China introduced substantial changes in his original draft resolution in different instalments. The original draft resolution was thus considerably improved in content and character.

11. My delegation would indeed be delighted to be of as much help as possible in this attempt to effect necessary improvements in the Chinese text consistent with maintaining entirely unimpaired the original character of the Convention. My delegation is happy that the draft resolution in its amended form obtained the support of the majority of the members of the Committee. I do not therefore propose to oppose the amended draft resolution here. Since, however, my delegation still entertains some doubt as to the complete soundness of the draft resolution, even in its amended form, I shall abstain from voting.

12. Mr. HSU (China): Before I proceed to explain our vote, may I make one remark. I regret very much—and I think the Assembly regrets with me—that the question of Chinese representation has been raised. There is an Assembly resolution on the question [609 (VII)] which eliminates discussion for the duration, and the party responsible for raising the question should have known it. As long as my delegation is recognized by the Assembly, whatever name you may call it, just the same it represents China.

13. In explaining the vote of my delegation, may I begin by congratulating the Sixth Committee for the

draft resolution [A/2351] which it has submitted. My Government's request for the revision of the Chinese text of the convention on genocide is novel, in a way, and might have constituted a difficult problem. But for a body of intelligent men and women like those in the Sixth Committee, well versed in law and full of common sense, no problem can be too difficult. The Committee readily recognized that the revision requested was a revision of language, not a revision of substance. It was the kind that could best be described as correction, and it therefore could be effected by a method less formal than that provided in article 16 of the Convention. The Committee next took account of the declaration of my Government that the purpose of the request was to bring the Chinese text into greater harmony with the other texts of the Convention. It took account also of the opinion of the Secretary-General that the text submitted by my delegation to replace the existing text confirmed the declaration of my Government. With these points cleared up, the Committee had no hesitation in drawing up the draft resolution now before us.

14. My delegation will vote for this draft and hopes that all the members of the Assembly will do the same.

15. The existing Chinese text of the Convention contains inaccuracies, as a check with the English text—of which it was a translation originally—will demonstrate. As an example, may I refer the Assembly to the term "genocide". If the term is retranslated from the Chinese text into English, it will appear as "endangering a race or races". Such a term is unmistakably in conflict with the provisions of the Convention, in which destruction is prohibited of four groups of human beings, of which the racial group is only one. Apart from forcing upon the courts the task of reconciling this inaccurate term with the contents of the Convention, that term would weaken one of the primary functions of the Convention, namely, the prevention of the crime. It is clear that the masses cannot have a lawyer's knowledge of the Convention and be aware of the discrepancy. When my Government discovered the inaccuracies, it was only natural for it to request a revision. I can assure the Assembly that the step was taken with great reluctance. Apart from increasing the load on the Assembly, the step runs counter to my Government's consideration for the Chinese Section of the Language Services Division of the United Nations Secretariat. My Government is ever conscious of the fact that it is not easy to translate English into Chinese, or *vice versa*, as the languages are of different language families and have different cultural backgrounds. Unless it is absolutely necessary, as in the present case, where crimes and punishment are involved, my Government is not desirous of being too particular.

16. My Government needs a satisfactory Chinese text for implementing its obligations under the convention on genocide, and the Sixth Committee has discovered a formula that will meet that need without causing harm or inordinate inconvenience to anybody. May I therefore appeal to the Assembly to join my delegation in accepting that formula. I hope that members of the Assembly will remember that the aspiration of my Government is the same as that of their own governments, namely, the liberation of mankind from an odious scourge against humanity. Neither fanciful legal

scruples nor pleas of non-recognition of my Government can be valid as a justification for denying support to the draft resolution.

17. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the draft resolution (A/2331).

The draft resolution was adopted by 31 votes to 13, with 10 abstentions.

Economic development of under-developed countries: reports of the Second Committee (A/2332) and the Fifth Committee (A/2338)

[Agenda item 25]

18. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has before it the report of the Second Committee (A/2332), containing draft resolutions on seven topics. The delegation of India has submitted an amendment [A/L.143] to paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution on the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources. In addition, the Fifth Committee, under rule 152 of the rules of procedure, has submitted a report [A/2338] on the financial implications of the draft resolution entitled "Financing of economic development through the establishment of fair and equitable international prices for primary commodities and through the execution of national programmes of integrated economic development".

19. The Assembly decided this afternoon [410th meeting] not to have a general discussion on this report, but to have explanations of votes only. There are, however, a number of draft resolutions in the report, which are the result of long and important work in the Committee. Some delegations have requested that the rule should be interpreted so that they will be permitted to explain their votes, if necessary, separately on one or two of the draft resolutions. I hope that, when possible, the explanations of votes will include all the draft resolutions. If any delegation considers it important to divide its explanation, I feel sure that the Assembly will agree to that procedure in the case of this very important report with so many draft resolutions. I appeal to delegations, however, if they do take that course, to keep their explanations on the separate draft resolutions to the irreducible minimum.

20. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia): My delegation wishes to speak particularly on the draft resolution entitled "Financing of economic development through the establishment of fair and equitable international prices . . .". That draft calls attention to certain factors which play a role in bringing about economic instability. Specifically, it deals with the phenomenon of undue and violent fluctuations in the terms of trade between industrial goods, on the one hand, and primary commodities, on the other. It is with some reluctance that my delegation speaks anew on this draft resolution, which has already been subjected to a lengthy, though interesting and penetrating, debate in the Second Committee. But my delegation feels obliged to do so in view of the suspicions and misgivings that still seem to linger in the minds of a number of delegations regarding the recommendations and proposals contained in the draft resolution, and also in view of the unjustified bias that has been ascribed to the draft by the Press.

21. Economic life, as demonstrated by science and by everyday practice, does not move in a clear-cut horizontal or vertical line. It goes through an up-and-down undulating movement. In most cases, although not in all, as indicated by the relatively stable price level in the United States just before the great depression, it affects the price system immeasurably. It was primarily the great depression of the thirties which intensified the general desire to arrive at a more regular and more stable development of economic life. Numerous attempts have been made to discover the causes of the trade cycle. Yet no definitive explanation has been given so far. Fortunately, the lack of full and complete knowledge concerning the forces that control the trade cycle has not thrown people into apathy. There are even those who say that it does not matter what the causes are. They are there. They are complex, just like the forces that play a role in a collapsing bridge. Whatever the cause, we know enough about certain major components of economic life not to refrain from planning and carrying out measures. I refer, for instance, to the measures undertaken to support effective demand by launching public works projects, in accordance with the principle of priming the pump.

22. It is an open question whether the under-developed countries, with their predominantly agrarian or extractive structure, have their own autochthonous trade cycles. However, it is not an open question, but a solid fact, that the under-developed countries are involved in the general world-wide trade cycle. In this, they are to a very considerable extent dependent on factors beyond their own boundaries. In the absence of domestic industries, of a home demand, the demand for raw materials is largely governed by external forces. In other words, the less developed countries are dependent on foreign demand. This circumstance is further aggravated by certain other basic circumstances.

23. In the first place, we have to consider the elasticity of supply of agricultural commodities. Their production is subject to the law of increasing costs. This means that the supply is relatively inelastic, which explains the rapid rise of prices of primary commodities upon an increase in the effective demand. Conversely, it also explains the steep decline in prices upon a reduction in the effective demand.

24. This dependence, which results in the high sensitivity of prices, is further accentuated by the peculiar formation of the present market. The present world market is smaller than it could potentially be. The reason for that is irrelevant to this discussion, but it has created a condition which has depressed the demand curve. Furthermore, in this relatively smaller market, we are faced with a situation in which certain consumers occupy a strong position. The result is the familiar economic phenomenon of "imperfect competition".

25. In the general picture of the ups and downs of economic life, the fluctuations in the prices of raw materials demand our special attention. Having stated two basic causes of the uncommon sensitiveness of the raw materials prices, my delegation will not reiterate their disastrous consequences on the economic development and monetary equilibrium of the under-developed countries; we have already done so in the discussions in the Second Committee.

26. Assuming that we are to continue our efforts to control the trade cycle and to stabilize economic life, we cannot avoid coming to grips with one of the major components of international trade—the prices of basic commodities produced by the under-developed countries. Nor can we ignore the prices of industrial goods. They too constitute a component of the general price movement. As a rule, prices of industrial goods are subject to a quite different elasticity of supply and operate in other market formations in that, as far as demand is concerned, they find a much larger number of market units than the raw materials.

27. My delegation has no illusions as to the complexity of the relationship between the prices of primary commodities and industrial articles, governed as they are by basically opposing factors. This situation renders our efforts to control the trade cycle more difficult. But if we are to accept the challenge of the complexities of the problem and continue to strive for the stabilization of economic life, we shall necessarily have to deal with the problem of the sensitiveness of the price system of raw materials in the context of the general price system, which also covers industrial products.

28. The draft resolution of the Second Committee proposes to indicate a fundamental approach to the solution of the problem. It calls our attention to an extraordinary and difficult problem. It is incorrect, as contended during the discussions in the Second Committee, to say that this draft proposes a ready-made solution of the problem. Once again, as it did in the Second Committee, my delegation wishes to draw attention to paragraph 6 of the draft resolution, which assigns the problem to a group of experts to be studied with a view to finding, not a theoretically feasible solution, but one which has a practical applicability.

29. The absence of a definitive explanation of the trade cycle should not deter us from taking measures designed to achieve international economic stability. In the pattern of the trade cycle, the prices of the primary commodities play an all-important role. It would be foolish self-deception to attempt to stabilize economic life as a whole while ignoring at the same time one vital component.

30. It is for that reason that the Indonesian delegation will vote in favour of this draft resolution. It will do so in the hope that, when the General Assembly reconvenes next year, we shall be able to have before us such recommendations on practical matters as it may be advisable to adopt with a view to improving international economic relations.

31. Mr. CHAUVET (Haiti) (*translated from French*): In committee, I explained my delegation's position on nationalization, or what is now called the right freely to exploit natural wealth and resources. I said that adoption of a resolution would weaken an implicit right possessed by all sovereign States. I pointed out that, from the point of view of economic independence, nationalization was essentially an internal measure, in no way requiring a guarantee by other nations. The present Constitution of my country has avoided the problem by prohibiting monopolies. The Government may, however, authorize a company to operate, on a profit-sharing basis, monopolies which by law belong to the State. The company acts on behalf of the Government. As to existing or future undertakings,

I do not think that my Government intends to nationalize any of them unless there are exceptional circumstances.

32. These are the reasons why my delegation will abstain in the vote, because a vote in favour would be tantamount to breaking down an open door and would lead to uneasiness and insecurity on the part of the persons from whom we seek capital. We might receive a disappointingly cool reception from those upon whom we called for help.

33. If I were to dwell on these fears, I should vote against this draft resolution, and I shall explain why.

34. The Second Committee, and the Economic and Social Council, are seeking every possible way to attract private and public capital for the development of under-developed countries. We are constantly talking about an international bank, an international finance corporation, an international fund. Then, at that very moment when the word "international" is buzzing in our ears, to the exclusion of all else, we start to talk about nationalization, direct or indirect. We choose to bring up this question at the very moment when the Press is conducting a campaign to demand that the new Administration in the United States, which is to take office on 20 January, should restrict the sending abroad of American capital. Are you not afraid that this resolution will be regarded as a scarecrow and used as a pretext to justify that trend of public opinion in the United States which, in order to reduce the tax burden of the American people, would rather have American capital invested in the United States than sent abroad to aid foreign countries? Do you not also think that we are, as they say, bringing grist to the mill of those who oppose technical and economic assistance in its present form? I hope that these fears are unfounded, but, having doubts on the subject, my delegation will abstain.

35. As we are going to vote shortly—and I hope that the vote will be unanimous—on the draft resolution concerning the activities of the regional economic commissions and the economic development of under-developed countries, I should like to make the following statement, which will be as brief as possible.

36. Among the under-developed countries, some are partly under-developed, some are under-developed and some are extremely under-developed. These three types of economic structure should lead us to establish a scale of the aid to be given to each type of country. The basis for the decision would be the standard of living, circulation of currency, the State budget, *per capita* income and the index of public health. In any case, this problem and all its ramifications could be considered in detail by the United Nations Technical Assistance Administration with a view to determining exactly which under-developed countries need immediate technical assistance from the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

37. Some under-developed countries have every possibility for modernization, whereas others have none at all. Should not special attention rightly be given to the latter? When, for example, there are various kinds of patients in a clinic, the doctor deals first with the most urgent cases. The United Nations Technical Assistance Administration could examine the situation according to this principle and make plans accordingly;

it might then consider, for example, whether certain under-developed countries with small budgets could not be granted a reduction in their share of the expenditure for each United Nations expert. This procedure would enable a small under-developed country not having a budget like that, for example, of Venezuela, Brazil, Mexico, India or Egypt, or of countries rich in oil or other mineral resources, to ask for a larger number of United Nations technicians, because its share in the expenditure necessary for each technician would be reduced to a minimum.

38. According to an old French proverb, loans are made only to the rich. Technical assistance, however, is not lent but given, and we should give first to those in greatest need. Because of its importance, this question should be approached methodically and scientifically. It is an urgent problem, and any delay would palpably retard the implementation of the technical assistance programme and the very favourable results of United Nations efforts to readjust world economy. I ask the Secretary-General to consider this question, and thus will our Organization become rich by all that it has given.

39. Mr. HALIQ (Saudi Arabia): My delegation will vote for most of the draft resolutions on economic development submitted by the Second Committee. For example, we shall vote for draft resolution A on the financing of economic development of under-developed countries, which expresses deep interest in the proposed special fund for economic grants-in-aid and low-interest long-term loans for the development of under-developed areas. We shall also vote, as we did in committee, for draft resolution B on the same subject, which expresses similar interest in the proposed international finance corporation. Draft resolution C, which my delegation had the honour of sponsoring jointly with the delegations of Egypt, Iraq and Lebanon, deals with the question of private investment in the development of under-developed areas. As a matter of fact, the Second Committee this year thoroughly and usefully occupied itself with the question of private capital investment in the development of less-developed areas.

40. This question of foreign investment has often been the subject of controversy in international economic circles. The actual behaviour of private foreign investment is rather coquettish. On some occasions and in certain areas enterprises externally financed prove to be very advantageous to the investor as well as to the country in which the investment is placed. On certain other occasions, the enterprise is not so advantageous.

41. Now, considering that investment is not the only important source of capital for the economic development of the under-developed areas, although it is one of the more important ones, the delegations of Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon and Saudi Arabia succeeded in getting the Committee's approval of a draft resolution designed to elicit relevant and valuable information on the favourable and unfavourable role played by private investment in foreign lands. In my opinion, this draft resolution is significant because it expresses the desire of the international community, or at least a considerable part of it, to achieve a just and sound relationship between private capital and government in the countries in which it is employed.

42. While I am speaking of private investment, I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to the draft resolution on the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources, for which my delegation voted when it was formulated. Without going into any detail in this regard, I merely want to express an opinion on this draft resolution, since it was and still is a subject of controversy.

43. The delegation of Uruguay submitted a draft resolution which attempted to reaffirm the right of each State fully to exploit its natural wealth and resources. Many delegations thought that it was more or less out of place in the Second Committee. The right of economic self-determination is inherent in the sovereign rights and acts of each Member State. As such, it need not be reasserted in a committee such as the Second Committee, which is devoting its utmost powers to encourage the economic development of the less developed areas by all possible means, including private external investment. Then the delegation of Bolivia stepped in with an amendment which was considered to be unwise and unfavourable by some States which are sources of private capital flowing to under-developed countries for investment.

44. At that stage, the Committee became involved in procedural entanglements which were designed, on the one hand, to postpone the discussion of the subject pending the final formulation of the United Nations covenant on human rights, which is likely to contain a clause on economic self-determination and, on the other hand, to speed up the work of the Committee, which was nearing its target date.

45. Meanwhile, the delegation of India, in co-operation with some of the Latin-American and Asian delegations, was informally working out a compromise amendment recommending to all parties concerned, whenever they chose to exercise their sovereign right freely to exploit their natural resources, to refrain from employing measures detrimental to international economic co-operation and mutual understanding among nations. I am not quoting the exact text, but that at least was the spirit that motivated the Indian amendment. This caused the delegation of Saudi Arabia to move the closure of the debate on that subject and come to the vote, thus speeding up the work of the Committee, which was nearing the target date of the end of the session.

46. In this connexion, my delegation will support the Indian amendment [A/L.143] which was submitted today to the General Assembly.

47. Another controversy centered around the proposal of the delegation of Argentina, now embodied in the draft resolution of the Second Committee entitled "Financing of economic development through the establishment of fair and equitable international prices . . .", which, among other things, called for an equitable relationship between the prices of raw materials and finished products as they affected the domestic savings and productivity of the less developed areas. One essential merit of this move initiated by the delegation of Argentina on the subject of the terms of trade and equitable comparative prices of primary and manufactured products is that this subject rests on a cherished principle; and by principle one means an abstract generalization. My delegation was, and still is, in favour of that principle. Disciplined and orderly

trade relations are almost unattainable in a world of disordered currencies; and orderly and disciplined currency systems in foreign exchange markets are impossible in the absence of stable and equitable trade policies. Hence the paradoxical situation with which the Committee found itself faced in its consideration of the original Argentine draft resolution.

48. Some delegations, among them my own, thought at first that this draft resolution was far-fetched and perhaps impracticable, but we could not help confessing the need for stressing the importance of some of the principles with respect to the international community which were implied in the draft. My delegation voted for it in the belief that there was an imperative need for the simultaneous establishment, by the collective endeavour of the United Nations, of a pattern of relations covering both the currency and financial disorders and the unhealthy, unfair and injurious practices in international trade. We thought that some progress had already been achieved by the United Nations with respect to collective action in the monetary rather than in the trade relations field, and that the adoption of a practical and reasonable stand on the Argentine proposal would result in a positive benefit. That is why we shall vote for it in the Assembly.

49. Finally, it is perhaps unfair to mention points of controversy in the Committee's work and achievements without a parallel mention of the high degree of unanimity reached by it on such an important subject as land reform. The draft resolution of Egypt, India, Pakistan and Indonesia on land reform was unanimously approved. This is a rare, immensely needed, and desirable practice in our Organization. Unanimity is not a new thing in the work of the Second Committee. It has been achieved with respect to some important draft resolutions in that committee at previous sessions of the General Assembly.

50. As RAPPORTEUR of the Second Committee, I should like to express an opinion with regard to the type of publicity which our Committee has received in the Press and in United Nations circles. It is regrettable that the political, and thus the hotly controversial, aspects of the work of the General Assembly are widely brought to the attention of world public opinion at the expense of the equally important and perhaps more constructive work with regard to economic, social and humanitarian aspects of the work of the General Assembly.

51. Mr. FACIO (Costa Rica) (*translated from Spanish*): The Costa Rican delegation will vote for the seven resolutions approved by the Second Committee [A/2332].

52. I should like at this point to refer particularly to the draft resolution on the right of peoples freely to use and exploit their natural wealth and resources. One of the main virtues of this resolution is its clear, simple and precise wording. Nonetheless, the most far-fetched interpretations have been given and radical intentions never contemplated in the text have been attributed to it. The unfounded alarm to which this resolution seems to have given rise among the large investment firms must be attributed to these erroneous interpretations, which have been reproduced or perhaps even fostered by the popular Press.

53. The alarm has been shown in widely differing forms and seems to become heightened the further away one gets from the actual wording of the resolution. We know, for example, of the strange case of the president of a great corporation, who cabled to several governments asking them to instruct their representatives to vote against this draft resolution, which was designed, according to this businessman, to encourage the under-developed countries immediately to expropriate the foreign firms established in their territory without compensation of any kind.

54. We do not know whether the distinguished businessman had or had not read the draft resolution upon which this Assembly is going to vote; we presume that he had not, since it is certain that no one who had read it calmly could draw the peculiar conclusion that it called upon the under-developed countries to confiscate foreign firms. The authors of the draft resolution never had anything of the sort in mind. Its preamble is confined to a repetition of universally accepted principles which are not open to any discussion whatever.

55. Paragraph 1 of the operative part, so far from making any recommendation which could be construed as directed against foreign firms, does precisely the reverse. Member States are recommended—and by implication particularly the under-developed countries—"in the exercise of their right freely to use and exploit their natural wealth and resources wherever deemed desirable by them for their own progress and economic development, to have due regard, consistently with their sovereignty, to the need for the maintenance of mutual confidence and economic co-operation among nations".

56. As Mr. Gutiérrez Gómez, the representative of Colombia, said so well, what better way could be found of saying that inequitable, confiscatory and unfair procedures should be discarded than to lay the stress in the recommendation on the absolute need for the maintenance of mutual confidence and international co-operation? Can anyone deny that this recommendation is favourable and suited to any firms which have sound holdings or wish to invest in the under-developed countries? How could anyone maintain, in the light of this paragraph, that this draft resolution is designed to encourage confiscation?

57. As far as my country is concerned, the recommendation in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution is wholly consonant with its international conduct and its constitutional precepts, and accordingly it is quite acceptable.

58. The recommendation in paragraph 2 gives what might be called the other side of the picture. After recommending the States which find it necessary to expropriate natural wealth or resources to refrain from doing so in any manner which may injure the legitimate interests of private firms, whether domestic or foreign, the States whose nationals have investments in countries which expropriate are asked to refrain from acts, direct or indirect, designed to impede the exercise of the sovereignty of any State over its natural resources.

59. In other words, States are asked to understand that historical, political, economic and social conditions differ from country to country and that acts of Co-

mestic sovereignty should accordingly be respected because they are carried out on behalf of a people whose interests, aspirations and sacrifices cannot be fully judged from the standpoint of foreign interests.

60. There is implicit in the recommendation the idea that in matters of this sort, as in all those falling within the scope of domestic sovereignty, there can be no general formulations or all-embracing solutions. Obviously there must be a common wish for prosperity, freedom and peace. The proposal means that the attitudes of Members of this Organization are to be examined in the light of this principle, but it tries to avoid binding them by formulas which are in force in other countries and are considered by them as adequate for their own people. What brings greatness and power to one country may bring poverty and despair to another. The fact that one country decides to exercise or to refrain from exercising its right freely to use its natural wealth and resources should not be viewed, for instance, from the standpoint of any given concept of free enterprise accepted or preached in another country. Because, I repeat, circumstances vary from people to people, from territory to territory, from State to State.

61. Let us take Bolivia, for instance. We believe that when the revolutionary government of this sister country decreed that the vast treasury of its mineral wealth should be used to serve the nation, and no longer be exploited by a small group of individuals who had misused it, who had drained it for their own unbridled enrichment, to keep the people of Bolivia in poverty and to impose upon them positively sub-human political and economic conditions, we believe, I repeat, that in this case the present Government of Bolivia is not acting against free enterprise nor is it molesting foreign capital. Those who take advantage of free enterprise to enjoy its benefits for themselves alone, depriving their fellow men of the opportunity to enjoy its benefits, are greater enemies of free enterprise than those who seize power from the exploiters and launch a policy of social prosperity which will emancipate those who have hitherto been mere wretched slaves.

62. Free enterprise properly understood means that more persons engage in it every day, not that those who came first should use this freedom to be the sole lords and masters of a whole nation through the unscrupulous control of its institutions and by keeping the mass of its citizens in ignorance and poverty.

63. Enterprise is entirely free in my country. We can say proudly that we Costa Ricans enjoy all freedoms; that in our country the charter of human rights is in our blood and we have shed our blood to defend it and to rescue it when it was imperilled. Nevertheless, the manufacture of liquor was nationalized almost a hundred years ago; insurance has been nationalized for more than a quarter of a century; and the banks were nationalized in 1948, with due compensation to the stockholders. This last step, the most daring of all, was prompted precisely by a wish to break through a situation which was hampering the development of free private enterprise, by enabling the small businessman to obtain credit facilities which had hitherto been controlled by a small group of privileged persons.

64. In our case, as in others we have mentioned, the circumstances which prompted the Government of Costa Rica to use and exploit through its institutions a certain form of wealth are special ones and cannot claim to be of universal application. We do not think, for instance, that there would be the remotest need to expropriate the firms which are exploiting our mines, just as we think that it would be an economic absurdity and a fatal political mistake to press for the nationalization of the sugar-cane, coffee or milk industries, since they are carried on in Costa Rica by private firms very efficiently and greatly to the benefit of the national economy and the political stability of the country.

65. The amendment submitted by the delegation of India makes it even clearer that the purpose of the draft resolution we are discussing is not to encourage in any way acts which might injure private enterprise or the sound investment of foreign capital. Since my delegation supported the draft resolution in committee with that idea in mind, we will be glad to vote for that amendment.

66. Mr. CECH (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from Russian*): The Czechoslovak delegation considers it necessary to explain its vote on draft resolution B on land reform.

67. My delegation recognizes that much of the substance of this draft constitutes a useful contribution to the solution of the problem of land reform. It has already had occasion to comment favourably on those provisions of the draft which recommend that Member States of the United Nations should take every possible step to bring about the land reforms necessary for the solution of the basic problems of agricultural production and for the improvement of the living standards of the working people.

68. The Czechoslovak delegation must, however, point out that there is one statement in the draft resolution which is incorrect and which does not constitute a proper introduction to the operative part. I refer to the words "world food resources have increased less rapidly than world population . . .". These words might give rise to the notion that the present unsatisfactory situation was due, and due exclusively, to the growth in population. In the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation, that brings us dangerously close to the false Malthusian and neo-Malthusian theories which my delegation rejects on principle, and which it opposes. The real cause of the unsatisfactory situation is primarily the fact that large areas of land are in the hands of foreign monopolies and are used for single-crop production. In other regions, the cause is the primitive methods of cultivation due to the difficult circumstances of the small tenant-farmers and small and medium farmers, or again the concentration of land in the hands of a few great landowners. There is thus an unfortunate disharmony between the preamble of the draft resolution and its recommendations.

69. Although the Czechoslovak delegation considers that the part of the draft I have referred to is not sufficiently precise and not entirely in accordance with its wishes, it will vote in favour of the draft, which contains some useful passages and recommendations, in order not to disrupt the unanimity of the vote.

70. Mr. JUNG (India): The delegation of India will vote in favour of the draft resolutions presented to the General Assembly by the Second Committee. Not having had the opportunity so far of explaining its vote against certain amendments to the joint draft resolution submitted in committee by the delegations of Uruguay and Bolivia, or even the reasons for which India moved its own amendments in the Second Committee, my delegation would like to give that explanation now, before the draft resolution on the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources comes under discussion. We should like to explain the background of the further amendment which we have introduced.

71. Representatives who took part in the work of the Second Committee will remember that the draft resolution, as originally presented, asked for the recognition of the right of a State to nationalize. A Bolivian amendment pleaded against coercion by other States exercised against the nationalizing State. Later, as the result of certain misgivings, genuinely felt and expressed by members of the Committee, against both the draft resolution and the amendment, a joint draft resolution was presented by the delegations of Uruguay and Bolivia asking for proper respect for the right of each country freely to use and exploit its natural wealth and resources as an indispensable factor in progress and economic development and, therefore, for the avoidance of the use of any direct or indirect pressure such as might jeopardize the integrated economic development of under-developed countries or mutual understanding and economic development generally.

72. In our view, the original Uruguayan draft resolution, by asking for the recognition of a right which we considered inherent in every State, implied also the power to deny that right. We considered such a position to be untenable. The Bolivian amendment seemed to us to be an improvement in the sense that it added a purpose to the draft resolution, but in itself it aroused many further misgivings.

73. Since the two proposals were merged, however, in the form of a joint draft resolution, we felt that there was an objection to the Second Committee discussing cases of direct and indirect pressures and entering, by implication, into individual cases which could be debated only in the context of complaints in a committee or organ of the United Nations other than the Second Committee.

74. As regards the principle itself, we had no doubt, and we have no doubt now, of the absolute right of a sovereign State to be master of its own economic domain. Now, between these two regions of a discussion on the rights of a State and a discussion on individual disputes, there is a region of certain broad considerations concerned mostly with the conduct of nations which could be considered, and this we thought should be dealt with only in general terms. I should like to say that this process was facilitated by the omission from the joint draft resolution of the term "nationalization" which, consequentially, made it inappropriate to deal with elaborate conditions, however necessary, such as those concerned with compensation and arbitration. If mention had been made of nationalization as such we should, ourselves, have in-

sisted on the inclusion of provisions for compensation, arbitration and the like, since we in India are constitutionally bound not to expropriate, to nationalize or to acquire except subject to fair and equitable compensation.

75. Here I should like to say that, in the context of a world awakening and political recovery in many of its parts from a state of tutelage or economic dependency, we could not have supported any amendment resulting, wittingly or unwittingly, in limiting the ultimate sovereignty of a State in the matter of the exploitation of its own wealth and natural resources because of concessional agreements entered into during a period of tutelage or economic dependency. It has to be recognized that the days of such exploitation are over, and that the ultimate right has to exist for the State to regulate its own economy. We believe that in this connexion there are considerations of conduct which no State should ignore.

76. We believe also that under-developed countries anxious to maintain the flow of capital, whether public or private, for their development, have to maintain conditions of stability and security without which capital is bound to shy off. That is precisely why we introduced, in the amendment which we submitted in committee, the consideration that a State choosing to exercise its rights in this field should have due regard to the maintenance of mutual confidence and economic co-operation among nations—and confidence in the economic sense can mean nothing but conditions of security.

77. We have now, by our further amendment [A/L.143], tried only to make this clear, and not to go beyond or subtract from what we originally intended. I hope that the amendment introduced by us with the object of amplification—and with that object alone—will be generally accepted, particularly since, in draft resolution C on financing of economic development of under-developed areas, we have already stressed the need for the specialized agencies and the governments of Member States to stimulate the steady flow into under-developed countries of private capital in adequate amounts.

78. Capital, like water, will find its own level. It will not flow into countries which do not provide conditions of security and stability. On the contrary, it will flow into countries which do provide such conditions. In my own country we endeavour to provide them, subject to our own national interests and the conditions of our own Constitution. But, at the same time, we of the under-developed countries wish it to be fully appreciated that ideas in this matter have to change in step with the change in the political consciousness and freedom of peoples, and that capital, whether public or private, must recognize that change. It is within that framework that reasonable security can and should be given to the flow of capital, and that is in fact what we meant and still mean by our reference to mutual confidence.

79. Mr. ELAHI (Pakistan): In explaining its vote in the Second Committee, my delegation made it quite clear why it had supported the draft resolution regarding the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources. In the first place, the draft recommends that the Member States should have due regard to

the need for the maintenance of mutual confidence and economic co-operation by exercising the rights of sovereignty in the free use of their natural wealth and resources. Secondly, it recommends that Member States refrain from any acts designed to impede the exercise of the sovereign right of a State over its natural resources.

80. We made it clear that, in our view, paragraph 1 of the operative part envisaged the payment of fair compensation in case of nationalization; and we also made it clear that we, in our country, had made a categorical declaration of policy in support of that principle. We welcome the investment of foreign capital in our country and guarantee the transfer of profits and repatriation of capital, with no exercise of discrimination of any sort against foreign capital. We feel that foreign capital can still play a beneficial part for the investing, as well as the recipient, country.

81. With these considerations in mind, we voted for the draft resolution, but there were some developed countries which expressed their doubts about the wisdom of adopting such a draft. The Indian amendment now before us helps to remove some of these misgivings, and we shall, therefore, very gladly support this amendment. Our position in voting on the other draft resolutions will remain unchanged.

82. Mr. GUTIERREZ GOMEZ (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): I first wish to place on record my delegation's satisfaction with the work done by the Second Committee during the seventh session of the General Assembly. During those discussions, in the course of which we had the opportunity of hearing the views and statements of all the countries concerned with the most pressing economic and social problems, there could be no doubt of the very sincere desire of all States Members of the United Nations to contribute to the progress and development of the under-developed countries. It may be said that the entire work of the Committee was inspired and advanced by that ideal which, in my delegation's view, is a highly important part of the United Nations' work for the maintenance of world peace and unity.

83. I wish to mention specifically draft resolution B concerning the financing of the economic development of under-developed countries, which refers expressly to the establishment of an international finance corporation to fill the gap which at present exists as a result of the limitations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in the field of private investment.

84. In my delegation's opinion the studies undertaken to date with the assistance of the International Bank, whose president submitted to the Economic and Social Council a report [E/2215] which strongly supported the Council's proposal for the establishment of such a corporation, the Council's conclusions and the discussions and statements made in the Second Committee during the current session show that the proposal is completely sound and that there is no reason for delaying the corporation's establishment or for discussing it any further.

85. Lastly, I wish to explain the vote cast by Colombia in favour of the draft resolution on the right of every country to exploit its natural wealth and resources freely. In the Second Committee and during

the rather lively discussion of this draft resolution we expressed our support of the basic idea and of the purposes which motivated the original sponsors. Nevertheless, we had some reservations and misgivings with regard to the original wording. Those reservations and misgivings with regard to the desirability of not discussing an unquestionable right, of not giving even the slightest appearance of encouragement to confiscatory action, of not discouraging free private enterprise, which is the greatest bulwark of world progress, and of not frightening foreign investors, have been dispelled by the joint draft resolution [A/C.2/L.165/Rev.1] and the amendment submitted by the delegation of India.

86. We consider that there can be no objection to the terms of the draft resolution concerning the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources and that both the wording and the content of the draft resolution deserve the support and approbation of all delegations. The operative part, which is the basic part, limits itself to making certain recommendations on the fairest way of exercising a right inherent in national sovereignty.

87. I should like to refer to the remarks I made in the Second Committee which the Costa Rican representative did me the honour of quoting here. There is no more explicit or comprehensive way of condemning and prohibiting unfair practices on either side than to recommend that due regard should be paid to the need for the maintenance of mutual confidence and co-operation among nations. Other forms of words could be used, such as respect for the principles of international law, or respect for fair business practices, but I sincerely believe that the words "mutual confidence and co-operation among nations" offer a much more inspiring, binding and eloquent way of conveying the purport of the proposal.

88. It was not my delegation's intention to explain our vote; I am doing so only because of the comments made in certain organs of the Press and business circles. These comments obviously distort the purport and motives of the draft resolution. I wish to state categorically that, when the Colombian delegation votes for this proposal, it is adhering strictly to its national constitutional principles with regard to the natural right of ownership, the non-discriminatory treatment of foreign investments and the development of free private investment as the most powerful factor in its economic development.

89. If the commentators who have helped to confuse public opinion to some extent regarding this draft resolution, instead of giving their personal interpretations and comments on the purport and motives of the draft, had merely published the text which we are discussing to-day, I am convinced that all misgivings would disappear and even the financial circles which to-day regard us with some concern would support our draft resolution.

90. I also wish to announce that the Colombian delegation will vote for the other six draft resolutions included in the Committee's report and for the amendment proposed by the Indian representative with regard to the draft resolution on the right freely to exploit natural wealth and resources, which improves the text considerably.

91. The PRESIDENT: The position is now that two delegations wish to explain their votes after the voting on the draft resolution entitled "Financing of economic development through the establishment of fair and equitable international prices . . ." ; two before, and eight after, the vote on the draft resolution on the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources; and one after all the voting is completed.

92. The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution of the Second Committee [A/2332] on the expanded programme of technical assistance for the economic development of under-developed countries.

The draft resolution was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

93. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolutions A, B and C on financing of economic development of under-developed countries.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 50 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

94. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on paragraph 5 of the operative part of the draft resolution entitled "Financing of economic development through the establishment of fair and equitable international prices for primary commodities and through the execution of national programmes of integrated economic development".

The paragraph was adopted by 34 votes to 3, with 16 abstentions.

95. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the draft resolution as a whole. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Yugoslavia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Liberia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Haiti, Poland, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The draft resolution was adopted by 35 votes to 15, with 9 abstentions.

96. Mr. DE SEYNES (France) (*translated from French*): During the debate in the Second Committee, the French delegation paid a tribute to the Argentine delegation's action in bringing up for discussion in the General Assembly the important problems raised in

the resolution just adopted. We welcomed the step and were pleased to note the high quality and exceptional interest of the debates to which it gave rise. Our sole regret is that the outcome was a text which we found it impossible to endorse.

97. The reasons for our objection were made abundantly clear in the Second Committee. They are, essentially, that the text asks certain governments for a commitment so general in scope that we cannot subscribe to it, at any rate until it is quite clear how it is to be put into effect.

98. Under paragraph 1 (a) of the operative part, my Government would not be free to take any measure that might affect prices unless it had first satisfied itself that the measure would not upset an equitable, just and reasonable balance between world prices for raw materials and for manufactured goods; nowhere in the resolution is the nature of that balance defined.

99. The French delegation, fearing that its objections might be due to a misunderstanding or misinterpretation, more than once tried to elicit what it considered necessary particulars, concerning both the nature of the desired balance and the possible methods for achieving it. It did so by asking questions or by submitting amendments whose sole purpose was to explore the possibilities of a common meeting ground. The questions failed to elicit the enlightenment sought and the amendments were rejected.

100. Furthermore, the debate, as it unfolded, merely increased our perplexity. It seemed to us that there was no agreement among the majority regarding the basic principles underlying the measures contemplated. Some appeared to favour absolute freedom regarding prices of primary commodities—or at least some of them—whereas others wanted a system of control to replace the operation of the price machinery. Our impression was that either the scope of government action in the countries where private enterprise still holds an important position was seriously overestimated, or else we were being asked to change our institutions completely, perhaps even our constitutions, to make them fit into the framework of a policy of international planning. The importance which the majority apparently attached to a certain wording did nothing to dispel our misgivings. We are the more sorry about this since there are a number of provisions in the resolution to which we take no exception and others which we are quite prepared to endorse.

101. When the draft resolution was voted upon, paragraph by paragraph, in committee, France supported the establishment of a new group of experts. Even though a similar group, composed of world-renowned personalities, has already informed us of its views regarding the problem on the agenda, I should like to assure the Argentine delegation and other delegations supporting it that the French Government will study the recommendations to be drawn up by the new group with no mental reservations and with all the attention they deserve, and we earnestly trust that we shall once more find ourselves on the same side as the Argentine delegation when specific recommendations are placed before us for solving problems that are of as much concern to us as to Argentina.

102. Furthermore, the French Government sincerely hopes that the United Nations will give a strong

impetus to the study of agreements relating to individual primary commodities, as referred to in paragraph 2 of the operative part. In existing circumstances, the conclusion of such agreements seems to us the most promising avenue for international economic action under United Nations auspices, and the resolution just adopted would, we believe, have been infinitely stronger had its provisions concentrated on this question. To judge by the most recent studies, the prospects of the future international demand for at least some primary commodities should encourage exporting and importing governments alike to seek agreements of this kind. A system of parity prices as part of these agreements is not, we believe, beyond possibility. We also feel that action on those lines, pursued with all the desirable energy, would permit the United Nations to regain that initiative and role of guide in the treatment of major economic problems which it has to some extent lost with the abandonment of the Havana Charter.

103. The French delegation sincerely hopes that the problem will remain on the Assembly agenda.

104. Mr. BUNGE (Argentina) (*translated from Spanish*): The Argentine delegation wishes to explain why it voted for the resolution entitled "Financing of economic development through the establishment of fair and equitable international prices for primary commodities and through the execution of national programmes of integrated economic development", which has just been adopted and which, it believes, is of special importance to the economic development of the countries in the process of development.

105. My delegation considers that that resolution will make it possible to deal with the problem of economic development from a more realistic point of view based on full knowledge of the various factors which determine the growth or stagnation of peoples and cause the disparities between wealth and poverty that affect the peace and security of mankind. The resolution has two basic elements.

106. The first concerns the deterioration of the terms of trade of primary products in relation to capital goods and other manufactured articles, and short-term periodic fluctuations in the prices of primary commodities. The problem to which these two situations—structural and cyclical respectively—give rise has an obvious bearing on the possibilities of progress in countries whose national income depends fundamentally upon the sale of primary commodities abroad. The problem becomes considerably worse if, as happens in many cases, the natural downward trend in the prices of primary commodities is accelerated and accentuated by governmental measures at the national and international levels which, directly or indirectly, exert a downward pressure upon such prices.

107. Secondly, if this situation is coupled with an excessive international division of labour, through which the world is divided into raw material producing countries and industrialized countries, the result is bound to be as follows: on one hand, owing to the unequal relative growth of the various national economies and the impossibility of complete mobility in the factors of production, some countries become progressively richer, whilst others stagnate and decay; on the other hand, the result of the deterioration of

the terms of trade will be that the peripheral countries are prevented from receiving the possible benefit of increased productivity, which will thus be transferred to the industrial centres. Obviously, therefore, the progress of the under-developed countries is to a high degree dependent upon the establishment of integrated economies on a national or regional basis which will make it possible to cushion the effects of the relative deterioration in the prices of primary commodities and to achieve a rate of expansion sufficient to absorb population growth completely while allowing for a constant improvement in standards of living. It is also obvious that the continuance of an international division of labour such as I have mentioned would inevitably result in the progressive impoverishment of the countries producing primary commodities. As proof of that contention, I need refer only to the fact that continuing technical progress and the increasing concentration of capital in large-scale industry are steadily reducing the share of raw materials in the total product.

108. The resolution takes these two factors into account and attempts to correct them through more conscious governmental action avoiding measures which would result in an inadequate, unjust and inequitable relationship between the prices of primary commodities and of capital goods; the conclusion of multilateral or bilateral agreements for the stabilization of prices on the basis of an adequate, just and equitable relationship; the reduction of restrictions on imports of primary commodities and the adoption and implementation of integrated national programmes of economic development by countries in the process of development.

109. The resolution also calls for a series of studies which will promote full understanding of the problems arising from economic growth under the present economic structure of the world. The correlation of a better and more stable price relationship with general economic development will undoubtedly facilitate the formation of national savings sufficiently large to reduce the necessity for international financing of the economic development of the peripheral countries.

110: With regard to the financial implications referred to in the report of the Fifth Committee (A/2338), my delegation regrets that the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions paid no attention to the far-reaching significance of the resolution and recommended a reduction in the funds required for the proposed study, regardless of the very real importance of and urgent need for such research, which was recognized during the debate even by those who did not accept the views on which the resolution adopted is based.

111. Fortunately the Fifth Committee corrected that mistake and approved the appropriation which had been cut. I therefore wish to put on record my delegation's hope that, in view of the fact that under the 1953 budget the Secretary-General has at his disposal an appropriation of \$US11,000 for per diem payments, the experts will not be required to do their work in less than the eight weeks which the Secretary-General himself said was the minimum needed to complete it.

112. The Argentine delegation voted in favour of this resolution in the firm belief that its adoption would mark an important milestone towards the solution of

the vital problem of eliminating the causes of the stagnation and poverty which afflict a large part of mankind.

113. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the draft resolution on migration and economic development. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Czechoslovakia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Iceland, Iraq, Lebanon, Mexico, New Zealand, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Australia, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The draft resolution was adopted by 36 votes to none, with 24 abstentions.

114. Mr. CUSANO (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*): The Uruguayan delegation wishes to confirm its opinion and attitude with regard to the draft resolution on migration and economic development which we have just adopted. We believe that the resolution will have very favourable results for the underdeveloped countries and, speaking from my own knowledge and experience of Latin America, I believe that it will be of great benefit to that part of the world.

115. It is my belief that there are in Latin America countries which possess vast wealth still to be exploited, and that it is not being exploited owing to a dearth of labour; and that, on the other hand, there are sister countries in other continents where the land is too impoverished to provide sufficient food for the inhabitants.

116. In a report by the United Nations Secretary-General [E/2019] which is known to all of you, it is stated that there are at the present time on the continent of Europe 4,500,000 persons who must inevitably leave their native countries because they cannot earn a livelihood there.

117. I believe that the countries of Latin America, and countries like Australia, which also took an active part in the consideration of the problem, and all countries wishing to attract immigrant families who will become part of their social and economic life, will find that this resolution provides them with great possibilities of developing bilateral and multilateral migration agreements. I firmly believe that this transfer of persons and families will be carried out with full respect for the recommendation contained in paragraph I of the operative part of the resolution—a recommendation which is consistent with the Constitution and laws of my country and for which I voted so enthusiastically

when the delegation of Haiti proposed it—which states that the equipment, transfer and resettlement of groups of emigrants shall take place without racial or religious discrimination, as part of the general economic development. The Uruguayan delegation, as sponsor of the resolution, hopes that the transfer of workers in pursuance of it will be carried out strictly in accordance with this principle.

118. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A and B on land reform. We shall vote first on draft resolution A.

The draft resolution was adopted by 53 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

119. The PRESIDENT: In respect of draft resolution B, a separate vote has been requested on sub-paragraph (a) of the operative part, which reads:

“Considering:

“(a) That world food resources have increased less rapidly than world population, so that in the world as a whole food consumption per capita is now less than it was fifteen years ago”.

The sub-paragraph was adopted by 47 votes to none.

120. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet Union delegation requested a separate vote on sub-paragraph (a) of the third paragraph of the preamble. The President, however, announced at the beginning of the vote that a separate vote was being taken on sub-paragraph (a) of the operative part.

121. In view of the fact that there has been some confusion on this point from the very beginning of the vote, I should like to request that the position be clarified by taking another vote.

122. The PRESIDENT: I shall be glad to clarify the situation. I read out the sub-paragraph on which a separate vote had been requested. It is true that it is in the preamble and not in the operative part. However, I read out the sub-paragraph and I assumed that it was the sub-paragraph on which a separate vote had been requested. If the separate vote was requested for a paragraph other than the one I read out, I should be glad to put that paragraph to the vote.

123. Meanwhile, the Assembly has just voted in favour of the sub-paragraph which reads:

“Considering:

“(a) That world food resources have increased less rapidly than world population, so that in the world as a whole food consumption per capita is now less than it was fifteen years ago”.

That is in the third paragraph of the preamble; the representative of the Soviet Union is correct about that.

124. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The President announced at the beginning of the vote that we were going to vote on sub-paragraph (a) of the operative part of the draft resolution, not on the clause which he has just read out. In view of the fact that there has been some confusion from the very outset of the vote, I request the President to put the sub-paragraph which he has just read out, namely, sub-paragraph

(a) of the third paragraph of the preamble, to the vote again.

125. The PRESIDENT: I think it would save time to put to the vote again the text that I have just read out, which is sub-paragraph (a) of the third paragraph of the preamble.

The sub-paragraph was adopted by 53 votes to 5.

126. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution B, on land reform, as a whole.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 56 votes to none.

127. The PRESIDENT: We now come to the draft resolution on the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources, to which an amendment has been submitted by the delegation of India (A/L.143).

128. Mr. SILES ZUAZO (Bolivia) (*translated from Spanish*): From the time of the founding of the United Nations up to this seventh session of the General Assembly which is coming to a close, the large, medium and small nations associated in this international Organization have referred repeatedly to the vital necessity of joint efforts to ensure the progress of peoples living in economically under-developed regions, for, as the representatives of the major Powers have also recognized, their own prosperity depends on this progress. This concurrence of views is based on reality, which is stronger than idealistic philosophies or selfishness; reality which provides evidence of the widening gap between the prosperity of the major Powers and the poverty and hardships of the under-developed countries, a disparity which augurs ill for the future and which makes it impossible for the international community to progress and effectively to fulfil the high purposes and principles of the Charter.

129. When the Second Committee was considering methods to remedy that situation, no one disputed the claim that it was an essential prerequisite that the under-developed countries should freely assume control of their economies and that the use of economic and political pressure and of fixed prices in the agreements relating to the purchase of their raw materials should be eliminated. The Committee also considered at length the economic difficulties hampering the development of the under-developed countries and their political implications and reached the conclusion that free exercise of economic sovereignty, adequately supported by the United Nations, would permit the development of constructive trade relations between the raw-material producing countries and the countries using those raw materials in their industries. But in addition to hearing these theories and listening to statistics, the members of the Committee had an opportunity to study facts and true experiences such as the nationalization of petroleum in Mexico and Iran and the nationalization of three great mining enterprises in Bolivia. Thus, the theories of the experts have been borne out for when raw materials are extracted without profit to the producer countries, a siphon, to use the Costa Rican representative's apt phrase, is created which draws off the product of the labour of one community for the benefit of others, and this is the condition giving rise to the different levels of economic life which endanger social international peace.

130. If to this we add the exercise of economic power, in terms of political control, with a view to facilitating the export of prosperity indefinitely at the expense of the poverty of the producers, we shall find an explanation for the paradoxical position of countries whose natural wealth is one of the causes of their backwardness.

131. Beyond theories and good international intentions, situations like that I have described inevitably drive nations to the nationalization of undertakings which exploit their wealth without benefit to the community, and in this way the nations punish the inhuman exploitation practised by the selfish interests which do not realize that the march of a people towards freedom and a better future cannot be stopped any more than the earth's rotations can be arrested. But it is just when these movements for economic emancipation occur that the ousted interests stop at nothing in their attempts to retrieve the position they have lost owing to their selfish behaviour.

132. This tendency was emphasized in the Second Committee when reference was made to the experiences of Mexico, Iran and Bolivia. In the first two countries the nationalization of petroleum led, in economic affairs, to a process comparable to the withholding of diplomatic recognition, the object being to reduce revenue and so to cause the political downfall of the emancipating governments.

133. To avoid the recurrence of such situations and tendencies, which are obviously at odds with the general terms in Article 55 of the Charter which mentions the need of creating "conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations", and in accordance with the recommendation contained in that article that the United Nations should promote "higher standards of living . . . economic and social progress . . . and solutions of international economic . . . problems", the delegations of Bolivia and Uruguay sponsored a draft resolution in the Second Committee concerning the free exercise of economic sovereignty, a resolution which the Committee approved and which now appears as the draft resolution on the right freely to exploit natural wealth and resources.

134. No direct objection was made during the debate to the right to expropriate property in the public interest. No such objection could be raised, inasmuch as not only the smaller countries but also the great industrial Powers have exercised this right when the public, social or national interest so required. In the United States, for example, it was held by the Supreme Court in the case of *State of Georgia vs. City of Chattanooga* (1924): "The taking of private property for public use upon just compensation is so often necessary for the proper performance of governmental functions that the power is deemed to be essential to the life of the state. It cannot be surrendered, and, if attempted to be contracted away, it may be resumed at will".

135. This quotation is taken from the letter written by a United States citizen, Robert Delson, and published in *The New York Times* of 17 December 1952; the letter goes on to make the following statement which I consider relevant:

"It is firmly established in American law that our courts will not sit in judgment upon the validity

of the acts of another government. The rule, established long before by the United States Supreme Court, was applied in the case of *M. Salimoff & Co. vs. Standard Oil Company of New York* (1933) to a situation quite analogous to the one with which we are here concerned. The plaintiff contended that his oil lands in Russia, and oil extracted therefrom, had been confiscated without indemnification by the Soviet Government. Legal action was brought to recover such oil from the Standard Oil Company of New York, which had purchased it and brought it to the United States. The action was dismissed on the ground that the taking of the plaintiff's oil properties, even though it was entirely without compensation, could not be held to be invalid."

136. In the case of the nationalization of the three tin-mining companies of Patiño, Aramayo and Hochschild, of whom the first two men were born in Bolivia and the third is a naturalized citizen of Argentina, the action was taken in accordance with the laws of my country. This is not a question of confiscation as some malicious persons have attempted to make world public opinion believe. In this connexion I should like to explain that my Government's opposition to foreign intervention in the domestic economic affairs of any State in no way affects its decision to offer adequate compensation for the property which was nationalized.

137. Contrary to what has been maintained by some delegations and in certain Press reports, the nationalization of the Bolivian tin mines has not led to the withdrawal of foreign capital from Bolivia. On the contrary, new investments have come in as is evidenced by the agreements relating to United States investments in sulphur and petroleum, the agreement concluded between the Government of the Bolivian Revolution and a group of South American and European capitalists for the investment of \$US12 million for the building of a tin smelter which will enable my country to attain greater economic independence through the sale of its raw materials in the refined state. I must also add that, contrary to the pessimists' predictions, tin production in Bolivia reached record heights in October and November 1952. This is due to the fact that my country's miners realize that they have for the first time become free factors of production serving the nation.

138. I should also like to mention that the United Nations, through its efficient Technical Assistance Administration, whose representatives we have found fully understand our problems, is co-operating closely with the Bolivian Government through the mission established at La Paz under the dynamic and intelligent guidance of Mr. Carter Goodrich.

139. The flow of fresh capital and the increase in mining production to which I have referred above confirms the theory of most of the United Nations economists that freedom to dispose of natural wealth promotes the development of the under-developed countries and, instead of frightening capital away, attracts it. The investments I have mentioned and others under consideration by United States citizens with a view to the exploitation of various Bolivian natural resources have also been taken into account in the Act of 7 April 1945 drafted by Dr. Víctor Paz Estensoro, then Minister of Finance and now President of Bolivia, which guarantees to foreign capital the payment of income and reimbursement of principal in foreign exchange.

140. Lastly, in order to avoid inaccurate interpretations of Bolivia's role in the debate on the draft resolution concerning the right freely to exploit natural wealth and resources and of the commercial and international relations of Bolivia and in particular the friendly ties which it is developing with the United States, I am constrained to say that the Bolivian movement is not anti-United States or opposed to the investment of fresh capital. It is an entirely separate matter that the ousted mining entrepreneurs wished to confuse world public opinion by representing themselves as United States nationals whereas they were either born in Bolivia or are naturalized citizens of Argentina and have been extracting money and the natural resources of my country at the expense of the unfortunate people of Bolivia.

141. I think it proper to add that in conversations with officials of the United States Government they have never questioned the sovereign right of the Bolivian State to nationalize its mines and last November they again stated that they would buy our tin as it was produced.

142. You have before you a draft resolution intended to protect the free disposition of the natural wealth and resources of the under-developed countries, a text which was discussed in detail in the Second Committee and which was approved after mature consideration by thirty-one members of the international community. The final decision taken on this resolution will tell the needy peoples of the world how much faith they should place in the United Nations as an Organization which attains its objectives and promotes the advancement of mankind.

143. Mr. CUSANO (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*): The countries that by destiny take their place among the small countries of the world as far as territory and population are concerned, have the right to contribute to the great human family, if nothing else, at least their fortunate experiences in democracy and social and economic affairs. That, in essence, was the underlying purpose of the initiative taken by the Uruguayan delegation.

144. The Uruguayan delegation wishes to confirm here what it said when it first submitted its draft resolution. That resolution was not intended in any way to complicate the normal relations between private investors and the under-developed countries. My delegation described to the United Nations the fruits of its fortunate experience with regard to the way in which Uruguay had carried out expropriation, incorporating into the possession of the nation all the property which, by decision of Parliament, was stated to be useful to the community.

145. Uruguay has no material problem to present. It merely put forward in the United Nations a doctrine which it felt might be universally applied for the sake of better understanding between the nations and it is very pleased to have done so and even to have heard the mistaken conceptions and interpretations expressed concerning its initiative, because those interpretations served to show up the intention of the resolution in its true light.

146. I need now only refer to the statements made by all the distinguished delegations which supported the resolution. Each of them—Saudi Arabia, India,

Costa Rica and Colombia—explained the attitudes of their governments. Each one made some contribution to the question. None of them found any dark intent behind the initiative Uruguay had taken. I said on one occasion that our country, which has firmly respected the principle contained in article 32 of our Constitution, establishing that when expropriation is declared to be a public necessity it shall be carried out in exchange for just and previously agreed compensation; and that my country was ready to accept any amendment to its proposal to the effect that the principle should be applied in accordance with the constitution and laws of each country concerned. We stand on that principle and our present action is based upon it. In sponsoring a proposal of such great import, Uruguay could not have been inspired by any unworthy motive, as certain delegations have alleged.

147. The position has been made clear. I am sure that those who were alarmed will at last be convinced, after hearing the categorical statements made here today by all the delegations concerned with this draft resolution.

148. When the matter was being discussed in the Second Committee and I referred to the relations which had existed between our country and the United Kingdom for many years and explained the nature of the arrangements and the manner in which they had been brought to an end, to the complete satisfaction of both parties—and documents exist to prove that—I expressed my gratitude for the statement made by the United Kingdom representative, which supported what I had said. Similarly, I should like to express my appreciation for all the generous statements concerning Uruguay made in the recent discussion, by the representatives of Bolivia, Ecuador and all who considered that our draft resolution was a fair one and represented a contribution to international understanding. I have no more to say in support of the draft resolution because I believe that the arguments advanced by all the delegations confirm that the Uruguayan resolution will strengthen the United Nations by promoting a better understanding of the needs of the peoples.

149. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put the draft resolution on the right to exploit free natural wealth and resources to the vote. We shall vote first on the amendment submitted by the delegation of India. This amendment calls for the replacement of the words "the maintenance of", in paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution, by the words "maintaining the flow of capital in conditions of security". A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Egypt, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador.

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

Abstaining: Greece, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Australia, Belgium, China, Cuba, Denmark.

The amendment was adopted by 39 votes to 5, with 16 abstentions.

150. The PRESIDENT: We shall now vote on the draft resolution as a whole, as amended. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Pakistan, Paraguay, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Against: Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, New Zealand.

Abstaining: Venezuela, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Cuba, Denmark, France, Greece, Haiti, Iceland, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Turkey.

The draft resolution as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 36 votes to 4, with 20 abstentions.

151. Mr. LLOYD (United Kingdom): My delegation has voted for all the draft resolutions in this report so far with the exception of two.

152. We voted against the draft resolution entitled "Financing of economic development through the establishment of fair and equitable international prices . . .". We, also, are anxious about constant fluctuations in prices of primary commodities. We agree that they are harmful to all nations, and we are ourselves much more vulnerable to such sudden fluctuations than most countries. But we do not believe that there is a universal remedy.

153. We consider that each commodity should be looked at separately in the light of particular conditions, and we are ready, as a government, to consider schemes to promote stability of demand and stability of prices at an economic level with regard to any particular commodity. We are also ready to consider any emergency action that may be required in special circumstances, but we do not believe that the recommendations in paragraph 2 of the operative part of the resolution, regarding the bilateral and multilateral agreements for groups of commodities, are practicable. We hold that view for three reasons.

154. First, we do not think that there are sufficient common factors to make it possible to relate hundreds of different commodities and goods produced in different places and under different conditions.

155. Secondly, such a relationship, if found, could be maintained only by government control of production, government allocation of materials and government

price controls for all important goods moving in international trade.

156. Thirdly, we think that any such move is undesirable because it takes us further away from our objectives of freer trade, fewer restrictions, greater production and higher standards of living.

157. It was because we believed that the resolution would defeat its objective—that is, the improvement of the standards of living in the countries of primary producers—that we did not vote for it. I would say this: no one has a greater interest than the United Kingdom in the prosperity of primary producers. As a great exporting country, we wish to have as large markets as possible. We think, however, that the resolution defeats the object in view.

158. We also voted against the draft resolution on the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources. I recognize that many efforts were made to improve that resolution, but I am afraid I still regard it as a nationalization resolution—particularly in the light of the statement made by the representative of Bolivia.

159. May I make it quite clear that the United Kingdom is in favour of the free exploitation by all countries of their national wealth and resources. We desire higher standards throughout the world: for humanitarian reasons, to stop hunger and disease; for economic reasons, because we believe that, if one part of the world becomes wealthier, all parts of the world will benefit; and for political reasons, because, obviously, international friction does result from low standards of living.

160. We ourselves have made some contribution in the past to the development of other countries. People are sometimes very ready to remind us of our investments which have been profitable; they are not always so ready to remind us of the many hundreds of millions of pounds spent in attempts to develop overseas territories on which we have had no return.

161. We strongly support the expanded programme of technical assistance, and we pay our fair share of the cost. Furthermore, in the recent Commonwealth Conference in London, measures were considered and agreed upon between Commonwealth governments to endeavour to develop under-developed portions of the Commonwealth and to increase standards of living throughout the Commonwealth.

162. Although we are earnestly seeking to advance these purposes in the ways which I have described, I think it is wise to utter one word of caution.

163. I do not believe it is right that the aim should be self-sufficiency for every State. I think it is much better that people should produce the things which they are most capable of producing, since, in that way, a true spirit of internationalism is more likely to be created.

164. For these higher standards which we all desire, substantial capital outlay is required. I should like to take as an example the commodity of coal in the United Kingdom—and I hope that, in selecting this one commodity, my attempt to avoid controversy will be recognized. If that raw material is to be properly exploited, tens of millions of pounds of capital investment are required at present. In many countries with other, similar, raw materials, domestic capital is insufficient

to enable those countries to develop their resources; foreign investment is required. Now, some people seem to think that capital is like a tap which can be turned on at will. They forget that capital represents someone's savings, someone's self-denial, someone's withholding of purchasing power. If such savings are to be made available for foreign investment, confidence is necessary. There must be the feeling that, if the investment is successful, there will be a fair reward and the assets created will not be filched away.

165. In my view, the resolution, judging by some of the opinions which were expressed during the course of the discussions of it and some of the statements of its supporters, cannot encourage the private or the public investor. I would draw particular attention to paragraph 2 of the operative part, which demonstrates by its omission of any reference to the obligations of the State receiving the investment just how one-sided the whole matter is. The under-developed countries are crying out for capital investment. Capital investment depends upon confidence. Confidence, we must admit, has been somewhat shaken in some countries.

166. We have the greatest respect for the representative of Uruguay. We recognize, as we have said before, the excellent way in which the Government of Uruguay has conducted itself in these matters. We certainly pay a tribute to the representative of Uruguay and his Government. If every government could behave as the Government of Uruguay behaves, the situation might be different. We think, however, that, in the light of the present trend of world opinion, this resolution will in fact do nothing to procure the ample flow of capital which is required. It will not contribute in a constructive way to raising standards or getting the investors of the world to co-operate to invest their money and their savings in the countries which so much need it. For that reason, we voted against the draft resolution.

167. Mr. LUBIN (United States of America): My delegation voted against the draft resolution on the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources, as amended by India. We believe that the Indian amendment improved the draft resolution considerably, and we wish to express our appreciation to the representative of India for the sincere efforts which he made to find a solution to a difficult problem. We abstained from voting on the amendment, however, because we believed that it did not go far enough.

168. I would make it quite clear at the outset that we voted against the draft resolution in spite of the fact that we did not disagree with the statements of principle which it contained. In fact, my Government has solemnly subscribed, in such international treaties as the Charter of the Organization of American States, to the same principles as are set forth in the draft resolution. We voted against it, not because of what it contains, but because of what it does not contain. We voted against it because, first, we were convinced that its adoption was unnecessary and, secondly, because we were convinced that it would seriously injure the efforts of the United Nations to bring about and further the economic development of under-developed countries.

169. I should like to take a moment to review the history of the consideration of the draft resolution in the Committee. As has already been stated by the

representative of Saudi Arabia, the draft resolution was first submitted by the delegation of Uruguay. In it, the proposal was made that Member States should recognize each country's right to nationalize its natural wealth. The representative of Uruguay stated to the Committee that his draft resolution was intended—as he put it—to justify the desire of the governments of the under-developed countries to nationalize their resources.

170. During the discussion that followed, a large number of delegations pointed out that the right to nationalize natural wealth was already fully recognized. Those delegations made it clear that no one had questioned the existence of such a right. They emphasized the fact that any resolution on this subject might actually be interpreted as qualifying and limiting the right of nationalization. They drew attention to the fact that the adoption of a resolution on this subject would give rise to a number of difficult problems, including that of compensation. Finally, they pointed out that the adoption of any resolution on the question of nationalization would discourage the international flow of private investment capital.

171. The representative of Uruguay then stated that he was prepared to accept an amendment incorporating the principle of just compensation.

172. In the light of this statement by the sponsor of the original draft resolution, the United States delegation decided to submit amendments in the form of four paragraphs which were designed to cover the question of compensation. We considered our amendments fair. We felt that they would give the draft resolution the balance which, in our opinion, it required. The most important paragraph proposed by the United States—the paragraph dealing with the treatment of the private investors whose property might be nationalized—called on governments to act in accordance with international law and included language that had been thoroughly thrashed out and agreed upon during the United Nations Conference on International Trade and Employment at Havana. Those amendments were offered in a spirit of co-operation. They were intended to make the draft resolution genuinely acceptable to all countries. The United States had hoped that their adoption, while not limiting the recognized right of countries to nationalize, would avoid unfavourable effects on the flow of private capital, against which many delegations had warned. The Committee saw fit to reject our amendments without discussion.

173. The General Assembly has now adopted an amendment, proposed by the delegation of India, which refers to the need to maintain the flow of capital in conditions of security. As I have stated, we feel that this is a distinct improvement in the draft resolution. I shall comment on it in a moment.

174. If I may turn now to the resolution that has been adopted, I should like to raise two questions. The first is: was this resolution necessary? In other words, has anyone questioned the right of a sovereign State to nationalize, or the right of a sovereign State freely to develop, its natural resources? The second is: has the adoption of this resolution helped us in reaching the objective which we all seek, namely, the economic development of under-developed countries?

175. As to the first question, every government has the constitutional right to nationalize and—may I add?

—to denationalize not only its natural wealth, but also any property and any business within its jurisdiction. My own Government has the power to nationalize property according to its right of eminent domain, and, although we have used that right sparingly, it is firmly established in our constitutional practice. Many of our municipalities have found it desirable to take over and operate electric power installations and transportation lines. Our federal government has used its power of eminent domain in the development of great river valleys, such as the Tennessee Valley. Other governments have the same power; no one has questioned it. To whom, then, has this resolution been directed? What danger has suddenly arisen to menace the right of any national government to assume control of its national economic life?

176. As to my second question, it is the opinion of my delegation that the resolution we have adopted will seriously hinder the achievement of our objective, which is the economic development of under-developed countries. We believe that this resolution may undo much of the painstaking effort which the General Assembly and many of its subordinate bodies have been making, over a number of years, to encourage the international flow of private capital. All but a very few delegations have repeatedly acknowledged the need for both public and private capital. It is true that the resolution which has been adopted nowhere uses the word "nationalization". But it is equally true that the meaning and purposes of the original draft resolution remain and, much as we regret it, in our opinion there is still danger that this resolution may be interpreted by private investors all over the world as a warning to think twice before placing their capital in under-developed countries.

177. The resolution now includes the amendment proposed by the delegation of India, which is intended to reassure the foreign investor and to maintain the flow of capital in conditions of security. As I have stated, my delegation is in sympathy with the purpose of this amendment and we believe that it is a step in the right direction. Unfortunately, however, this amendment does not seem to us to go far enough, and we were therefore unable to support the draft resolution as a whole. In our opinion, the resolution is still one-sided. It lays stress on the right of States to nationalize. It is most specific as to the obligation of other States to refrain even from indirect acts which might impede that right of nationalization, but it still says nothing about the obligations of States which do nationalize their resources to refrain from taking action which ignores the rights of private investors under international law, treaties, and agreements. Even although the Indian amendment was a distinct improvement, my delegation was unable to vote for a draft resolution which did not specifically refer to the obligation of governments to reimburse private investors whose property was nationalized.

178. Mr. DE GROOTE (Belgium) (*translated from French*): The Belgian delegation would like to explain briefly its abstention in the vote on the draft resolution on the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources.

179. After hearing all the explanations and clarifications given during the debate, the Belgian delegation is still convinced that the resolution is inappropriate. For, despite the improvement effected by the Indian amend-

ment, the interpretation it would almost certainly be given would not be such as to promote the flow of investment capital essential to the economic development of the under-developed countries. The Belgian delegation considers that, at a time when every effort should be made to stimulate the investment of capital in less developed nations, it is not advisable to pass a resolution which can slow down or stop the flow of the capital required for the equipment or development of industrial or agricultural undertakings.

180. On the other hand, the Belgian delegation did not vote against the resolution, because a negative vote might have been interpreted as meaning that Belgium opposed the right of every nation, in the exercise of its sovereignty, to use its natural resources as it deemed fit. Specifically, Belgium did not want to give the erroneous impression that it would contest the right of any country to nationalize enterprises in its territory if such nationalization were carried out on equitable terms and accompanied by the payment of fair compensation.

181. In the light of those two considerations, the Belgian delegation was of course obliged to abstain in the vote on the resolution.

182. Mr. JOHNSON (Canada): I wish to explain very briefly the reasons why the Canadian delegation abstained on the vote on the draft resolution on the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources.

183. When this draft resolution was introduced in its original form, the Canadian delegation took the view, to which it still adheres, that the problem was primarily legal and not economic and that the only fruitful or, indeed, proper approach for the United Nations was from the legal point of view. If it is the considered opinion of the United Nations that it is desirable or necessary to develop an international code of law which should govern the terms and conditions of international private investments, there are organs of the United Nations—for example, the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly and the International Law Commission—through which this problem could be expertly explored and clarified.

184. The resolution as adopted is, on the face of it, a general and innocuous statement with which it is difficult to disagree, but in the light of the debates which took place in the Committee and of the tendentious attacks made upon individual Member States, it is impossible to ignore the adverse effects which it may have on what is known as the "climate of investment". We welcomed the amendment which was proposed by the delegation of India in an effort to remove these misgivings, and we voted in favour of it. Nevertheless, even though the amendment was adopted, my delegation feels that the resolution is still somewhat one-sided and continues to carry some regrettable implications arising from the debate which took place in committee. As my delegation explained in committee, we are neither for nor against government ownership of natural resources as a general principle. We have, therefore, not voted against this resolution, but, for the reasons I have explained, we abstained.

185. Mr. DE SEYNES (France) (*translated from French*): The French delegation was unable to vote for the draft resolution on the right of peoples to exploit their natural resources and wealth. I believe it is un-

necessary to say that the principles affirmed by the text are in no way at issue. But the enunciation of principles, however self-evident they may be and even though nobody thinks of challenging them, raises certain problems in our work that the resolution just adopted does not, in my government's view, dispose of satisfactorily.

186. The enunciation of the right of peoples to exploit freely their natural resources has already been broached in the Commission on Human Rights¹ and is shortly to be taken up in the Economic and Social Council, in does not, in my Government's view, dispose of satisfaction with what had hitherto been regarded as the normal practice for dealing with problems of that nature. The French delegation does not see how the affirmation of a right can be divorced from its legal content, or consequently, how it can be withdrawn from the consideration of the organs competent to deal with legal questions. If the problem is to be dealt with, a discussion of economic questions is not the proper context for affirming a right; rather, the object of such a discussion should be to devise ways and means of promoting each country's development, to consider the conditions and circumstances which would influence the choice between a number of alternative solutions for the exploitation of basic resources.

187. If a draft covenant on economic rights were not being studied in the United Nations at the present time—a draft which specifically lays down the right in question—there might conceivably have been sufficient grounds for singling out this right from among all other economic rights and making it the subject of a separate resolution. Even so, it seems, such a resolution should have been considered in a legal context by a body qualified to deal with legal questions, rather than in the Second Committee in the context of economic matters. If it was desired at all cost to debate the question in an economic setting, the more specifically economic aspects, to which the United States amendments related, should not have been excluded from the debate.

188. Like other delegations, we willingly concede that the Indian amendment improved the text, but that amendment was not to our mind enough in itself to restore a balance that was precarious from the outset.

189. The arguments on the grounds of urgency, that the established procedure could not take its normal course and that accordingly our somewhat formalistic misgivings should be set aside, force us to the conclusion that we are being asked to take part in a discussion of certain disputes which are not before the Assembly and on which it is not called upon to express a judgment. The discussion that took place in the Second Committee and in the General Assembly itself has been such as to lend colour to that presumption.

190. Even assuming it possible to remove all those objections, we still could not escape certain afterthoughts concerning the text we were being invited to approve. Since the matter to which it relates is the economic development of under-developed countries, the interests of those countries should be the chief concern. Some pin their hopes on nationalization, and they have said that the backing of the General Assembly was likely to help them. Others give more prominence in

¹ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fourteenth Session, Supplement No. 4.*

their plans to private investment, and they have expressed fears that such a text may increase the hesitation of foreign capital. Hence, we could not aid one side without doing the other an ill turn.

191. These few rather heterogeneous reflections all lead to the same conclusion: that a good principle does not necessarily produce a good resolution. The French delegation, being unable to vote either against a good principle or for a resolution that it regards as defective and untimely, preferred to abstain. At the same time, it voted for the Indian amendment which it felt improved the text, though not enough to remove all the objections we had raised.

192. Mr. JOOSTE (Union of South Africa): I am intervening to explain the reasons which caused my delegation to vote against the draft resolution on the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources.

193. We cannot but look with sympathy on efforts in all countries to achieve the greatest measure of economic development and the improvement of standards of living. What I have to say, therefore, should not be construed as reflecting in any way on the aims and motives of those who were responsible for the proposal. However, when the delegation of Uruguay in the Second Committee presented its original draft resolution, the South African delegation was concerned because it recognized the possibility of serious implications and consequences of a debate on this highly controversial and complex matter. We felt, for instance, that a discussion of this matter in this form, where there are so many conflicting views and interests, could seriously disturb the system upon which the interdependence and the national economies of so many of our countries rest.

194. Unfortunately, as the General Assembly is aware, these fears were soon substantiated. Whether or not owing to an incorrect interpretation of the proposal, financial circles soon gave expression to their apprehensions as to the possible effects which this proposal could have on the free flow of capital to countries whose economic development depended, among other things, on their own individual ability to attract foreign private investments.

195. As is known, the South African delegation stated this concern in the Committee, and pointed out that it would not be able to associate itself with this proposal, first, because we were not convinced that the United Nations could take any decision on this subject; secondly, because we felt that the proposal unwittingly cast doubt on the inherent sovereign rights of States; thirdly, because we believed that it would be unwise to express any opinion, even by implication, on the advantages or disadvantages of centralized development as against private enterprise, and that a recommendation on such a matter would, in our view, be tantamount to an invasion of the domestic policies of States; fourthly, because we were opposed to anything which might be interpreted as an attempt to circumscribe the rights and indeed, the duty of a State to protect the interests and security of its citizens; and, finally, because we believed that it would be most unfortunate if this Organization did anything which might in any way be construed as detracting from international obligations freely undertaken.

196. It is true that the wording of the draft resolution which was finally approved by the Committee, and now

amended, does not bear a close resemblance to the original draft. Yet we could not ignore the interpretation given by public opinion and the Press, both as to what it contains and especially as to what it omits, in the light of some of the statements made in the Committee.

197. May I conclude by stating that South Africa, like many other countries, has with care and patience developed an economy based on principles designed to meet its own requirements. We have developed financial relations abroad which are based on a full knowledge of, and confidence in, our economic practices. These relations have been strengthened because of the fact that they have been mutually beneficial. We cannot therefore participate in any action which, whether due to misunderstanding or otherwise, might damage the confidence of private investors in the economic policies of my country.

198. In the light of these circumstances, the South African delegation abstained on the amendment which was introduced by the delegation of India. We did so because, while its acceptance improved the draft resolution, it could not render the draft completely acceptable to us. We voted against the draft resolution as amended.

199. Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand): The debate in committee leading to the adoption of the resolution on the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources demonstrated the intense concern of a number of delegations with the question at issue. It is with full recognition of that fact that I desire to explain why my delegation is opposed to that resolution—and I am bound to say, while paying full respect to those who supported it, that the resolution in its present form seems to be precisely that kind of diffusion of its energies which can only weaken this Organization.

200. May I recall that the Committee first discussed a draft resolution whose apparent purpose was to affirm the right of a State to nationalize its wealth and resources. May I also recall that this national prerogative was never challenged in the course of the debate. On the contrary, it was affirmed as an essential attribute of sovereignty by many members. Why, then, this resolution? The right of nationalization was attested by the recital of resources, industries and utilities nationalized without prior international sanction.

201. Some delegations, including my own, doubted not only the necessity, but equally the wisdom, of adopting any resolution on this subject. We could not see then, and we still do not see, how such a resolution as this can be productive of practical results. We expressed the fear that such a resolution, irrespective of its terms, would be misunderstood—that it would be interpreted to cast doubt on the readiness of underdeveloped countries to provide the proper conditions for attracting financial assistance from outside their boundaries.

202. That fear, we think, was well founded, and we say with great respect that it has not been removed by the amendment introduced by the delegation of India. Certainly, the course of the debate in committee and, to some extent, the course of the debate here, has done nothing to allay our apprehensions. The Committee did not concern itself primarily with the simple affirmation of a sovereign national right. The point at issue became one of relations between States when a Member decided

to nationalize resources to which foreign enterprises had contributed capital or skills. When it was proposed to pass judgment on the circumstances in which a State might deal with foreign interests, the least we expected was that the draft resolution would spell out the rights of the other party. This was not done.

203. Two facts stand out from committee discussions. During the course of the debate a revised text was submitted by the sponsors. That text contained not one word of recognition of the interests of those who had contributed capital and were being urged to contribute more capital for economic development. Further, a majority rejected amendments proposed by the delegation of the United States which would have detailed the responsibilities—properly, in our judgment—resting on States nationalizing foreign enterprises.

204. These facts cannot be overlooked when we examine the operative provisions of the resolution on which we have voted. Those provisions were proposed at a late stage by the delegation of India. I recognize the considerations which prompted the search for a text which might command wide support, and I welcome the reference to maintaining the flow of capital in conditions of security. I recognize also that this text concedes a mention of the responsibilities of those undertaking their own development programmes. But in my opinion, what is proposed does not meet the full requirements of the case. The only recommendation directed to States nationalizing foreign enterprises is that they should have due regard, consistently with their sovereignty, to maintaining the flow of capital in conditions of security, to mutual confidence and economic co-operation among nations. It is the opinion of my delegation that this general admonition is not enough, but that more specific provisions should have been included.

205. Amendments to this end were introduced in the Committee. It was proposed that States should refrain from action contrary to the principles of international law and practice and to the provisions of international agreements. It was proposed to recommend that "countries deciding to develop their natural wealth and resources should refrain from taking action, contrary to the applicable principles of international law and practice and to the provisions of international agreements, against the rights of interests of nationals of other Member States in the enterprise, skills, capital, arts or technology which they have supplied". Surely a reasonable suggestion.

206. These amendments were rejected. They seemed to my delegation to state elementary principles of international relations to which all should be ready to agree. Their rejection cannot fail to cast a doubt on the expression of regard for confidence and co-operation in the resolution before the Assembly—and that is a serious conclusion.

207. My Government sympathizes with the desire of the less developed countries to protect their political and economic independence. We share with others a real concern for the social and economic progress of all peoples and welcome the steps which less developed countries are taking to develop their own economies. My Government indeed, in many ways, has given tangible evidence of its sympathy for independence and of its concern for progress. We believe, however, that international co-operation is an essential element in the

achievement of these goals and that such co-operation must be based on a proper respect for the rights of others. This resolution, in our opinion, misjudges the temper of the times. It misjudges the opinion of a considerable area of the world and will not promote, but will rather impede, the process of co-operation and the attainment of our common objectives.

208. My delegation has always felt that the exercise in which the Committee was engaged on this question of nationalization was futile in conception and likely to be objectionable in product. The objections we feel with regard to the resolution are not based primarily on what it says; we are more concerned with what it does not say and with what some representatives have said here tonight. We therefore voted against the resolution.

209. Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): I wish to explain very briefly the vote of the Australian delegation on the draft resolution concerning the right freely to exploit natural wealth and resources.

210. Representatives will recall that, in the Committee, Australia, together with the Philippines, spoke in favour of a Danish draft resolution recommending that the debate on this question of the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources should be adjourned and that no resolution at all should be adopted. In the opinion of my delegation, it was neither desirable nor timely to have a General Assembly resolution on this subject.

211. This resolution, on the face of it, appeared to present no particular difficulties. However, the vote on the draft in committee showed that there were real difficulties in it. The United States, the greatest capital-exporting country in the world, voted against it. Other capital-exporting countries abstained. My own country, which is anxious to continue to attract capital, also abstained. Furthermore, I believe that some of the countries which voted for this resolution did so with no great enthusiasm.

212. In the first place, the debate which accompanied the draft resolution was highly political in character. In important respects this debate was a backwash of current issues arising out of certain acts of nationalization in Member States. It was clear from the committee proceedings that the countries carrying out nationalization measures felt that this resolution might be an expression of United Nations opinion favourable to them. As my delegation stated in committee, these countries were seeking to have the United Nations take sides. This is the first difficulty in this resolution; namely, that it is difficult to appraise and evaluate its merits in view of these political overtones.

213. Secondly, there is the fact that a series of amendments proposed by the United States were rejected and found no place in the resolution. These amendments were designed to balance the resolution by giving expression to the principle that the rights of foreign investors and foreign interests generally should be safeguarded. It seems to my delegation that any resolution on this broad question of the control of natural wealth should be complete and should accommodate all such reasonable viewpoints.

214. Our third objection to the resolution is that it consists of broad generalities without practical significance. We think it unfortunate that a Main Committee of the Assembly should have spent a whole week in

such a fruitless exercise as the drafting and approving of this resolution.

215. At the present time Australia is attracting considerable foreign investments. Australia could not be a party to any action by the United Nations which might be harmful to the flow of capital. In our judgment the terms of the resolution are so general and innocuous as to have no practical significance. Accordingly, my delegation abstained from voting on this resolution.

216. Mr. HALIQ (Saudi Arabia): In voting the draft resolution on the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources, as amended by the delegation of India, we voted for certain reasonable recommendations asking governments to refrain from employing certain important measures which are detrimental to international co-operation in the economic field. We recommended to governments that they should give due regard to the need for the maintenance of mutual confidence and economic co-operation among nations, bearing in mind the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. We asked governments also to refrain from acts, direct or indirect, destined to impede free exploitation by a State of its natural wealth and resources. We voted for nothing else.

217. There is nothing frightening to private investment in this resolution. I think the second Indian amendment, which was incorporated today in the body of the resolution, greatly helped to alleviate the apprehensions expressed—perhaps unjustly—by some business and investment circles. I think the Indian amendment was an amicable gesture of goodwill consistent with the sovereignty of the State when it co-operates with private foreign capital.

218. Reference was made by previous speakers on this resolution to its effect on private capital, in that it would tend to discourage private foreign investment from flowing into the under-developed areas. Foreign investment, like all investment, is but a part of the process of the economic development of the under-developed areas, and development can neither be foreseen nor enforced by any single will. It is but the process of evolving patterns of activity, unfolding in one direction, disappearing in another, as obstacles are either removed or cannot be surmounted and as beliefs, aptitudes and hopes change. It consists in bringing into being new, socially acceptable patterns of co-operative behaviour. To regard it merely in terms of conflict of social or political will is to apply to it a category of thought in which it cannot be adequately expressed.

219. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (*translated from Spanish*): The delegation of El Salvador did not intend to speak after the vote as it considered that the brilliant statements made by the four Latin American delegations—Costa Rica, Colombia, Bolivia and Uruguay—in explaining their votes were perfectly clear. However, as the representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States and a number of others, in explaining their votes, again mentioned the view that the draft resolution on the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources, which we have approved, can be considered dangerous or, at best, superfluous, my delegation, which voted in favour of the Indian amendment [A/L.143] submitted today and in favour of the draft resolution as a whole, wishes to offer some explanation of its reasons for so doing.

220. In our view the draft resolution, as amended by the Indian amendment, cannot be considered either dangerous or superfluous.

221. If we examine the two paragraphs of the operative part we see that there is no question of granting a right, which already unquestionably exists for all States—the right to nationalize or expropriate private property—but rather that the resolution refers to this unquestionable right and in so doing, for purely economic reasons, draws the attention of States which may at a given time consider the expropriation of certain natural resources necessary for their economic development, to the necessity of performing the expropriation with due regard for their own economic advantage and respect for the rights which others may possess in the property to be nationalized.

222. Paragraph 1 of the operative part reads:

“Recommends all Member States, in the exercise of their right freely to use and exploit their natural wealth and resources wherever deemed desirable by them for their own progress and economic development, to have due regard”—this is a recommendation, an appeal to those States—“consistently with their sovereignty, to the need for”—and here comes today’s amendment by India—“maintaining the flow of capital in conditions of security, mutual confidence and economic co-operation among nations.”

Far from deterring foreign capital investments, this means, on the contrary, that foreign capital will be attracted, because the United Nations recommends that expropriation, when it is considered necessary, should be carried out in a manner compatible with mutual confidence and economic co-operation between the nations and, of course, in such a way as to maintain the flow of capital in conditions of security.

223. Paragraph 2 of the operative part of the resolution “recommends all Member States to refrain from acts, direct or indirect, designed to impede the exercise of the sovereignty of any State over its natural resources”. That is only a restatement of the principle of non-intervention by one State in the domestic affairs of another, a principle for which the Latin American States fought for a long time and which they succeeded in incorporating in international documents that all Latin American States are committed to observe; it is a principle which not only the Latin American States, but all States throughout the world, especially the small ones, are especially eager to uphold.

224. I should also like briefly to state our understanding of the resolution which is the same as that explained so brilliantly by the Latin American delegations; if it had been otherwise we should not have voted in favour of it or of the Indian amendment to it. We took it to mean that when expropriation takes place it should be accompanied by the payment of compensation to the national or foreign undertaking which owned the property that is nationalized. Our understanding could not have been other, because our Constitution states: “No person may be deprived of his property except for the purposes of a lawfully proved public or social interest, subject to fair compensation payable in advance. In cases of war, public calamity, or for the building of new highways or housing, and the supply of water or electric power, the compensation may be paid after expropriation.” The Constitution

also states: "Confiscation, whether as a penalty or for any other reason, is prohibited. If any authority violates this provision that authority shall be liable at all times in his person and property for the damage caused; the period of limitation shall not apply with respect to the property confiscated."

225. I repeat that my delegation could not have betrayed those express provisions of our Constitution and that we gave our support to the resolution on the understanding that it did not offer any loop-hole for the requirement of fair compensation payable to concerns whose property becomes public property.

226. I am in full agreement with the words of the distinguished Colombian representative when he said that if the Press, in speaking of this matter, had confined itself to publishing the plain text of the resolution without adding ambiguous or mischievous comment, this strange idea that the United Nations was trying to endorse the confiscation of the property of foreign undertakings without any compensation would certainly never have arisen.

227. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution entitled "Activities of regional economic commissions and economic development of under-developed countries".

The draft resolution was adopted by 52 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

228. Mr. ARKADYEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The statements made in the Second Committee by representatives of the under-developed countries bore witness to the unsatisfactory and constantly deteriorating economic situation in those countries. That fact was referred to by the representatives of a number of countries, including Uruguay, Bolivia, Argentina, Costa Rica, Indonesia and Egypt. They pointed out that in the world capitalist market the under-developed countries were finding it increasingly difficult to dispose of their products and, because of the armaments race in the United States and the other States of the North Atlantic bloc, were unable to obtain the equipment which they needed. The militarization of the economies of those countries not only does not improve the economic situation of the under-developed countries but has still further contributed to its progressive deterioration. The militarization of the economies of the countries of the North Atlantic bloc, and United States pressure, is leading to an increase in the military appropriations even of the under-developed countries, at the expense of their already limited resources.

229. The assistance which the United States claims to give in reality causes a deterioration in the position of the under-developed countries, since it is accompanied by the imposition on those countries of conditions which place them under the economic, political and even military control of the United States.

230. The Soviet Union delegation abstained from voting on the draft resolution on the expanded programme of technical assistance for the economic development of under-developed countries, because this so-called expanded technical assistance is a link in what is known as President Truman's Point Four programme, and is in no way designed to promote the development of under-developed countries. It is bound up with so-

called military assistance, and comprises a system of measures whose purpose is the subjection of the economies of the under-developed countries to United States control and the use of their territories for the establishment of military bases and military springboards, in fulfilment of the aggressive plans of the United States.

231. The second group of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly relates to the financing of the economic development of under-developed countries. The question of the development of domestic sources of financing in under-developed countries has not received satisfactory attention in the Economic and Social Council. It should also be noted that the unfavourable relation between the prices of the raw materials and products of the under-developed countries and the high monopoly prices of the industrial products of the advanced capitalist countries limits the financial resources available to the under-developed countries for the expansion of their economies. In addition, the militarization of the under-developed countries absorbs a substantial proportion of their resources, which could otherwise be invested in civilian production. An exaggerated idea exists of the peculiarly beneficial role of foreign capital in the under-developed countries. But the foreign capital which flows into the under-developed countries does not promote the development of an independent national economy and industry in those countries; the investors concerned are merely pursuing their own selfish ends of extracting the maximum profits without regard for the needs of the national economies of the under-developed countries. The credits granted to certain under-developed countries by banks under United States control are being used mainly to expand the production of strategic raw materials, such as uranium, not for the effective economic development of those countries. The USSR delegation is not inclined to overestimate the potentialities of either the special fund or the international finance corporation, which are to be established under the resolutions just adopted by the General Assembly. It is a foregone conclusion that these credit institutions, if established, will operate under the aegis and control of United States financial institutions such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and will therefore not bring about the desired improvement in the financing of the under-developed countries. For these reasons the Soviet Union delegation abstained from voting on those resolutions.

232. The USSR delegation studied the draft resolution on "Financing of economic development through the establishment of fair and equitable international prices . . .", originally submitted by the delegation of Argentina, with particular interest and attention. Both in committee and in the General Assembly, it voted for sub-paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) of the third paragraph of the preamble and for paragraphs 1, 3 and 4 of the operative part, but abstained on the remaining paragraphs and on the draft resolution as a whole. We support those proposals of Argentina and other under-developed countries contained in that resolution which are designed to promote the development of a national and independent economy and of civilian industry in the under-developed countries.

233. The Soviet Union delegation abstained from voting on the draft resolution on migration and economic development, considering that the views put forward

in that resolution did not reveal the true causes of unemployment, under-employment, poverty and under-consumption in the capitalist countries and, in particular, in the under-developed countries. The resolution is based on the erroneous theory that these phenomena are due, not to the social conditions prevailing in those countries, but to over- or under-population.

234. The USSR delegation supported draft resolution B on land reform, submitted in the Second Committee by Egypt, India and Indonesia. It believes that this resolution will help to accelerate land reform in the under-developed and other countries where such reform has become a matter of urgency. It considers, however, that sub-paragraph (a) of the third paragraph of the preamble is incorrect and unacceptable, since it puts forward the theory that the shortage of world food resources is due to the growth of the population. It also finds unacceptable the similarly Malthusian theory contained in the second paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution on the increase of food production approved by the Second Committee on the proposal of the Ecuadoran delegation, which will be considered by the Assembly at a later stage. USSR representatives have always pointed out that statements such as those contained in the paragraphs I have mentioned are based on Malthusian theories. As we know, the Malthusians and neo-Malthusians seek to conceal the true causes of the food shortage in certain areas and countries of the world, namely, the monstrous social and economic conditions in the capitalist countries and the policy of the colonial Powers, which are hampering the proper development of the productive forces of the under-developed countries, particularly in agriculture and the production of foodstuffs. By perpetuating the one-sidedness and backwardness of the economies of the under-developed countries, this policy hampers the all-round development of their economies, the use of the latest and most advanced agricultural techniques and the execution of hydraulic engineering and development works which would ensure that food was always available in excess of the population's requirements.

235. My country, the Soviet Union, has already shown in practice that, given a highly organized agriculture whose development is based on advanced techniques and on great irrigation works, development and other works, carried out on a national scale and designed to increase agricultural production and productivity, the volume of agricultural production expands at a rate which far outstrips the largest population increase ever recorded in my country. Thus, the cause of the food shortage in many countries of the capitalist world is not the increase in population, but the monstrous social and economic conditions and situation of the under-developed countries, which hamper economic development in general and progress in agriculture and food production in particular. For these reasons, the USSR delegation voted against sub-paragraph (a) in the third paragraph of the preamble of resolution B on land reform. We voted for the draft resolution on the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources, submitted in the Second Committee by Uruguay and Bolivia, because this resolution is concerned with the right of peoples, in particular of the under-developed countries, freely to use and exploit their natural wealth and resources, and because it provides that all Member States shall "refrain from acts, direct or indirect, de-

signed to impede the exercise of the sovereignty of any State over its natural resources". The history of the under-developed countries shows many examples of the exploitation of natural wealth by the colonial Powers and by foreign capital, with the result that even countries rich in natural resources have been and still are in a state of poverty and want, while their resources serve to enrich foreign monopolies. The Soviet Union opposes, as it has always opposed, the maintenance of such conditions in the under-developed countries. It considers that the natural resources and riches of every country should be used for the benefit of its people. It therefore voted for this draft resolution.

236. The PRESIDENT: Before proceeding to the next item on the agenda, I wish to state that I have been informed that the delegation of Uruguay feels that, in the course of this debate and the explanations of votes, an observation has been made which reflected unfairly on its motives in introducing a draft resolution which has been adopted as the resolution on the right to exploit freely natural wealth and resources. I did not myself hear any such observation, but if one has been made in the course of a statement by anyone, I am sure that it must have been done by inadvertence because the motives of the Uruguayan delegation in introducing this or any other draft resolution are above reproach. On this, as on previous occasions, its motives and its actions have deserved only our highest respect. I hope that the Uruguayan delegation will accept that assurance from the Chair.

Report of the Economic and Social Council (chapters II, III and VI (section I)): report of the Second Committee (A/2350)

[Agenda item 11]

237. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution contained in the report (A/2350).

The draft resolution was adopted by 50 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.

Request for the inclusion of an additional item in the agenda of the seventh session: report of the General Committee (A/2356)

[Agenda item 7]

238. The PRESIDENT: There is before the General Assembly the report of the General Committee (A/2356) on the inclusion in the agenda of the item, "Complaint of the mass murders of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war by United States armed forces on the island of Pongam". This afternoon [410th meeting], the General Assembly agreed to take up this item as the fourteenth item of its agenda.

239. As representatives probably know, the General Committee met today at 2 p.m., at the request of the delegation of the Soviet Union, in order to consider the request of that delegation for the inclusion of this item in the agenda. As will be observed from the report of the General Committee, it was decided to recommend to the General Assembly the inclusion of this item and, because of the request of the Soviet Union, its consideration without delay, before the suspension of the work of the current session of the General Assembly.

240. I have been informed of the desire of many delegations to complete this part of our session at the earliest possible time. Therefore I should like to suggest that, if there is no objection to the inclusion of the item in the agenda, we might expedite our work and save time by proceeding immediately to its consideration.

241. As there is no objection to the procedure which I have recommended, I consider the item accepted by the General Assembly for inclusion in its agenda, and we shall proceed immediately to its consideration.

Complaint of the mass murder of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war by United States armed forces on the island of Pongam

[Agenda item 76]

242. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): As is known, the USSR delegation yesterday addressed a letter [A/2355] to Mr. Pearson, the President of the General Assembly, on the need to include in the agenda of the seventh session of the General Assembly the urgent and important question of "the mass murder of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war by United States armed forces on the island of Pongam". In view of its nature and of its international implications, the item submitted by the USSR delegation is an urgent and important one which calls for immediate consideration before the suspension of the work of the current session of the General Assembly.

243. The motives which prompted the Soviet Union to raise this question before the General Assembly are the new crimes committed by the United States military authorities against Koreans and Chinese in the prisoner-of-war camp on the island of Pongam. It is now widely known, particularly from the reports of the Associated Press and Reuters, that, on 14 December 1952, United States military authorities perpetrated new and unheard-of brutalities against Korean and Chinese prisoners of war on the said island of Pongam. The American guards of the prisoner-of-war camp on that island killed 82 and wounded 120 Korean and Chinese prisoners of war. According to the latest information, two of the wounded have already died. This bloody and brutal deed was perpetrated against prisoners who were demanding repatriation. It is an act of butchery and savagery which has eclipsed all the previous crimes committed by the United States executioners against prisoners of war, particularly on Koje Island. The representative of the United States military command in Korea was obliged to admit, as has been reported in the Press, that the incident in the camp at Pongam was the most serious and the most disastrous in its consequences of any that had ever taken place in an Allied prisoner-of-war camp.

244. The brutalities committed on the island of Pongam by the American soldiery, which has embarked on a policy of lawless bloodshed, and the savage treatment of prisoners of war on Koje Island, Cheju Island and at Pusan, to which the USSR delegation drew the attention of the General Assembly during the discussion of the Korean question, take on the character of a policy of systematic extermination of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war in American camps by the United States military command in Korea. Representatives of

the United States military command do not deny the facts concerning this new and bloody incident, these new crimes of the aggressors. Thus the correspondent of the Associated Press reports from Pusan that after the so-called investigation of the murder of 82 and the wounding of 120 prisoners of war, Colonel Caldwell of the United States Army commended Colonel Miller, the commandant of the camps on Pongam Island, for his resolute action. The American soldiery which committed this new crime has undoubtedly surpassed the Hitlerite criminals in cruelty and sadism.

245. This bloody act of repression against Korean and Chinese prisoners of war was perpetrated because the prisoners asked to be repatriated and because they did not wish to be subjected, as prisoners in American hands, to the violence and terror inflicted on them by the United States military authorities in Korea in order to force them to betray their countries and place themselves at the mercy of the American executioners. Even the fragmentary information published in the world Press, including the American Press, which describes the bloody incidents in the camps on Pongam Island, shows that the American interventionists in Korea dealt their terroristic blow against the prisoners of war only because those heroic sons of the Korean and Chinese peoples refused to betray their countries and peoples, to dishonour themselves as soldiers, or to fail in their patriotic duty. The courage and tenacity of these Korean and Chinese patriots are proved by the fact that, dying at the hands of the American murderers in Pongam, they sang their national patriotic songs, which further infuriated the organizers and perpetrators of this mass murder.

246. These new bloody crimes committed by the United States military authorities in Korea show that the ruling circles of the United States continue shamelessly to ignore the most elementary principles of international usage and law, in their criminal treatment of both the civilian population and prisoners of war. At the same time, they continue to ignore the elementary principles of relations between States. If any new facts were needed to reveal the aggressive plans of the ruling circles of the United States in Korea, they are furnished by these latest crimes of the American executioners.

247. Mr. Jessup, the United States representative in the General Committee, stated today [85th meeting] when the USSR proposal was discussed, that the camp on Pongam Island, where the United States military authorities committed this brutal act of repression against Korean and Chinese prisoners of war, houses civilians, not prisoners of war. But even if that were so, is it possible to find any justification, or any shadow of a justification, for this mass murder of the persons confined in the camp? The statement that it was civilians who were involved is in fact inaccurate. That assertion is refuted by none other than American correspondents. The correspondent of the Associated Press states in his report from Pusan that the persons confined in the camp on Pongam Island were classified as military personnel at the time of their capture. According to him, these prisoners of war declared during their interrogation that they wished to return under communist control when an agreement was eventually reached on the exchange of prisoners. The United Nations Command subsequently reclassified these prisoners of war as civilians.

248. What value, then, can be placed on the assertions of representatives of the United States Government, particularly assertions made in the United Nations General Assembly, that the repatriation of prisoners of war is being hindered by the refusal of many of those prisoners to return to their countries? At this point no one who does not deliberately close his eyes to facts can fail to see that such assertions by United States representatives to the effect that prisoners of war do not want to be repatriated are false. Those representatives are deceiving their own American people and world public opinion, in an attempt to conceal the real aggressive aims of the Wall Street bosses who have unleashed the war of aggression against the Korean people.

249. This policy of the ruling circles of the United States and the crimes of the American soldiery in Korea, especially the brutal and unprecedented crimes against prisoners of war on Pongam Island, cannot be concealed behind any of the hypocritical statements made by representatives of the United States Government, just as they cannot be concealed behind such hypocritical resolutions as the one recently adopted as the result of the discussion of the Korean question in the General Assembly [*resolution 610 (VII)*].

250. It is well known that the United States military authorities in Korea have committed crimes against Korean and Chinese prisoners of war before: the USSR delegation frequently drew the attention of the General Assembly to that fact during the discussion of the Korean question. It drew attention to the bloody acts of repression against prisoners of war in the camps on Koje Island, Cheju Island and at Pusan, and adduced the relevant facts, which completely refuted the assertions of representatives of the United States Government that that government's policy towards prisoners of war was based on the principles of humanity, freedom of the human person and so forth. None of these facts was refuted. They were confirmed by the reports of American and British news agencies, by the admissions of former commandants of prisoner-of-war camps—Brigadier Generals Colson and Dodd—by the statements of Korean and Chinese prisoners who were fortunate enough to escape from these death camps and also by the report, dated April 1952, of the International Committee of the Red Cross, which certainly cannot be suspected of any sympathy with the People's Democratic Republic of Korea or the People's Republic of China. They were also confirmed in the reports of the Canadian war correspondent, Mr. Stevenson, who visited those camps; the reports were published in the *Star Weekly* and have been deliberately ignored by the United States representatives and other troubadours of United States foreign policy.

251. The notorious and bloody incidents in the camp on Koje Island are characteristic of the situation prevailing in American prisoner-of-war camps. The aforementioned report of the International Committee of the Red Cross contains a communication from its representatives which, according to the report, is a first-hand account. The passage reads as follows:

"At about 4 a.m. on 18 February, approximately one regiment of fully-armed troops entered the compound without any warning. Nearly all the prisoners were asleep, with the exception of some who were put under guard in a tent. The troops surrounded the

other tents, including that of the prisoners' representative, who was unable to establish contact with the camp administration.

"The prisoners were forced at bayonet point to remain in their tents. If one or other of them, unaware of what was going on, tried to leave the tents, he was fired on. The prisoners were alarmed and, thinking that they would all be killed, ran out of the tents to defend themselves and to find out what was happening. The troops then opened fire on them.

"At daybreak, the prisoners' representative again tried to speak to the commander of the troops. He also tried in vain to control the prisoners. One of his comrades, the leader of the third battalion of the prisoners, who had helped him in his attempt to communicate with the commander, was killed by a shot . . . At that point, approximately 8 a.m., Colonel Fitzgerald appeared on the scene . . . In his presence, more shots were fired, while the prisoners were singing."

252. This report of the International Committee of the Red Cross was not circulated to the representatives to the seventh session of the General Assembly, despite repeated requests to that effect by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR, Mr. Vyshinsky, who emphasized the necessity of distributing it to delegations. It is probable that no one would have known about it, had it not been published in the April 1952 issue of the *Revue Internationale de la Croix Rouge*. Some prudent person is doggedly concealing this document from the delegations and from world public opinion.

253. An interesting Associated Press dispatch from Geneva, dated 16 December, stated that the International Red Cross Committee had that day made public a communication in which it said that the action of the United Nations Command in Korea showed that that command was violating the Geneva Convention on prisoners of war. Further on, the dispatch stated that, describing those incidents, the Committee had declared that it appeared, in the circumstances, that the firing constituted a violation of article 42 of the Geneva Convention of 1949.

254. May I remind representatives that article 42 says: "The use of weapons against prisoners of war, especially against those who are escaping or attempting to escape, shall constitute an extreme measure which shall always be preceded by warnings appropriate to the circumstances."

255. Nevertheless, a further butchery of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war subsequently occurred on Koje Island. General Colson, to whom I have already referred, admitted that even earlier cases of bloodshed had occurred in the camp when many prisoners of war had been killed and wounded by the aggressors. He stated that he would do everything in his power to put an end to force and bloodshed in the future. He assured the prisoners of war that in the future they could count on humane treatment in the camp, in accordance with the principles of international law.

256. This forced admission proves that in the prisoner-of-war camps the United States Command is resorting to the criminal practice of compulsory screening, accompanied by violence and murder, to suppress the just protests of the Korean and Chinese prisoners of war

against the violence to which they are subjected by the United States Military Command in Korea.

257. A document which by now is well known, entitled "Our life is in danger. Help us to get out of this American hell quickly", issued by the soldiers and officers of the People's Army on Koje Island, contains the following information:

"On 19 May 1952, it was announced in compound No. 66 that all prisoners who wished to return to North Korea should fall in at 7 p.m. near their barracks ready to embark. It was found that everyone without exception wished to be repatriated. When we fell into line, the American soldiers opened fire on us with machine guns and flame-throwers and attacked us with tanks. One hundred and twenty-seven of our comrades were killed and many others wounded."

However, that was not enough for these American military executioners. They decided to persevere in their criminal acts in order to crush the will and spirit of the true sons of the Korean and Chinese peoples who had been captured by the Americans. The document to which I have just referred says: "On 22 and 23 May, American guards carried out a bloody massacre in compounds Nos. 602 and 72. Eighty-eight of our comrades were killed by machine-gun fire and hand-grenades and 39 persons were wounded. On the same day, 18 more prisoners of war were killed in compound No. 16." This letter from Koje Island was signed by 6,223 prisoners of war.

258. Reports from the world Press, including the American Press, speaking of more shooting on Cheju Island, where 52 prisoners of war were killed and 113 wounded on 1 October by two American platoons which had come to carry out reprisals against the prisoners of war.

259. A little later, on 24 October, that is to say, during the present session of the General Assembly, the Associated Press reported that nine "Communist prisoners of war", to use the words of the report, had been wounded in compound No. 2B in the Pusan camp.

260. Brutalities against Korean and Chinese prisoners of war have been going on during the seventh session of the General Assembly and are continuing. According to the reports of American and British news agencies, between 14 October and 4 December 1952 alone, 321 Korean and Chinese prisoners of war were killed or wounded. These are the figures issued by United States sources in Korea. The true numbers of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war murdered by the American monsters may well be imagined.

261. In view of these crimes which the United States military command in Korea has systematically committed against the Chinese and Korean prisoners of war, it must be clear to everyone by now that the so-called voluntary repatriation, so hypocritically discussed by the American magnates and their servile followers, is in fact what has been going on on Koje and Pongam, that is to say, the use of force on prisoners of war to compel them to fight against their compatriots. The question of voluntary repatriation is being exploited to prevent a peaceful settlement of the Korean question. This must be clear to all except those who are blind or who are consciously distorting the facts and doing everything they can to justify the people who organize and carry out these unprecedented crimes, that is to say, the torture and massacre of defenceless Korean and Chinese prisoners of war in the American prisoner-of-war camps in Korea, which all decent human beings have rightly begun to call death camps.

262. As we know, the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea have repeatedly protested against the mass reprisals and brutalities inflicted on Chinese and Korean prisoners of war. Only today, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, Mr. Chou En-lai, sent the President of the General Assembly, Mr. Pearson, another strong protest [*A/2358 and Corr.1*] against the butchery of prisoners of war on Pongam Island. The General Assembly cannot ignore this. It may be well to recall that the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Chou En-lai, speaks for the People's Republic of China and, although its representatives are not at present seated in the General Assembly, they are, as you all know, invisibly present as the representatives of a great country and a great people who have taken their fate into their own hands.

263. The crimes of the United States military authorities in Korea are not fortuitous. They are the consequence of the Korean policy followed by the ruling circles of the United States, a policy which aims, as the discussion of the Korean question at the present session of the General Assembly has once again confirmed, at continuing the war of aggression against the Korean people and extending that aggression against Korea and China.

264. At the very outset of the discussion, the USSR delegation drew attention to the importance and urgency of the Korean question and to the fact that the Assembly must take practical steps to end the bloodshed and settle the issue in Korea. We drew attention to this in connexion with the consideration of the order in which items on the Assembly's agenda should be discussed, and we urged that the Polish proposals, providing for the immediate cessation of hostilities in Korea on land, sea and in the air, should be discussed by the First Committee at the very beginning of its work. As you know, our proposal was not adopted, owing to pressure by the United States Government. It is no accident that it was not adopted. In the course of the discussion on the Korean question arising out of the report of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea [*A/2187*], it became clear that the United States Government was once again adopting the firm policy of preventing the cessation of hostilities in Korea and continuing the Korean adventure.

265. This also became clear during the debate on the USSR proposal that representatives of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea should be invited to participate in the discussion of the Korean question. This proposal too was categorically opposed by the United States Government in the person of the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, although, under the pressure of the United States Government the First Committee invited agents of the puppet Syngman Rhee régime to participate in the discussion of the question [*511th meeting*]. The statements of those agents showed that not only were Syngman Rhee's supporters not trying to end the war in Korea but that, on the contrary, as they frankly stated, their aim was to continue the war and to seize North Korea. As long ago as that, the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, said that his Government was categorically opposed to the participation of representatives of the Government of the People's Democratic Republic

lic of Korea in the consideration of the Korean question. Nevertheless it should be clear to everyone that such participation would have been in the interests of the United Nations, as the question could have been considered more thoroughly and from various aspects, and a proper solution found. The true representatives of the Korean people could then, from the rostrum of the United Nations, have raised their voice in righteous indignation at the crimes which are daily and even hourly being committed by the interventionist armies on Korean soil against both the Korean civilian population and the Korean and Chinese prisoners of war who have fallen into the hands of the American military.

266. The position taken up by the United States Government, aimed at continuing the war in Korea, was even more clearly revealed when the question of repatriating prisoners of war was considered. The USSR delegation gave facts to prove that the ruling circles of the United States had no intention whatsoever of seeking a solution to this problem and that they were continuing their previous policy of forcibly detaining prisoners of war, although as we—and we are not the only ones—have already said, this policy is contrary to the most elementary and universally recognized principles of international law. The delegation of the USSR showed that that policy of the United States Government was in flagrant contradiction with the Geneva Convention of 1949, which provides for the repatriation of all prisoners of war. It is well known that this convention, like a number of other international documents, is an expression of lofty humanitarian principles hallowed by time, which all civilized humanity has recognized for centuries. The United States Government is blatantly defying these principles of international law and international legality by ignoring the moral and political obligations which it accepted in the Geneva Convention.

267. It is well known that the immediate repatriation of all prisoners of war after an armistice has been signed is one of the most fundamental and oldest rules of international law, which was reaffirmed in the Geneva convention on prisoners of war in 1949. The leaders of the United States, however, regard this international agreement—as, incidentally, they regard other international agreements which bear the signature of the United States—as a mere scrap of paper. The politicians at Washington have decided to detain the prisoners of war by force, and make a great deal of noise about what they call voluntary repatriation in order to mislead public opinion at home and abroad. All the talk about voluntary repatriation, forcible repatriation and non-forcible repatriation are only different versions of the same plan, namely, to detain the prisoners of war by force, a plan which is in flagrant contradiction with international law and the obligations solemnly assumed by the United States. It is a long time since the world has witnessed such hypocrisy. The same people on whose orders thousands of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war are being tortured and cruelly put to death in the torture chambers of Koje, Pusan, Cheju and other American death camps, pose here as the defenders of the prisoners of war. For example, Mr. Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States, and other United States representatives to the seventh session of the General Assembly, while talking about law, morality, and humani-

tarian principles, foist upon the General Assembly resolutions inspired by them for the sole purpose of sanctioning the illegal detention of tens of thousands of prisoners of war by the United States command.

268. The facts show that the trans-Atlantic preachers of humanitarian treatment of prisoners of war are grossly deceiving world public opinion. According to a dispatch of the Korean central Press agency published in May 1951—I think these facts should be mentioned, as it is perfectly possible that they may not be generally known—1,400 prisoners of war were secretly sent to the United States to be subjected to experiments with atomic weapons. The lists of these prisoners of war were destroyed. On 19 July 1951, 100 prisoners of war were shot by machine-gun fire in the prisoner-of-war camp Number 62, in order to give the machine-gunners training in shooting at moving targets. On 18 February 1952, another 300 prisoners were killed in the same camp in the same way. On 13 March and on 17 and 20 April, a total of 175 prisoners of war were brutally murdered. Documents confirm that on 10 May 1952, in camp No. 76, 4 prisoners who had stated their desire to return to their country were hanged. On 1 May, the hangmen gouged out the eyes of 18 prisoners. On 18 May, 13 fighters of the Korean People's Army in the camp were quartered. When the other prisoners in the camp started to protest, the guard officer picked from among them 50 men who on the same day were subjected to experiments in the use of new hand-grenades; 4 prisoners were killed on the spot, and the remaining 46 were wounded and died of injuries shortly after. Horrible brutalities were committed by the aggressors in camp No. 77 on 27 May 1952. The documents state that flame-throwers of a new type were tried out on a large group of prisoners of war who had demanded to be repatriated. Almost 800 prisoners were burned alive on that day. On 20 and 30 May, a total of 37 prisoners were killed, and 16 wounded in the same camp. Here are the facts cited by the Korean central Press agency and which so far have not been refuted.

269. I hear laughter from the United Kingdom delegation, which for some unknown reason has decided to laugh louder than the United States delegation. No one knows why.

270. During the discussion of the Korean question, and in particular, the question of the prisoners of war, the United States representatives distorted and juggled with the facts; they made all sorts of absurd statements in an attempt to show that the United States policy on this question was not contrary to international law and the afore-mentioned Geneva Convention. Yet the falseness and hypocrisy of such assertions on the part of the United States representatives and representatives of other States taking part in the aggressive war in Korea are only too obvious. The discussion has shown that all statements to the effect that the repatriation of all prisoners of war is impossible and that the Korean and Chinese prisoners of war do not wish to be repatriated, are designed merely to conceal the policy of violence and terror against Korean and Chinese patriots who express the legitimate desire to return to their country and an equally legitimate indignation at the atrocities committed by the American butchers in Korea. It was to this legitimate desire of the prisoners of war to be repatriated and to return to their

country that the United States military authorities in Korea responded by further mass killings of prisoners of war, this time on the island of Pongam.

271. There can be no doubt that the so-called Indian resolution, which was rubber-stamped by the General Assembly under pressure from the United States, suited the needs of certain United States circles which do not wish to put an end to the bloodshed in Korea which has already claimed hundreds of thousands of victims killed or wounded on both sides, to say nothing of the enormous human and material losses suffered by the Korean people as a result of the expansionist and aggressive war into which it had been forced. Nor can there be any doubt, to anyone who does not shut his eyes to the facts, that the United States soldiery is guilty of a heinous crime in Korea.

272. The USSR delegation has already pointed out that the Indian resolution was just what the ruling circles of the United States wanted, for they do not want to put an end to the bloodshed in Korea. Notwithstanding the attempts to prove the contrary, the fact remains that the resolution met the needs of those circles in all particulars; not only did it fail to contain anything that might lead to the immediate cessation of the bloodshed in Korea—thus being aimed from the start at the continuation of hostilities—but it also doomed to failure any attempt to achieve a settlement of the question of prisoners of war. Under the resolution, the whole question was reduced to this: the belligerents in Korea would exchange only those prisoners of war who “voluntarily” stated their desire to return to their country of origin, while the other prisoners of war would remain in the hands of a repatriation commission. Yet it is a known fact that the United Nations, which is one of the parties to the conflict, is to act as the arbiter on the repatriation commission. Needless to say, the request that the United Nations should act as an arbiter in the settlement of the question of prisoners of war is unprecedented, unjust and quite inadmissible. Thus the real purpose of the Indian resolution was not to achieve a cease-fire in Korea or a settlement of the question of the prisoners of war in conformity with the principles of international law, the Geneva Convention and the basic rules of international law. I must recall this fact to those who, wittingly or unwittingly, have tried to represent the resolution as providing a real basis for the settlement of the question of the prisoners of war.

273. It must now be clear to everyone, from the reply which has been received from the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and from the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, that the resolution could not provide a basis for the settlement of this question, as its sole purpose was to deceive world public opinion.

274. It is certainly no mere coincidence that the adoption of this resolution was immediately followed by the mass murders of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war on the island of Pongam.

275. If it has the slightest regard for its own authority, the General Assembly cannot shut its eyes to the crimes committed by the United States military authorities in Korea. It cannot tolerate such acts. Its duty is to put an end to the criminal activities of the American soldiery in Korea, which are aimed at the extermination

of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war. In the circumstances, it is absolutely essential for the General Assembly, as we have already pointed out, to consider at once, even before the present session is suspended, the item submitted by the USSR delegation concerning the mass murder of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war by the United States military authorities on the island of Pongam, and its draft resolution on the subject. It is the more essential for the General Assembly to take action on the mass murder of Chinese and Korean prisoners of war as the United States command commits these crimes under the cover of the United Nations flag. The USSR delegation submits the following draft resolution [A/2355] for the General Assembly's consideration:

“The General Assembly,

“Noting new evidence of inhuman brutalities perpetrated on 14 December 1952 against Korean and Chinese prisoners of war on the island of Pongam by the United States military authorities, that have resulted in the death of 82 and the wounding of 120 Korean and Chinese prisoners of war,

“Considering that such mass murders of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war in United States camps are characteristic of the systematic extermination of prisoners of war, as shown by the numerous atrocities committed by the United States military authorities against prisoners of war in the camps on the islands of Koje, Cheju and Pongam, in Pusan and other places.

“Condemns these criminal acts by the United States military authorities in Korea, who are trampling upon the elementary principles of humanity and universal ethics and grossly violating the generally accepted standards of international law in regard to prisoners of war, and

“Insists that the Government of the United States shall take immediate steps to end the brutalities committed by the United States military authorities against Korean and Chinese prisoners of war, and shall call those guilty of committing these crimes to strict account”.

276. We hope that the other delegations will support this draft resolution and that the General Assembly will have the strength to put an end to the atrocities of the United States military command in Korea, atrocities which, as we have already pointed out, take the form of systematic mass murder of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war who are in American camps in Korea. At the same time, the USSR delegation wishes to draw the General Assembly's attention to the fact that the States which for any reason do not summon up the necessary courage to support this proposal will assume a heavy responsibility in the matter.

277. Mr. GROSS (United States of America): In the remarks which I have to make, I should like to ask the Assembly to keep in mind three factors which seem to me to be relevant to the question which has been placed before the Assembly and the manner in which it has been put forward. The first is the time chosen by the Soviet Union delegation to raise the question; the second is its motives in doing so; and the third is the substance of the charges made here, not for the first time but repeatedly, *ad nauseam*, as

they have been, from the day when the item concerning Korea came up for discussion before the First Committee at this session.

278. On an unforgettable Sunday, 25 June 1950, the Security Council met and decided to repel aggression². Now, many Sunday nights later, the General Assembly meets to expose a hollow propaganda manoeuvre by the Soviet sponsor of that aggression. The world knows who is for peace in Korea and who is using every means to prevent peace. On 3 December [399th meeting], fifty-four nations declared their wish to see peace restored in Korea. The Soviet Union representative this evening reviles the dignity of this Assembly and says that the Indian draft resolution was rubber-stamped by the Assembly under United States pressure. The USSR Government and its satellites voted against peace, and that is the fact which they are seeking to conceal this evening.

279. Our patience is tried and our intelligence insulted by a shabby midnight propaganda stunt. Nevertheless, it is fitting that this Assembly should discuss the item that the Soviet Union representative has raised so hastily. My Government urged that the item should be included in the agenda, waiving the rules which could have been invoked to prevent its inclusion today. We believed that the item should be discussed before we finished our pre-Christmas work, and we took this position because we believe that the USSR accusations should be brought out of the dark corners of their origin and exposed to the white light of the truth.

280. I turn to facts. What was the background of the events on Pongam? Here are the facts. On Pongam Island, over 9,000 Koreans were interned. These were captured communist guerrillas operating in South Korea and other Communists rounded up for revolutionary activity behind the lines. They were not prisoners captured from enemy armies. There were no Chinese among them.

281. On 6 December 1952, the prisoner-of-war command reported indications that plans for a mass breakout were being formulated within the prisoner-of-war and internee camps of the Unified Command. As the Soviet Union representative brought out a few moments ago, this was just three days after the adoption by the Assembly of the Indian draft resolution calling for peace in Korea. As the Soviet Union representative said, there is a connexion between these facts. I believe the connexion will be clear to all those of us who are free to think for ourselves and realize that this was part of a conspiracy and a design which was undoubtedly related to the actions taken by the Assembly. Who the conspirators were, we shall now see.

282. Coded documents had been intercepted in several of the compounds. The code was broken by the authorities and the documents disclosed plans for a mass break. The code appeared to be common throughout the main camp and the branch camp areas, indicating that the plan was centrally directed. The date and time that these plans were to be operative was not known. An investigation was, of course, at once initiated. All camp commanders were acquainted with the situation and were directed to take every precaution to negate

any attempt by the internees to put such plans into effect.

283. Eight days after the first reports became available, the plot matured in the violence on Pongam—and the Assembly will note that this violence occurred on the same day that the Chinese communist authorities rejected the United Nations resolution. The Chinese communist authorities knew and selected the day on which they chose to send their rejection. And here, again, the connexion between the dispatch of that note and the events on the island of Pongam was surely not an accident or a coincidence.

284. Now, just what did happen on Pongam? At noon on 14 December, reports came to the commander of the camp that internees in two of the camp compounds were massing. It was evident that immediate action was necessary to prevent the rioters from breaking out of their compounds and inciting their fellows in the six other compounds to attempt similar action. The compound commander, with a small detachment of United States and Republic of Korea guards, had to act at once to prevent many hundreds of internees from breaking out of their compounds and inviting pitched battles. These facts are put before my colleagues in the Assembly on behalf of the Unified Command. They are not based upon news dispatches.

285. The camp commander at once dispatched platoons to the two compounds in which the internees had begun to mass. Into the first of the compounds, compound F, went 110 guards of the United Nations Command. Twenty of them were armed with shotguns. They deployed as skirmishers twenty-five yards away from the massed internees, who had drawn themselves up many ranks deep in military fashion. Behind the ranks of the internees were hundreds more, threatening, screaming and throwing rocks down upon the United Nations guards from a high ledge upon which they had taken positions. The camp commander ordered the rioters to quiet down and to disperse. When his order was disobeyed, he realized that only a show of force could restore order and prevent a mass outbreak of the rioters. The plans disclosed in the codes which had been intercepted and broken was in the process of being matured.

286. What show of force could be employed? The direction of the wind made the use of tear-gas impossible. A frontal approach by the few guards upon the many massed men was out of the question. But the rioting was skilfully organized, planned and directed, and it was necessary to fire volleys to quell the rioters in two compounds where the disturbances started. And, meanwhile, internees were massing in four of the other compounds, again obviously in pursuance of a prepared plan. A burst of fire was necessary in two of these compounds in order to prevent further outbreaks. Having quelled the riots in the first two compounds, the camp commander was able to send the guards into three other compounds and move the demonstrators out without having to use firearms. The dead and wounded were at once evacuated.

287. These are the facts as reported to the Unified Command by the commanding officer on the spot.

288. The use of force to repress inspired and centrally-directed outbreaks of fanatical violence by prisoners is, at times, unavoidable. That such unavoidable use of

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, No. 15.*

force should result in casualties is no evidence that force was not required. In normal course the Unified Command at once instituted an investigation of the incident on Pongam. This investigation, which is still under way, may well develop further facts about the origin of this latest in a series of ruthlessly executed plans to sacrifice human lives in order to create propaganda for cynical use on occasions such as this. And who has shown more vividly and with more sickening directness how such fabricated propaganda can be used? We also deplore the fanaticism, the suicidal frenzy which would have involved far greater casualties among both internees and guards of the United Nations Command alike if the measures I have described had not been swiftly and firmly adopted.

289. One may ask: what was the purpose of the outbreak on Pongam? I suggest to the Assembly that escape was not their only motive, that bloodshed was the real motive, the sacrifice of as many internees as possible and the deliberate fashioning of ammunition to provide an excuse for a false issue. For the fact is that, from the beginning of the consideration of the Korean question in the General Assembly, the consistent purpose of the Soviet Union Government and its delegation here has been to create the impression that prisoners of war all wish to be repatriated and are being held against their will. That has been the consistent purpose of the USSR representative from the first moment the matter was discussed by him at the commencement of this session. This explains why the Soviet Union representative has produced this propaganda item in the middle of the night. It is obviously a clumsy attempt to smear the United States and the United Nations at the last minute, in an effort to cover up the fact that the aggressors and their Soviet Union sponsors have rejected peace in Korea.

290. Does the USSR representative really think he fools anyone by this manoeuvre? The world will not forget that the Soviet Union Government and its satellites have rejected the fair and honourable proposal introduced by the Government of India for the settlement of the prisoner-of-war question, as set forth in the resolution of 3 December. The world will always remember the patience and perseverance with which the United Nations has sought peace in Korea, at Kaesong, at Panmunjom and here. The world will not be misled into believing that black is white simply because the Soviet Union Government says so. The agenda item before us and the explanations we have heard this evening amount to a warmed-over version of the charges and invective with which Mr. Vyshinsky sought vainly to confuse the prisoner-of-war question earlier. We have now heard still another round of these same lies which characterize the Soviet Union approach to the problem of peace in Korea.

291. The USSR representative this evening talked at some length—some fifteen or twenty minutes—concerning incidents on Koje and Cheju Islands, where there were and are prisoners of war—not internees, but prisoners of war. He has talked—as Mr. Vyshinsky did before him—about the failure of the United States, as he alleges, to comply with its obligations under the Geneva Convention. What are the facts about the treatment of prisoners of war in Korea? The Government of the United States, in its initial presentation on the Korean question, made these facts perfectly

clear on 24 October, in the First Committee of this Assembly [512th meeting].

292. From the very beginning, the Unified Command has followed the provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1949. There has never been any secret about the administration of United Nations prisoner-of-war camps. We have thrown these camps wide open to the International Committee of the Red Cross and have encouraged full investigation of conditions within our camps. There has been a thorough scrutiny of what we have done and the world has been kept fully informed. On occasions when the International Committee has criticized our conduct, the Unified Command has taken any corrective action necessary.

293. What has been the practice on the other side? The communist authorities have hidden their treatment of prisoners from the eyes of the world. They have failed to appoint a protecting Power or any benevolent organization such as the Red Cross. They have continually refused to permit the International Committee of the Red Cross to send representatives to inspect their camps. They have refused to exchange relief packages, and until very recently they have refused to exchange mail; they now allow this, but only on a most limited scale. They have refused to report on the health of prisoners of war, and they refuse to exchange the seriously sick and wounded, as is required by the Geneva Convention. They have failed to give the accurate location of prisoner-of-war camps and they have failed to mark them properly. They have located their camps in places of danger near legitimate military targets, in defiance of the Geneva Convention.

294. The Unified Command has observed the Geneva Convention in all these respects. The International Committee of the Red Cross has been attempting for some time to contact the communist authorities in order to obtain access to their camps and in order to persuade the Communists that they should live up to the Geneva Convention. But the only answer the International Committee of the Red Cross has ever received from the Communists was a statement from the North Koreans early in the conflict that they would live up to the Geneva Convention. Having said that, the North Koreans dropped a curtain of secrecy over the treatment of prisoners of war.

295. The Soviet Union Government may now recognize the mistake which it made in brutally rejecting the Indian draft resolution for peace in Korea, and thus contemptuously flouting the will of the United Nations. But does the Soviet Union Government really believe that it can retrieve this mistake by injecting a false issue into our deliberations at this eleventh hour of our session? The Soviet Union representative's midnight manoeuvre will go down in our annals along with Mr. Vyshinsky's laughter at disarmament during the last session of the Assembly.

296. The Soviet Union Government has only one way out from the consequence of its betrayal of peace. That way is to accept the United Nations proposals for solving the prisoner-of-war question. Until it does so, the world will remain convinced that those who have launched aggression in Korea insist that the bloodshed shall continue.

297. The USSR and its satellites stood alone against the fifty-four nations which endorsed the principle of

non-forcible repatriation as the key to peace in Korea. Now the Soviet Union can offer only this lurid effort to mask its own desire to see the conflict continue as long as the Soviet Union Government can delude the victimized people of Korea and China into fighting for it.

298. I have already suggested that the USSR item does not pose a new problem for us. The Soviet worldwide propaganda apparatus has been pouring out accusations of mistreatment by the Unified Command of prisoners of war as part of its hate campaign. All of us have been sickened by this effort to poison international relations. The United States is eager to take this opportunity to expose the latest chapter in the Soviet hate campaign.

299. In conclusion, there is a lesson to be drawn from this eleventh-hour manoeuvre by the USSR Government. It furnishes proof of the fact that when Members of the United Nations unite on a moral issue and rally from all parts of the earth around the cause of peace and in defence of the Charter, the enemies of peace are driven into corners of desperation. But we do not believe that our unity can be broken or undermined by acts of lying desperation such as those we have witnessed here.

300. Mrs. SEKANINOVA-CAKARTOVA (Czechoslovakia): It is not long since delegations came to this rostrum to discuss the question of Korea. The General Assembly had both the duty and the opportunity to contribute to a just settlement of the Korean question. The adoption of the draft resolution [A/L.118] submitted by the Soviet Union delegation, which was aimed at the settlement of the Korean question in its entirety, would have created the conditions necessary for the repatriation of the prisoners of war in accordance with the principles of humanity and international law.

301. The majority in the General Assembly, which succumbed to United States pressure, did not adopt the path to peace indicated by the USSR draft resolution, and thus we are here today again faced with the most burning question concerning Korea.

302. The representative of the United States, who has just spoken, said that the world knows who is for peace. Yes, I agree, it does know. It does know of the untiring efforts of the Soviet Union for peace ever since the war in Korea was unleashed. Nor are the peoples of the countries of the world in any doubt as to who is waging the war in Korea under the cloak of the United Nations. They see more and more clearly that the war in Korea is an American war, which serves no interests other than those of the United States monopolists, and that they are the same aggressive forces which criminally started this war on that memorable Sunday when the United States representative, who has just spoken to us, sent his well-known telegram to the Security Council. Yes, the whole world knows today, and it will never forget, what the United States is doing in the prisoner-of-war camps under its command in Korea.

303. According to recent reports of the Associated Press and Reuters agencies, the United States Command in Korea has committed new crimes against prisoners of war. On 14 December 1952, the United States interventionists killed 82 and wounded 120

prisoners of war on the island of Pongam. The tragic events on Pongam, as well as those which have occurred in other places where there are United States prisoner-of-war camps, have shocked the world and aroused the anger, indignation and opposition of all honest people.

304. The massacres of prisoners of war on the island of Koje, on Cheju, at Pusan, on Pongam, and elsewhere, have shown once again that there are no crimes which the United States aggressors would not commit in the endeavour to detain the greatest possible number of Korean and Chinese prisoners, whom they intend, on the one hand, to drag by force into Chiang Kai-shek's and Syngman Rhee's armed gangs, and, on the other hand, to use for their propaganda by trumpeting all over the world that "tens of thousands of the prisoners refuse to return to the rule of communism". The United States aggressors have used all forms of violence in order to force the prisoners to make declarations that they do not wish to return to their homes. In their endeavour to break the resistance of the Korean and Chinese prisoners, the United States aggressors have drowned the prisoner-of-war camps in blood. There have been massacres and murders.

305. According to the *Congressional Record* of 10 June 1952, the following so-called more significant incidents are listed as having taken place from the middle of June 1951 to the end of May 1952: 18 June, 7 prisoners shot and 4 wounded, Koje; 15 August, 9 prisoners shot and 25 wounded, Koje; 15 August, 8 prisoners shot and 22 wounded, Pusan; 17 and 19 September, 20 prisoners shot and 31 wounded, Koje; 23 December, 14 prisoners shot and 24 wounded, Koje; 18 February 1952, 75 prisoners shot and 139 wounded, Koje. This great massacre took place—and I am quoting again from the *Congressional Record* of 10 June—when the United States soldiers, or, as the *Congressional Record* calls them, the United Nations Command personnel, entered the compound in order to ascertain which of these civilian internees were actually loyal South Koreans. On 13 March 1952, 12 prisoners were shot and 26 wounded at Koje; on 20 May 1952, 1 prisoner was shot and 85 wounded, at Pusan; on 1 October 1952, 56 prisoners were killed and 109 wounded on Cheju.

306. In the period from 14 October to 4 December—that is, during this session of the General Assembly—321 Korean and Chinese prisoners were killed or wounded, according to American and British sources. In reality, of course, there has been much greater bloodshed, which the United States authorities have succeeded in keeping secret or which United States official sources do not mention. This applies to the events that took place in the prisoner-of-war camp on Koje Island, as well as at the camps on the mainland in Pusan, Mansan and Jongchon, where those prisoners have been placed who, according to the Americans, preferred suicide to returning home.

307. From the very beginning of the truce negotiations, the United States authorities made preparations in order to detain the greatest possible number of prisoners of war. They tattooed anti-communist slogans on their bodies by force. They beat them until they were unconscious, dipped the fingers of their victims in their own blood and then put their finger-prints on the fabricated declarations expressing unwillingness to return home. When, by the end of April, the truce nego-

tiations had entered into a decisive stage, the United States authorities transferred 100,000 prisoners of war by force from the island of Koje to other camps on the mainland and falsely claimed that these separated prisoners had, in the course of screenings, expressed their preference for death rather than return to the Communists.

308. Suddenly this painstakingly fabricated lie was exposed by a United States general, General Colson, in connexion with the well-known case of General Dodd, the United States commander of the camp on the island of Koje, at the time when the prisoners put forward their demands that the United States command should instantly cease the barbaric treatment, the insults, the tortures, the practice of forced petitions signed in blood under threats and solitary confinement, mass murders with the use of guns and machine-guns, the use of poison gases and bacterial weapons and experiments with the atomic bomb. The prisoners further demanded an immediate cessation of the forced screening on the basis of which thousands of prisoners of war of the North Korean People's Army and the Chinese People's Volunteers were being rearmed.

309. The representative of the commander of the camp, General Colson, in his declaration in replying to those demands, admitted that violence, bloodshed, killings, forced recruitment and rearming of prisoners of war had taken place and promised that an end would be put to such acts. Colson's admission of the constant terror and violence prevailing in the prisoner-of-war camps clearly showed the whole world what so-called voluntary repatriation means and what brutal and criminal methods are utilized by the United States aggressors in order to exact the so-called voluntary declarations. These criminal methods have reached such a point that they have even provoked the opposition of the allies of the United States who are participating in the interventionist United States war in Korea.

310. The Canadian Government, in a sharp note of protest, rejected the Pentagon's orders to send its soldiers to the island of Koje and made the United States solely responsible for the events in the prisoner-of-war camps. In the same way, the barbarous acts committed by the Americans in the camps have provoked indignation in the United Kingdom. This also was reflected in the debate in the House of Commons on 19 May in which Members of Parliament openly expressed their disquietude. It was stressed that it was evident from the documents of the Commission of the International Committee of the Red Cross that the screening of the prisoners on the island of Koje was being carried out under the threat of machine-guns and under the threat of massacres. There seems to be a long distance between London and New York. The murders of the Korean and Chinese patriots have evoked provocative laughter from certain members of the United Kingdom delegation here.

311. The events on Koje were soon followed by others and all of them unmasked the big United States lie. The United States authorities alleged that all prisoners of war who had been transferred to the mainland would choose death rather than repatriation.

312. In the report of the United States command concerning the events on Koje, it said:

"By the time of the case of General Dodd, approximately 100,000 prisoners had, in the screening

process, already declared that they would forcibly resist return to communist control, and these had been removed from the island."

313. Thus, at that time there were approximately 70,000 prisoners on this island. And yet, on 17 June over 60 prisoners were wounded and killed in the prisoner-of-war camp in Pusan on the mainland. On 20 May, 86 prisoners were killed and wounded in Pusan, according to the admission in the report of the United States command in Korea, in which it is stated that on 20 May prompt and firm action by United Nations command personnel averted what might have been a serious incident in Pusan. At 7 a.m. armed United States military personnel moved into the compound, where they met stiff opposition from prisoners. In gaining control over the compound, one prisoner was killed and 85 others suffered injuries. The situation was well in hand by 9 o'clock in the morning.

314. I quote from the *Congressional Record* of 10 June:

"In the prisoner-of-war camp in Jongchon 16 prisoners of war were killed and wounded in a similar so-called riot."

315. Nothing can better and more manifestly unmask the United States lie than the fact that in the camps which the United States authorities have publicly declared are only for those prisoners who prefer death to repatriation the same bloodshed is taking place as in these camps which are exclusively reserved for those prisoners who, according to United States sources, have asked to be repatriated.

316. The Commander-in-Chief of the United States forces in Korea, General Clark—who replaced General Ridgway—declared on 15 May that he would not fulfil the promises given to the prisoners by General Colson. This declaration by General Clark meant that the United States Command had no intention of putting an end to the terror, violence and bloodshed that prevailed in the camps. On the contrary, General Clark gave General Boatner a free hand in this respect for his operation "Break Up". The military, armed to the teeth, attacked the prisoners in gas-masks and, with the help of tanks, destroyed their barracks and their modest belongings with flame-throwers and left thousands of dead and wounded behind them.

317. According to an article in the *New York Journal-American* of 26 May, significantly titled "Boatner tells troops to rough up Koje prisoners", General Boatner gave the following instructions to the soldiers who had just come to Koje:

"You must not kill prisoners unnecessarily. If you get into a fight, slash him, use the butt of your rifle; knee him in the groin; but do not kill him unnecessarily."

That is how the United States command applies the provision of the Geneva Convention concerning the treatment of prisoners of war.

318. The bestial crimes committed by the United States and South Korean soldiers against the helpless prisoners are also demonstrated by the report of the *Washington Sunday Star* in which the correspondent of the paper, Jerry O'Leary, wrote on 18 May of this year: "So violent was their rage that the South Korean troops took pliers and pulled every finger-nail from the hands of a captured Red."

319. The United States aggressors in Korea are committing crimes which equal the atrocities of Hitler's henchmen.

320. Not even the International Committee of the Red Cross, a loyal and obedient tool of the American aggressors, could, under the pressure of world public opinion, continue to conceal the barbarous acts committed in the United States prisoner-of-war camps. In the report of its Commission, the Committee was obliged to admit the forced screenings and bloodshed caused by the United States forces in the camps. The report of this Commission was previously printed in Geneva only in the bulletin *La Revue Internationale de la Croix Rouge*, with restricted circulation; and its publication now coincides with the new atrocities on Pongam.

321. The majority of this General Assembly recently adopted a resolution submitted by India based on the requirement of the forcible detention of the prisoners of war, which the United States has been putting forward ever since October 1951 and which constitutes a most flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention and of international law. The resolution, which is nothing but another version of the original draft resolution sponsored by twenty-one Powers and submitted by the delegation of the United States of America, is based on the false hypothesis that among the Korean and Chinese prisoners there are some who do not want to return home.

322. The resolution adopted by the majority in the General Assembly against the clearly expressed position of the Governments of the People's Republic of China and the People's Democratic Republic of Korea declares that force shall not be used either to effect the repatriation of the prisoners of war or to prevent it. The initiators, authors and sponsors of the resolution claimed that repatriation would be effected in accordance with the Geneva Convention and with international law.

323. At the time, Foreign Minister Vyshinsky and the delegations of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Poland and Czechoslovakia proved beyond any doubt that the resolution had no other purpose than to legalize the acts of violence perpetrated by the United States of America against the prisoners so far and to open the way to further crimes of such a nature. All this helps the United States to continue the forcible retention in captivity of the prisoners of war so that the Korean armistice negotiations may be broken off and sabotaged and the Korean war prolonged and extended.

324. Even in the short period which has elapsed since the discussions in the First Committee and in plenary meeting of the General Assembly on the Korean question, the facts have only too clearly confirmed how right these delegations were in their judgment of the Indian resolution.

325. Even in the course of the seventh session of the General Assembly, massacres of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war are continuing because they resist the questioning and screening and refuse to express unwillingness to return to their homelands. In the period from 14 October to 4 December, an average of six to seven Korean and Chinese prisoners fell victims to American barbarism every day.

326. And now, new massacres of the prisoners have taken place.

327. According to Press reports, which I have quoted, the United States Command in Korea has committed new crimes against the prisoners on Pongam. On 14 December, the United States interventionists killed 82 and wounded 120 Korean and Chinese prisoners. Some of these prisoners succumbed later to their wounds.

328. According to the Press reports of 17 December, the United States Command has termed the events on the island of Pongam as the most sanguinary since the events on Koje Island; and Colonel Caldwell, head of the United Nations Prisoner Command, declared, according to *The New York Times* of 16 December 1952, that it was a very serious situation.

329. The commander of the camp on Pongam tried to justify these barbarous steps. Carbines, guns and machine-guns were used against the helpless prisoners for singing their national songs prohibited by the United States Command. According to *The New York Times* of 17 December, the United States Command saw a threat in the fact that the prisoners sang the song of the Declaration of Independence of North Korea and other songs of their land which they love so passionately that not even the most brutal steps could or can break them. According to *The New York Times* of 17 December, Colonel Miller, commander of the camp, said the following about this affair:

"When one of them fell under the withering machine-gun and small-arms fire others would drag him back to his feet and he would continue to sing communist songs. Later they continued to sing while lying wounded on the ground. Some were still singing hours later when they were placed on the operating tables in the hospital."

330. There were 82 dead and 120 wounded Korean and Chinese prisoners of war. This bloody balance is approvingly described by Colonel Caldwell in the words "Colonel Miller did not use more force than necessary".

331. According to a report in *The New York Times* of today's date, Sunday, the Commander-in-Chief of the United States forces in Korea, General Clark, has considered it appropriate to declare, just after the events on Pongam, in connexion with the report of the International Committee of the Red Cross, that his Command 'had afforded and will continue to afford the P.O.W.'s decent and humane treatment'. Eighty-two dead and 120 wounded prisoners of war: that is the testimony of the decent and humane treatment that the United States Command affords prisoners of war.

332. The new crimes of the United States interventionists in Korea have aroused a storm of protest all over the world. Under the pressure of public opinion, the United Kingdom Government has been obliged to ask the Government of the United States for a full report on the massacres of the prisoners on Pongam island. In the British Parliament, the Members of Parliament have, according to the *New York Herald Tribune*, termed these events unprecedented and have demanded to know how much longer British troops would serve in areas where such incidents were likely to occur.

333. The deep indignation aroused by these acts and the opposition to them may also be seen from the fact

that in the British Parliament urgent demands were made to the United Kingdom Government that it should require that the management and control of prisoner-of-war camps be given to some other country than the United States. This is an unambiguous expression of the deep distrust of the United States military command, which is increasingly committing atrocities and acts of terror against the heroic Korean and Chinese prisoners, and of the unwillingness to share in the responsibility for these acts which international law brands as war crimes.

334. All honest people are filled with horror and disgust at the crimes of the United States aggressors in Korea. Those responsible for the massacres of prisoners of war stand exposed before the whole world as war criminals.

335. The United States representative has tried to dismiss as propaganda the descriptions of the horrible crimes committed by United States hangmen in the prisoner-of-war camps. Does not the thought that, every day, heroic and courageous Korean and Chinese patriots are being killed in the prisoner-of-war camps only because they love their country and their people give pause to the United States representative? Can such a serious accusation, such tragic and horrible facts, be ignored and dismissed by a mere reference to propaganda? Can anyone maintain today that he is unaware of the acts that are being committed by the United States armed forces in the prisoner-of-war camps in Korea?

336. In passing judgment on the war criminals of the Second World War—and many of those criminals had recourse to excuses similar to those being used today—the Nürnberg Tribunal did not recognize ignorance of atrocities perpetrated in the Nazi concentration camps as an exculpatory factor.

337. The General Assembly, one of the principal organs of the United Nations, the international organization entrusted with the maintenance of peace and security and the promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights, cannot and must not ignore the facts on which the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union delegation is based.

338. The General Assembly cannot and must not permit barbarous acts, contrary to the fundamental principles of humane conduct and international law, to be committed in the name and under the flag of the United Nations, under a flag which should be the symbol of peace. It is the General Assembly's duty to condemn—as all peace-loving peoples throughout the world have already done—the criminal acts of the United States armed forces in Korea and to insist that the United States Government should take immediate measures to put an end to those crimes and to bring those who have committed them to account.

339. For all these reasons, the delegation of Czechoslovakia gives its wholehearted support to the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union delegation, and we appeal to the General Assembly to adopt that draft resolution.

340. Mr. LLOYD (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom supported the inclusion in the General Assembly's agenda of the item now before us. We should have liked the Assembly to debate the item on its merits. Unfortunately, the violent wording of the motion itself

and the provocative and intemperate manner in which it has been introduced makes it very difficult for us to continue to judge the matter on its merits. The talk of guinea pigs for atomic bomb warfare and the allegations that prisoners are being used for experiments in flame-throwing—statements which we know are ridiculous—demonstrate how ridiculous is the draft resolution itself.

341. Some of us have been wondering why the draft resolution was introduced suddenly, at the last minute. I think the reason probably is that the propaganda of the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc during this session of the General Assembly has, on the whole, fallen very flat. This is a last, desperate attempt to regain the initiative in the cold war and save something from that propaganda failure.

342. We must realize, however, that this sort of debate is part of the price of freedom. We know quite well that no such discussion could take place about any incidents in any concentration camps or prison camps behind the "iron curtain". We welcome this sort of discussion. The nations with forces in Korea, the Unified Command: we are prepared to meet this sort of allegation in debate, to discuss the matter, to face criticism and to judge the question on its merits. That, as I have said, is something which cannot take place in fairly large areas of the world's surface today.

343. Many issues have been raised in the statements made here. I am not going to go into those issues. I shall confine myself to the question of the prisoner-of-war camps.

344. The Soviet Union representative alleged that the prisoners of war were attacked because they demanded repatriation. I wonder if anyone really believes that statement. After all, who is preventing those prisoners from being repatriated?

345. I did think that Mr. Gromyko's references to the Indian resolution were singularly ungenerous. That resolution was, as we know, an honest and sincere attempt to find a middle way and a basis of agreement whereby these prisoners could be repatriated. It is only the flat rejection of the resolution by the Soviet Union—followed, unfortunately, by that of the Chinese People's Government—which is in fact preventing these people from being repatriated.

346. It is also becoming clear that the Chinese High Command is deliberately inciting these prisoners to riot. I thought the grim catalogue of dates and incidents read out to us by both representatives of the Soviet bloc who have spoken were a condemnation of themselves rather than of the United Nations command.

347. Of course, we can see the advantages of inciting prisoners continually to take part in these incidents. There is the propaganda advantage, the possibility of making capital out of the incidents. There is also the fact that incidents such as these do tie up fighting troops which might be used for other purposes. Anyone who has studied the chronology of these events knows that they are singularly well timed to fit in with some other event.

348. As I have said, I believe there is evidence of a deliberate programme of inciting these prisoners to take part in the incidents. It is difficult to control

prisoners of war at any time. I imagine that some people present here either have been in prisoner-of-war camps themselves or have had something to do with them. They know that it is always a difficult task to maintain discipline over prisoners of war.

349. The prisoners whom we are now discussing are a particularly tough lot. I say that because, as I have had occasion before to remind the General Assembly, I have seen some of them myself. In June, during my visit to Koje, I saw the compound which had been the scene of bitter fighting. I saw the complicated system of tunnels which had been dug by the prisoners, the trenches with which they had surrounded all their huts. I saw the spears mounted on the wooden rifles, the tent-poles with the sharp iron spikes, the knives and daggers, the clubs, the home-made grenades—not quite the equipment of altogether peace-loving people. A moment ago, the representative of Czechoslovakia spoke of the modest belongings of the prisoners. I have just described some of the modest belongings which I myself saw. Incidentally, I saw in that compound the places from which there had been recovered the corpses of the prisoners executed by the communist controllers of the compound—and I wonder if the story of their grim fate will ever be told.

350. So those who criticize should remember that this is a problem of great difficulty. Prisoners of war, at any time, are difficult to control, and these are a particularly tough lot of prisoners of war and I think that the people controlling them have been faced with a problem of unparalleled difficulty. Nevertheless—and I say this knowing quite well that attempts will be made to make some propaganda out of what I say—although we recognize that it is a tough job to look after these people, at the same time we believe in the principle that only reasonable force should be used to deal with any situation. We believe that errors of judgment may be made by human beings. We believe that men may make mistakes, and we believe that the death of eighty-two men is a grave matter. Therefore, although no evidence has yet been adduced that there have been mistakes made or that there have been errors of judgment, we think that it is perfectly right and proper that a full and thorough investigation of this most unfortunate incident should take place.

351. I say that it is part of the price of freedom that we should submit to investigation our deeds and the deeds of those who act on our behalf. We have heard today the report given by the representative of the United States Government. My Government has complete confidence in the Unified Command and in the fact that this full and thorough investigation which has been spoken of will take place, and that it will be conducted fairly and objectively. I say that, however intemperately they are introduced and however violent they are in their terms, it is right that we should investigate the charges that are made. We are not afraid that that investigation should take place.

352. But, having said that, I revert again to the comment with which I began. I do think that it is lamentable that this Assembly should be adjourning in this sort of atmosphere. Mr. Eden spoke earlier in the session regretting the hate warfare and saying, as I think we all believe, that peace cannot be achieved by these methods—the distillation and the dissemination of poison. We desire peace, and we desire it passionately.

Our soldiers went to Korea only in order to resist aggression. But we do not believe that it is possible to achieve peace or to obtain the atmosphere for peace if that atmosphere is continually to be poisoned by this sort of charge and this kind of speech. So I think it is a matter for bitter regret that, on the eve of Christmas, we should have this further injection of poisonous propaganda into the international atmosphere, and I hope that this Assembly will show what it thinks of that by rejecting this draft resolution by an overwhelming majority.

353. Mr. NASZKOWSKI (Poland) (*translated from Russian*): The whole world was shocked by the tragic news of what happened seven days ago on the island of Pongam, where United States detachments in a prisoner-of-war camp killed 82 prisoners of war and wounded 120 others. This laconic official communiqué is the disgraceful evidence of a crime to which no one can be indifferent. It should not only stir up the conscience of all mankind but should also impel to action the Organization which the peoples have called upon to stand guard over peace and security and human rights, and to ensure that all States respect all treaty obligations.

354. The echoes of the Korean debate in the forum of the United Nations, during which various spokesmen of the aggressors tried to convince us of the humanitarian motives of United States policy towards prisoners of war, had hardly subsided when the Press reported the events on the island of Pongam which Colonel George Miller, the United States commander of the camp on that island, describes with unprecedented cynicism in today's or rather in yesterday's issue of *The New York Times*.

355. Colonel Miller gave the order to kill the prisoners for singing patriotic songs, for loving their country. Eighty-two men were killed and 120 wounded. That name, Colonel George Miller, must be remembered well. It will go down in history as a symbol of crime, as a synonym for the collective murder of unarmed men.

356. Of course Miller is only a tool of the United States system of aggression. The roots of this crime go much deeper. They must be sought in the Pentagon and in the buildings of Wall Street. It is from there that the orders come. It is there that the ideas, the systems, the methods are evolved. The basic method consists of attempting to break the solidarity and unity of the Korean and Chinese prisoners of war; of physical annihilation, i.e., of murdering the most conscious and active elements; and finally of the psychological exhaustion and weakening of prisoners of war so that they may succumb to threats, pressure and torture.

357. These acts have a systematic character. Although I shall refrain from speaking about all the facts which have already been mentioned here, I must remind the Assembly that during the present session a number of additional brutal acts of repression have occurred on the islands of Koje and Cheju. The United States prisoner-of-war command reported in its communiqué of 15 November that between 1 August and 12 November, 245 prisoners had died in prisoner-of-war camps, 170 as a result of inhuman conditions of hunger and disease and the remainder, in the words of the communiqué, violent deaths.

358. Even United States and British Press agencies were forced to admit that in the period from February to July 1952 inclusive there were eleven massacres of prisoners of war. On the average, 100 prisoners of war per month were either killed or wounded in the first half of 1952.

359. The United States delegation, with the assistance of its British allies in aggression, has tried to laugh off these terrible accusations. But the laughter sounded hollow in this hall, and I am sure that it will be given its true value by world public opinion. Incidentally, this is not the first time that the United States and United Kingdom representatives have shared a laugh at the terrible tragedy of the Korean and Chinese prisoners of war. According to a report in the *Sydney Telegraph* on 18 June 1952, the notorious Boatner and Lord Alexander guffawed loudly when they saw the ruins of the prisoner-of-war huts. Newspaper accounts may perhaps sound dry and may not enable the reader to imagine such a military operation against unarmed prisoners of war, organized by United States detachments armed to the teeth. But a horrifying picture of these operations is given by the now well-kept report of the International Committee of the Red Cross, to which the representative of the Soviet Union has already alluded. And this is a report by an organization which can hardly be suspected of sympathies for the Korean people; this is a report by an organization in the service of the United States.

360. In this way the Charter and fundamental international obligations are being systematically violated, and all this is taking place under the flag of the United Nations. The tragic plight of the prisoners of war in United States camps has already been confirmed by the well-known statements of General Dodd and General Colson. It has also been confirmed by a number of utterances by the former camp commander, General Boatner, who according to a Reuters dispatch of 26 May 1952 gave British detachments newly arrived on Koje Island the following orders: "If you get into a fight, slash him, use the butt of your rifle, knee him on the groin". The organizer of the atrocities, General Boatner, repeatedly declared that mocking the prisoners of war was sport to him. Describing the action in which American detachments attacked 6,000 prisoners of war with tanks, bayonets and flame-throwers, with the result that 40 men were killed and 104 wounded, General Boatner told the British Minister of Defence, Lord Alexander, in as many words, that "it was a magnificent spectacle" and, as I have already said, they both guffawed. This was reported by the *Sydney Telegraph* of 17 June 1952.

361. If any representative is still doubtful about the authenticity of the crime which was committed on Pongam Island, and is still repeating the stock American allegations about "Soviet propaganda", we refer such doubting people to the issue of *The New York Times* which I have already mentioned. Let them read carefully and attentively this terrible document, this monstrous indictment, which Colonel George Miller has brought not only against himself but against the whole United States Army and the United States Government. Not only did the United States Government fail to arrest the criminals, to relieve Miller of his command and to subject him to severe punishment, but on the contrary, it praised these acts and will probably decorate

Miller and his subordinates, as it did his predecessors on Koje Island.

362. The United States representative has attempted here to justify the acts of the United States soldiery in Korea. I do not, however, think that in doing so he advanced the reputation of the United States. He said with egregious cynicism that they had to fire volleys at these terrible mutineers armed with stones, because the wind was not favourable for the use of gas. He spoke here of the fanaticism of the prisoners, giving it as the reason for the clash. Apparently, in the language of the United States aggressors, love of country and patriotism are called fanaticism, for which people are shot. That is not surprising when we remember that patriots are shot for just such fanaticism in the colonies and "protectorates" of Africa and Asia. Such are the ethics and the philosophy of imperialism.

363. Mr. Gross has also alleged here that the prisoners' resistance is organized as a conspiracy and is even imposed on the prisoner by the Korean authorities in the execution of political manoeuvres. Apparently, therefore, people will die exhausted by torture, die fearlessly with a song on their lips, for the sake of political manoeuvres. "Bloodshed was the real motive", said Mr. Gross in so many words. No, this was not a manoeuvre. This was simply their boundless love of their country, and their inflexible will to return to it, feelings which Mr. Gross and his like cannot understand. However, these feelings are understood perfectly by persons who have fought and are fighting for the independence and freedom of their country.

364. The United States representative made still another charge. He spoke about a last-minute, midnight proposal, on the eve of Christmas, and so forth. According to this logic it seems that although defenceless people are being killed day and night, it is better not to disturb the midnight rest and Christmas calm of the representatives.

365. I have already mentioned the report of the International Committee of the Red Cross. I said that even this institution was bound to admit and describe some of the barbarous acts of the Americans in the prisoner-of-war camps. These forced admissions of the International Committee of the Red Cross are to be explained by the fact that the actions of the United States authorities constitute most flagrant violations of international law and of the provisions of the Geneva Convention, which clearly say that prisoners of war must be humanely treated. This springs from the whole spirit of the Convention. Article 13 of the Geneva Convention contains the following clause: "Any unlawful act or omission by the Detaining Power causing death or seriously endangering the health of a prisoner of war in its custody is prohibited and will be regarded as a serious breach of the present Convention".

366. But what were the latest effects on Pongam Island? Were they not in fact a glaring violation of article 13 of the Convention? They were a most flagrant violation of it. I submit that no one can deny this. I would add that article 13 provides for the protection of prisoners of war against acts of coercion and intimidation. What were events on Pongam Island and Koje Island, and in other prisoner-of-war camps, but a cynical violation of that provision?

367. As regards the assertion by the United States representative in the General Committee that the camp

on Pongam Island contained civilian internees, I would point out that according to our information the events in question took place in a camp for prisoners of war, a fact which was even stated in the American Press. For example, the special correspondent of *The New York Times* on Pongam Island, Robert Alden, reported in the issue of 21 December that a prisoner-of-war camp was involved and that the casualties were prisoners of war. He said quite clearly that all these prisoners of war had stated that they wished to return to North Korea.

368. If, as we are now told, these were civilians, then it would appear that these prisoners of war were illegally "reclassified", which is the normal practice of the Americans in Korea. But one way or the other, that circumstance does not in our view affect the substance of the question, since bloody atrocities committed on persons detained in camps are inhuman and illegal whether the detainees are prisoners of war, civilians or partisans, as Mr. Gross has stated in his latest version of the story. Apparently, the United States delegation itself is not quite clear whether the camp contains prisoners of war, partisans or civilians.

369. But whatever the facts, it should be pointed out that civilian internees are also protected by international legislation, including the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.

370. As regards the partisans to whom Mr. Gross referred here, with such contempt, I would remind him that article 4, paragraph 2, of the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war accords to partisans the same protection as to members of armed forces.

371. Discussion of the Korean war at the present session has lasted for almost two months. The United States representatives, and certain other representatives, who echo every United States announcement and every United States assertion, have assured us that the majority of prisoners of war do not wish to return to North Korea or to China and that it would be necessary to use force against them, which the tender conscience and soft-heartedness of United States officers will not permit them to do. But in actual fact we find that the Korean and Chinese prisoners of war are giving daily proof of their patriotism, their devotion to their country and their solidarity. This is precisely why they are being killed.

372. For that reason we consider that our Organization must intervene in this tragic and shocking affair. The Charter, and in particular Article 10, fully justifies this request. The States implicated in these bloody atrocities and the commanders of the aggressive forces in Korea are trampling upon the obligations and treaties they have contracted, and are thus violating the Charter. In making large-scale use of arms against unarmed prisoners of war, the United States forces are violating the generally recognized principles of international law and the United Nations Charter.

373. It is the Assembly's duty to take a decision on the question, particularly as it recently took an incorrect and false decision on the Korean question, a decision which bolstered the self-confidence of the United States aggressors and paved the way for the bloody atrocities on Pongam Island.

374. The Assembly at the same time rejected the Soviet Union proposal for an effective settlement of the Korean question, and postponed debate on the Polish proposal designed to bring about a slackening of international tension, and, above all, the liquidation of the Korean conflict. We now have ample proof that the resolution adopted by the United Nations endorsed the operations now being undertaken by the United States military authorities.

375. This is how freedom of decision and the right of prisoners of war to express their views look in practice. Such are the results of "screening". Without the slightest twinge of conscience men are being killed because, despite coercion and threats, despite the terroristic methods employed by the United States forces helped by the South Korean police and the hirelings of Chiang Kai-shek, they love their country and wish to return to their homes.

376. Is it possible for us to overlook these glaring facts and leave the unfortunate prisoners of war from China and the People's Democratic Republic of Korea to their fate, leave them at the mercy of people who murder them daily? For what has occurred in camps hitherto—the inhuman maltreatment of prisoners of war by the United States troops in Korea—gives us every justification for asserting that these crimes will continue, that there will be more innocent victims of United States barbarism. Can we possibly permit the same fate to overtake not two hundred but perhaps five hundred or even a thousand more prisoners of war tomorrow or in a week's time? That is why the question is so urgent. In no case and in no circumstances can we evade a decision, seeing that the protection of human dignity, that human life, is at stake. We have a special responsibility when the persons involved are unarmed persons, who should be protected by solemn international obligations—obligations which are being trampled upon by United States forces in Korea in a shameless manner unprecedented in history.

377. For the reasons I have given, the Polish delegation warmly supports and will vote for the Soviet draft resolution [A/2355]. The Polish delegation considers that these crimes should be condemned and branded as contrary to the elementary principles of ethics and humanity. What is the substance of the Soviet Union draft resolution? First and foremost, it recalls that further instances of inhuman and brutal treatment of prisoners of war in United States camps in Korea occurred on 14 December 1952. It emphasizes that the methods applied to prisoners of war have developed into a systematic extermination. It asks us to brand these criminal acts, asks that those responsible for these brutalities should be punished and that the United States should take immediate steps to end the brutal treatment of prisoners of war. Is this not a logical and natural demand in view of the horrors being perpetrated in prisoner-of-war camps in Korea?

378. The demand for the punishment of the guilty is a duty which cannot be evaded by those who approach the problem in a sincere and honest spirit. Such crimes cannot and must not remain unpunished. If we believe in human dignity, if we are unwilling to see that dignity trampled upon or to see such acts go unpunished, we must demand that the criminals receive the punishment they deserve for their deeds. We must adopt the Soviet Union draft resolution. We must warn those who

would dare to repeat tomorrow the atrocities of yesterday and today. On us lies the responsibility for the fate of unarmed and defenceless prisoners of war. The peoples of the world demand this of us.

379. Mr. SARPEN (Turkey): My delegation wishes to join the other delegations which have risen to express their sense of outrage at the misuse of this Organization and the disrespect for world public opinion represented by the draft resolution now before the Assembly.

380. I have the honour to represent a country whose troops have been fighting under the Unified Command in Korea for about two years. Our troops are part of the United Nations army in which sixteen Members of the United Nations are represented and which is fighting pursuant to a United Nations resolution backed by fifty-three of our Member nations. The affront to the United States contained in this new draft resolution is an affront to every country which has associated itself with the United States to resist and defeat the criminal aggression in Korea.

381. On 3 December, fifty-four Members of this Organization once more affirmed their unity in support of the principles of the Charter and their common determination to carry this first collective action against aggression to an honourable conclusion.

382. We should not be surprised that this statement of desperation now before us, which is designed to distract attention from the true meaning of our resolution of 3 December concerning Korea, is riddled with inaccuracies, misinterpretation and untruth. It has already been pointed out in the General Committee and at this plenary meeting that there are no Chinese on the island of Pongam and that the Koreans interned there are all Korean civilians. All of us know that the prisoner-of-war camps on the islands of Koje, Cheju and Pongam, as well as the other prisoner-of-war camps under the Unified Command in Korea, are under inspection by the International Red Cross, and we know that they are conducted in strict accordance with the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. To talk of systematic extermination of prisoners of war in these camps shows a disregard for the facts which does not even attempt to achieve plausibility.

383. It is important for us to state that these specific statements and others contained in this draft resolution are untrue. It is even more important for us to understand and set forth clearly the purpose of the draft resolution. Its purpose can only be to try to distract the attention of the world from the defeat which the aggressors have sustained in Korea and elsewhere.

384. During this session of the Assembly, we have listened to dozens of long angry speeches which have tried to convince us that truth is falsity, that defence is aggression and that aggression is defence. Well, they have failed. In the vote on 3 December, the whole world has been given striking proof that efforts to divide the Members of the United Nations have failed. The sponsors of those efforts are afraid to have the world know of their failure. They are afraid to have the world know that the United Nations is stronger than ever in its determination to achieve a just peace in Korea, based on the Charter principles of respect for individual human rights and fundamental freedoms. For this reason, they have raised this false alarm and initiated this

diversionary action, hoping that it will distract attention from the truth, which is so dangerous to their cause.

385. This new and eleventh-hour effort will fail, as their earlier efforts have failed, to disguise the true meaning of events in Korea. My delegation does not find it difficult to see through these new devices, and we have confidence that all other Member States which are free to see and speak the truth find them equally transparent.

386. As an illustration of the feelings of the public—of the American public, for the time being—I shall read out one or two lines of one of the telephone messages I have received tonight. I received this particular one about two or three minutes before I had the honour of coming to this rostrum. The message states: "Please remind the sponsors of this resolution that North Koreans and Chinese murdered United Nations war prisoners during a forced death march . . ." That, as I have said, is a message I received a few minutes before I came to this rostrum.

387. It is my hope that the Assembly will waste little time in disproving these allegations. Let us hasten to put an end to this petty manoeuvre which, with its flagrant disregard of our most carefully considered actions, is an affront to this Assembly. I hope that we shall emphasize our complete rejection of this draft resolution by voting it down as decisively and as rapidly as possible.

388. Mr. KYROU (Greece): I hardly need state my delegation's position in regard to the Soviet Union draft resolution now before us. We can but oppose with disgust so nasty a propaganda device.

389. I shall be very brief in explaining the attitude of my delegation, for the very transparency of the whole manoeuvre relieves me of the necessity of expatiating on it.

390. One may wonder what is the ultimate aim of this knocking on the door of the General Assembly at this very late hour—literally *in extremis*. In this connexion, I should like very respectfully, to draw the attention of my fellow representatives to a curious coincidence which, in my humble submission, is certainly not fortuitous. The letter of the deputy head of the USSR delegation requesting the inclusion in the Assembly's agenda of what only by a euphemism can be called an item, was sent on the very day on which our President circulated his report (A/2354) of 20 December 1952, regarding the adamantly negative attitude of the Peiping and Pyongyang régimes towards the resolution of 3 December on non-forcible repatriation of the prisoners of war.

391. This intended coincidence—and, by the way, another chronological coincidence to be added to those enumerated by the United States representative—leaves, I think, no room for doubt that the aim of this last-hour trick was simply to shake the faith of the overwhelming majority of the United Nations—a majority of fifty-four out of the sixty Member States—in the justice of the aims of this resolution. The ruling circles of the Soviet Union apparently hope that by muddying the waters and injecting an element of confusion into the prisoner-of-war problem they can eventually mitigate the unfavourable impression that one is bound to derive from the cynical rejection by the Peiping and Pyongyang régimes of our proposal, the proposal, I repeat,

of fifty-four out of the sixty Member States, a proposal due to the generous initiative of a great Asian country.

392. In the last analysis, the Soviet Union propaganda attack is directed against the United Nations and not against the United States, as it is stated, or rather pretended, in the title of this so-called item. This fact is clearly borne out by the cable addressed on 14 December to the President of the General Assembly by the Foreign Minister of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. I beg leave to quote the following sentence from the cable in question (A/2354):

"Can it be that those delegates who sponsored and adopted the illegal resolution in the United Nations have really forgotten that the United Nations is one of the belligerent parties in the Korean war?"

393. May we be permitted to put this question of His Excellency, Mr. Chou En-lai, in a slightly changed form, to those of my colleagues who, in the First Committee, took the initiative of submitting or morally co-sponsoring the text that became the General Assembly's resolution of 3 December?

394. Can it be that you, gentlemen, have really forgotten that the United Nations is, in fact, as Mr. Gromyko has not hesitated to remind us, one of the belligerent parties in the Korean war and that it is fighting in Korea against aggression? Can it be that you, gentlemen, will accept without any protest the affront against the United Nations contained in the new so-called item submitted by the Soviet Union? Can it be that you, gentlemen, will permit yourselves to be taken in by this undisguised propaganda trick and that you will, by not categorically rejecting this slanderous proposal, contribute to the sapping of the moral value of our resolution, of your resolution? God forbid.

395. Mr. MENON (India): The General Committee and, later, the General Assembly, in according at this late hour its unanimous assent to the discussion of this problem on this last day of our Assembly session, records the concern of all of us, irrespective of the views held on this draft resolution, in regard to the general problem of Korea and of the treatment of prisoners.

396. It is not my intention to cover any of the ground that has been traversed by speakers on either side which does not strictly appertain to this draft resolution. This draft resolution—at least so it purports—deals with the disturbances that have occurred in some of the camps in Korea, where there have been casualties.

397. I think it is proper, appropriate and, perhaps, significant that the last item on which we should speak at this session of the General Assembly should be the problem of Korea, so that when we go home it will be part of our very serious and grave concern.

398. Irrespective of all the arguments pro and con, we cannot forget the fact that there has been a grievous incident, and we have to deal with this in terms of the Geneva Convention. If there has been one result above all others from the adoption of the resolution on Korea, it is that an overwhelming majority of the Assembly and even those who opposed the resolution—have affirmed their allegiance to the Convention.

399. The United States delegation has referred to the fact that there were no prisoners of war in these camps.

I am neither anxious nor able to contest this, nor am I desirous of doing so; it is not necessary to do so. But I should like to say—and this is by no means any condemnation since it would be very wrong to condemn without having the facts before one—that whoever these people are, they come under the Geneva Convention because the Geneva Convention, in article 4, definitely lays down, in relation to the treatment of civilians, that the persons protected by the Convention are those who at any given time in any manner whatsoever find themselves, in case of a conflict or occupation, in the hands of a party to the conflict, or of an occupying Power of which they are not nationals.

400. In the last sub-paragraph of that article, it exempts people covered by other sections of the Convention. I say this merely to point out that the concern of all of us must be to see that the terms of the Convention, as a rule of law, are observed. Since this matter has come before us, we appeal to those with the responsibility and the power to see that the matter is fully investigated in order that the peoples of the world will have confidence in our professions of support of the Geneva Convention.

401. It is a sad state of affairs when, in prisoner-of-war camps or anywhere else, the nationals of other countries who, as a result of hostilities, have come under the responsibility, care and control of the detaining Powers, should become subject to action which ends in killing.

402. This question has now come before us in this forum, and no effort should be spared to consider whether it was necessary to use force, whether the force used was warranted by the Geneva Convention and what further steps can be taken if, unfortunately, this war should continue, as it is continuing, to prevent any recurrence of this character. These occurrences, apart from the special views which various people may hold, have the effect of weakening the faith of the peoples of the world in the whole conception of the rule of law in regard to war prisoners. This is the main reason why we have intervened in this debate.

403. Reference has been made to the resolution that was adopted by the Assembly, which is no longer our resolution, and to its effect one way or another in regard to the rioting. It is not my intention to enter into a debate upon its merits or what it stands for, or to try to refute the various arguments that have been advanced. However, I cannot let this last day of the session pass without removing from the minds of people outside this hall an erroneous impression of what it stood for. Reference has been made to our being a rubber stamp. It would require a very large stamp to stamp us. Therefore, I reiterate, and I do not care very much what contradictions may continue to follow, that the resolution was an endeavour to obtain peace in Korea. I am sure that everyone will feel that if that effect had been achieved now, there would have been no prisoner-of-war camps and no riots. The ending of the war is the way to end the treatment of the prisoners of war, whether or not the facts alleged are true.

404. I should like to read what my Prime Minister stated in Parliament concerning the resolution:

"This resolution was based on certain principles which are based on the Geneva Convention, which lays down well-established principles on the practice

of international law on the subject. While voluntary repatriation would have been against these principles and was ruled out, it was stated that force shall not be used against prisoners of war to prevent or effect their return to their homelands and no violence to their persons or affront to their dignity or self-respect shall be permitted in any manner or for any purpose whatsoever."

405. Reference has also been made to China; it has been said that we have submitted proposals of which it had no knowledge. I took very good care in the course of the debate not to involve more parties than necessary, because our one concern was not to score a point in the debate but to make some contribution to peace. As to the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, it was not represented at the United Nations, but we communicated these principles to it at Peking on 2 November; we were not acting here for fifteen or seventeen days without the knowledge of those on whom this would have an impact. We were given to understand that the Central People's Government appreciated our attempt. While it made no commitment at all, there was no disapproval indicated. It made it clear, however, that it was entirely opposed to voluntary repatriation.

406. The Government of India, while greatly appreciating the wide support for the resolution received from a very large number of States Members of the United Nations, deeply regrets that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union Government have been unable to accept the resolution. That is our position. We still hope that on reconsideration, these governments will appreciate that the proposals contained in the resolution are fair and just, are based essentially on the Geneva Convention and on international law, and are not opposed in any way to the basic principles which they themselves put forward on earlier occasions.

407. The resolution is not mandatory. It is an honest attempt to find a solution to a problem which is endangering the peace of the entire world and the continuation of which has brought the utmost ruin and misery to the people of Korea.

408. It was not our intention to refer to this, but the debate has brought the subject into the discussion at this time. Even though at the present moment the resolution stands rejected by the Central People's Government, I believe we can permit ourselves to think that the discussions have had the effect of focusing the attention of the overwhelming majority of peoples and of governments of the world on the way of peace. They are aware of the Korean problem and of the efforts and the perseverance that must be exerted and all the work that must be done, whatever the obstructions; and that is the purpose that we have achieved so far. We admit that the purpose is not complete until the war in Korea is ended, but neither invective in this Assembly nor battle in Korea will bring about peace. Therefore, we continue to appeal; and as regards my Government and my people, we shall struggle in this direction.

409. As for the draft resolution itself, we shall not vote against it for the simple reason that it refers to prisoners of war. Equally, we cannot vote in favour of it because it refers to facts which are alleged and which have not been investigated, as far as we are

concerned. We have stated our position fully. We believe that any allegations of this type, however sound or however wild, must be investigated fully and thoroughly in fairness to the people who are responsible for the conduct of these places. The confidence of the people of the world must remain unshaken.

410. I should also like to take this opportunity of directing the attention of the Assembly, of the President, and of all those concerned, to the appeal that has been made by the Red Cross organizations for the immediate repatriation of the sick and wounded prisoners on both sides. The appeal has been made to the United Nations Command and to the Governments of the People's Republic of China and of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea that those who are wounded should be returned immediately in accordance with article 109 of the Convention.

411. With these words, I conclude my last statement to this Assembly.

412. Mr. JOHNSON (Canada): In the last hours of this part of the seventh session, we have suddenly been asked by the Soviet Union delegation to consider an item in terms which prejudice the issue completely.

413. In this and in preceding sessions of the General Assembly, we have seen a good many propaganda draft resolutions of one kind or another. By now we know their flavour rather well. But never, at least in my experience, have we been confronted with a more flagrant misuse of this great forum. Look at the way the question is put to us, and read the language of this draft resolution.

414. In our country, a man is innocent under the law until he is proved guilty. Would that that were so in our international proceedings.

415. This is an old communist technique. It has become so hackneyed in their repertory that it need not, I trust, detain us long. Nor will it have much effect on independent minds in free countries where the facts can be considered and discussed impartially. We can be quite certain that those who make these wild charges on the basis of second-hand information are in no position to draw conclusions from what little they have heard. But then, the object of this draft resolution is not to obtain facts; it is to falsify and distort them.

416. By all accounts, the incidents on Pongam were provoked by a carefully planned and fanatically executed riot on the part of the internees. It was no spur-of-the-moment disturbance. Was it a coincidence that it occurred on 14 December, the very day that the Chinese reply was sent to the President from Peking rejecting the United Nations proposals for bringing about an honourable settlement of the fighting in Korea and the disposition of the prisoner-of-war question?

417. Both in its substance and in its manner of presentation to this body, the Soviet Union draft resolution stands in sharp contrast to the General Assembly resolution dealing with the whole of the prisoner-of-war issue in the context of the armistice negotiations. After many weeks of considered debate and careful study, the General Assembly approved this resolution by an overwhelming majority. Originally sponsored by the Government of India, the resolution was subsequently supported by fifty-four of our Members. It

put forward constructive and workable proposals for resolving the deadlock on the prisoner-of-war question. It was adopted by this Assembly in the face of provocation and propaganda from the Soviet Union and its associates. If accepted by the Communists, its proposals would not only have enabled us to obtain a clearer picture of the conditions in the camps on both sides and of the attitudes of the prisoners of war on both sides than is now available; it would have stopped the fighting in Korea. It would have brought peace.

418. We already have ample evidence of the willingness of the Unified Command to investigate the charges which have been made over the past months concerning conditions in their camps. The Unified Command has welcomed and facilitated investigations of conditions in the camps under its control, and has assisted the efforts of the International Committee of the Red Cross to prepare reports on conditions in these camps during the Korean hostilities. But, on the communist side of the line, what is the situation? We remain in ignorance of the conditions under which United Nations forces are detained in camps under communist control. The facts have been concealed behind a wall of silence. They could be buried alive, but we would never hear a word about it. I wonder what would happen to our prisoners in communist hands if they descended on their guards singing patriotic songs, brandishing weapons and hurling rocks. There would be none of them left to report.

419. The General Assembly resolution on Korea was rejected by the Peking Government and by the North Korean authorities to whom it was communicated. This rejection is abundant proof that, despite their protestations, the Communists do not want to stop the fighting in Korea and are bending every effort to exploit the impasse which has been reached over the prisoner-of-war issue. The object of this Soviet Union move is to attempt to weaken and, if possible, to destroy the unity on the Korean question which has marked this seventh session. So far as we are concerned, that attempt will fail.

420. Mr. MUNRO (New Zealand); I found it impossible to divorce my consideration of this draft resolution from the language used by Mr. Gromyko in introducing it. I—and, I should imagine, most of us here—have been shocked by the allegations made by him tonight against United States officers in Korea and, indeed, elsewhere, for in making these allegations he is really indicting the American people. Is it not fantastic that charges of the most fearful enormities should be made against the representatives of a most kindly nation and against that very nation as well? I wonder whether Mr. Gromyko and those who speak with him believe that the peoples of the world who are free to think and to speak for themselves really believe the outrageous nonsense of which he has delivered himself tonight? Certainly not the people in my country or in any other country having liberty of expression. I think the Soviet Union representatives and their obedient followers should ponder over this aspect of the matter: that those who constantly seek to deceive and hoodwink others are finally themselves deceived.

421. I am sure many amongst us have noticed one aspect of the so-called explanation submitted in support of this item. Surely it is remarkable that the complaint presented to us here is based upon reports of United

States and British news agencies. One thing is therefore clear: that there has been no attempt by anyone to conceal the facts of the matter. On the contrary, they have been publicized in every newspaper in the world. When the representative of the Soviet Union quoted a Reuters dispatch, it was noticeable that he ignored many of the points contained in the news which was supplied by Reuters, that he made no reference whatever to the studious planning of this revolt in the prisoner-of-war camps.

422. The Soviet Union draft resolution calls for the condemnation of criminal acts. I think that everyone will agree that a criminal's first thought is to conceal his crime. Surely there is great significance in the fact that, were it not for the publicity which the Unified Command has freely permitted, this item could never have been brought before us. There is, of course, nothing unusual about this publicity. We know—and all know—what goes on in the camps administered by the Unified Command. The International Red Cross has access at all times to these camps. On the other hand, it has been mentioned before in the course of this debate—and I think it should be mentioned again—that we know absolutely nothing of what goes on in the camps administered by the North Korean and Chinese communist authorities. The attempts which have been made in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Convention to secure the inspection of communist prisoner-of-war camps in Korea have met with a flat rejection. Had this incident occurred in the communist camp, we should have known nothing whatever about it.

423. Have we heard, either, any member of the communist bloc mention the Geneva Convention in this respect? They have emphasized that that Convention should be strictly observed. If there is a revolt in a prisoner-of-war camp, surely, by the terms of the Convention, the controlling authority has the duty to suppress it.

424. I shall not attempt to examine at any length the facts of this matter. The events that occurred on 14 December, the organized attacks by fanatical prisoners on the United Nations guards who were forced to open fire in self-defence, followed a regrettably familiar pattern. All the evidence points to the fact that uprisings of this kind are cold-bloodedly planned to influence and, indeed, to hoodwink world public opinion.

425. The tactics which the Soviet Union has followed in raising this matter immediately after the abrupt rejection of peace proposals endorsed by the great majority in this Assembly, and the openly propagandistic language of the draft resolution placed before us are plain signs that the motives of its sponsors are as suspect as their version of the facts. We all deplore the fact that the use of force should have been necessary to maintain discipline in United Nations prisoner-of-war camps. It is even more regrettable that the tragic results of deliberately incited lawlessness should be so shamelessly exploited in an attempt to secure a propaganda victory. But this attempt, I make bold to say, will not disturb the confidence of free peoples in the integrity and humanity of the United States officers in the Unified Command.

426. That the desperate attempt shown in this draft resolution should have been made at this late stage

in our deliberations shows, my delegation believes, that even the Soviet Union feels the weakness of its position in regard to this Assembly's proposals for bringing about peace in Korea. My delegation feels confident that free opinion everywhere will not be deceived by this manoeuvre, and in that confidence we shall vote against the draft resolution.

427. Mr. KISELYOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The peoples of the world have been shocked by the monstrous evil deeds committed by the American aggressors on Pongam Island. It was stated in a radio communication that at 1 p.m. on 14 December of this year the camp guards killed 82 and wounded 120 Korean and Chinese prisoners of war. The American interventionists are committing crimes in Korea which overshadow the most monstrous manifestations of brutality, banditry and terror the world has ever known.

428. We have all heard Mr. Acheson boast here that United States armed forces had killed and wounded one and a half million Koreans since the beginning of the war. That figure, which was quoted by the Americans themselves, should be known to all peace-loving peoples. The same fate awaits all other peoples, unless we put an end to such bloody misdeeds in good time.

429. The United States soldiery on Pongam Island has overshadowed and outstripped the crimes and murders previously committed on Koje Island. This monstrous butchery was perpetrated, according to the camp commandant, for the sole reason that the prisoners of war were singing songs. This is how the special correspondent of *The New York Times*, Robert Alden, described this mass shooting of unarmed prisoners on 17 December. I quote:

"At 12.30 p.m." on Sunday "the prisoners in F Compound massed on a high ledge of their enclosure looking down on their guards. They linked arms and began to sing forbidden songs . . . One hundred and seventy extra Korean troops and forty Americans were rushed to the lower edge of Compound F. They stood with fixed bayonets and loaded rifles just below the singing prisoners. Colonel Miller was at their head.

"Orders were shouted for the prisoners to stop their singing. They only sang louder and louder . . .

"[Miller] ordered the American troops to fire one round with shot-guns at the prisoners. The round was fired but the singing now had been taken up by all the compounds . . . The Colonel ordered another round fired. The singing continued.

"Colonel Miller ordered fifty South Korean soldiers and forty Americans to fire with rifles and carbines into the massed ranks in Compound F. At the same time a .30-calibre machine-gun was fired from a nearby tower into Compound B. At first the fire had little effect on the fanatics. Forced to their knees by their wounds, they kept singing . . . But when the second round of firing was ordered and bullets ploughed into the compounds, cutting many down, the singing began to die out . . .

"The whole action lasted fifty-five minutes."

430. This is how the correspondent of a leading newspaper describes these unheard of misdeeds of the American monsters. Public opinion throughout the world

has been shocked by these monstrous new crimes of the aggressors. The Press indignantly censures this barbarous shooting of prisoners. Thus, for example, on 17 December of this year, the British newspaper *Daily Mirror* wrote: "Will no one tell Clark that these terrible killings are just intolerable? We are told this time that the butchery was due to rioting, but this appears to be nothing but a pretext." This is what the newspaper *Daily Mirror* says. You are fully aware of its political orientation. We know very well that these daily butcheries of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war are due to the fact that they resist interrogation and screening and wish to return to their own countries.

431. Murder, torture and mass terrorism are the methods whereby the United States military command is trying to force prisoners of war to become traitors to their countries, American hirelings and soldiers of those contemptible murderers, Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek. All those who do not agree to such proposals are simply killed. The brutal atrocities perpetrated against prisoners of war on Koje Island, Cheju Island, at Pusan and other places, as also the latest mass killing of prisoners on Pongam Island, are all links in the long chain of monstrous crimes of the United States military command, which has taken the well known course of hitlerite terrorism and mass murder of prisoners of war.

432. The latest events on Pongam Island have made such a great impression on world public opinion that even the United Kingdom Government, according to the *New York Herald Tribune* of 18 December 1952, has asked the United States for a detailed report on the disturbances on Pongam Island, as a result of which 82 prisoners of war were killed.

433. Speaking here, Mr. Lloyd attempted to white-wash this monstrous terror against prisoners of war on Pongam Island. He came out as the advocate of the United States Command in Korea and took it completely under his protection. As we see, however, he did not confer with Mr. Nutting, the United Kingdom Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, who made a statement absolutely contrary to that Mr. Lloyd made today from this rostrum. Mr. Nutting said that the United Kingdom should propose the transfer of the control and administration of prisoner-of-war camps from the United States of America to some other country. That was a statement by an official representative of the United Kingdom Government. Before making his statements here, Mr. Lloyd should at least read what his colleague in the government says.

434. Mr. Hale, a Labour Member of Parliament, speaking in the House of Commons on the use of machine-guns by the Americans in shooting the prisoners, said that that unprecedented incident had done great harm to the Western Powers in Asia and asked how long British troops would continue to serve in places where similar incidents might occur. These are official statements by a representative of a government which is itself actively participating in the aggressive war in Korea.

435. These brutal atrocities against Korean and Chinese prisoners of war serve as proof of the fact that United States ruling circles do not wish to put an end to the war in Korea and are doing everything in their power to prolong it. The United States command

in Korea has turned the prisoner-of-war camps into death camps. This is not a term used at random—or a rhetorical figure, but an accurate reflection of the facts.

436. In their attempt to justify their principle of so-called "voluntary repatriation" the United States interventionists continue to this day their forcible interrogation and screening of prisoners of war, forcing them to sign with their blood statements of allegedly voluntary repatriation; they are forcibly branding the prisoners, tattooing them and compelling them to become traitors to their countries.

437. The British newspaper *Daily Express* of 16 December contained the following statement:

"Only three years have passed since the United States and the United Kingdom signed a convention in Geneva on the treatment of prisoners of war. This convention unequivocally states that prisoners of war should be released and repatriated immediately upon the cessation of hostilities."

How can the British and the Americans justify the detention of all the prisoners of war who should be repatriated? I do not think that the *Daily Express* can be accused of pro-Soviet sympathies. These statements in the British and American Press make it clear that the American soldiery in Korea has suffered a great defeat and that that is why it is behaving so brutally.

438. The echo of the volleys has spread around the world and has been heard by the peoples of all countries. These volleys have shown not the strength, but the weakness, of the American aggressors; they have shown the strength and invincibility of the heroic people which has produced such stalwart and loyal sons of their country. No brutalities and threats by the United States can intimidate and conquer the freedom-loving little Korean people, which is fighting so heroically for its freedom and independence.

439. When he spoke from this rostrum, Mr. Gross did not deny the killings which have taken place on Pongam Island, but tried to attribute the USSR delegation's action in raising the question to a desire to make propaganda for its own ends. This is the purest slander and falsehood, which no special proof is even needed to refute. The facts point to the opposite: prisoners have been shot, killed, terrorized and so on, and that fact is known to the whole world.

440. The question naturally arises why the United States command is brutally persecuting prisoners of war who, as Mr. Gross states, are demanding repatriation to their motherland. Why does the United States side refuse, without any reason, to accept the just proposal made by the Korean side on the basis of generally recognized international conventions? The reason is that the United States is persistently repudiating and disregarding the 1949 Geneva Convention, article 13 of which reads:

"Prisoners of war must at all times be humanely treated. Any unlawful act or omission by the Detaining Power causing death or seriously endangering the health of a prisoner of war in its custody is prohibited and will be regarded as a serious breach of the present Convention. In particular, no prisoner of war may be subjected to physical mutilation or to medical or scientific experiments of any kind which

are not justified by the medical, dental or hospital treatment of the prisoner concerned and carried out in his interest.

"Likewise, prisoners of war must at all times be protected, particularly against acts of violence or intimidation and against insults and public curiosity.

"Measures of reprisal against prisoners of war are prohibited."

441. It is obvious that United States ruling circles and the United States command in Korea are not fulfilling the terms of this convention. The whole world is aware of this. Following the instructions of its Government, the United States command has on the contrary adopted a policy of clear disregard for this convention, because it knows it can act with impunity. For the purpose of detaining Korean and Chinese prisoners of war in order to hand them over later to the Syngman Rhee and Kuomintang clique and use them as cannon fodder, the United States command has begun to resort to the most brutal treatment of prisoners of war, to the mass torture and murder of Korean and Chinese prisoners.

442. In corroboration of this, I shall give a few examples, which are mainly taken from the United States Press. For example, in its issue of 23 May 1952, the periodical *U. S. News & World Report* stated: "Violence occurred many times, twice on a large scale. On February 18, 78 persons were killed and a great many wounded in a communist uprising . . . A dozen more rioters were killed the following month".

443. The Associated Press correspondent, Mr. Jordan, also reported on 26 May 1952 that, according to informed circles, the most serious clash occurred in the period between 16 and 20 September, when a hundred prisoners of war were injured, fifteen of them fatally. Dozens of prisoners of war who were sent to hospital were severely beaten and as a result fifteen later died on reaching hospital. In an attempt to restore order, guards shot fourteen persons. Twenty-two persons received bayonet wounds.

444. In a special report submitted to the House of Representatives on 10 June 1952, even the United States Secretary of the Army, Mr. Pace, admitted that 182 prisoners of war had been killed and 570 injured between 8 June 1951 and 20 May 1952 and that on 18 February 1952 alone, 75 prisoners of war were killed and 139 injured. That in a single day.

445. Those reports alone are enough to paint a ghastly picture of the murder and torture of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war. The fragmentary information which has reached and still reaches us indicates that death lay in wait for every prisoner of war every day, every hour and every minute. Not a day or night passed but prisoners of war perished. The United States guards, armed to the teeth, searched and still search the camps, perpetrated and still perpetrate acts of brutality.

446. As the information I have quoted indicates, United States official representatives have admitted that the killing of prisoners of war and forcible screening have taken place. The *Washington Post* reported on 13 May 1952, that a senior United States officer had in fact confirmed that the treatment of prisoners of war on Koje was inhuman, had promised to end interrogation for the purpose of ascertaining whether

or not prisoners desired repatriation, and had hinted that prisoners were being armed. This is an official statement by senior United States officers.

447. The assertion by the United States side that a proportion of the officers and other ranks who have been taken prisoners do not wish to return to a peaceful life in their motherland, but on the contrary to remain as refugees in South Korea, is completely contrary to the facts and without foundation. The question naturally arises why you are persecuting and murdering prisoners of war who are alleged to be so anxious to remain in your hands. Why are you murdering prisoners of war and forcibly compelling them to sign with their blood statements that they wish to remain on your side of their own free will? Why are you subjecting them to tattooing and fingerprinting? That would appear to be unnecessary. But the whole world is aware of the horrors which are being perpetrated in the prisoner-of-war camps. The United States side has itself admitted that of 176,000 prisoners of war, 83,000 have expressed a desire for repatriation, while the remainder allegedly do not desire repatriation. I have already stated that this is a lie.

448. On the contrary, despite cruel torture and ill-treatment, all prisoners of war wish to return to their motherland and the monstrous events which have occurred on Pongam Island bear this out.

449. What is the reason for the unwillingness of the United States to repatriate the remaining North Korean and Chinese prisoners of war? The reason is that United States ruling circles do not wish to end the war in Korea and to sign an armistice. This is obvious to the whole world.

450. Even the organ of Netherlands big business circles, the *Algemeen Dagblad*, wrote on 12 February 1952 that it was becoming obvious that the Americans were deliberately prolonging the armistice talks and desired the continuation of the war.

451. An interesting statement appeared in the British newspaper *The People* on 8 June 1952 to the effect that armistice talks had been in progress for many months and had finally broken down solely on account of the refusal of the United Nations—in reality of the United States—to agree to a complete exchange of prisoners of war.

452. Further, *The New York Times* pointed out in a leading article on 7 June 1952 that "the Geneva Convention provides that 'prisoners of war shall be released and repatriated without delay after the cessation of hostilities.'" All this goes to show that the United States Government's refusal to accept the just proposal of the Korean side, a proposal based on generally accepted international agreements, and to conclude an armistice in Korea, is quite unjustified.

453. United States ruling circles are attempting to conceal from the peoples their policy of prolonging the war in Korea. The prolongation of the war is inflicting untold suffering and hardship on the Korean people and has given rise to tension in the Far East and throughout the world. This war is unquestionably profitable to United States firms and monopolies, since it increases war production and results in colossal profits.

454. It should be noted that United States aggression in Korea represents one of the stages in the policy

of preparing a new world war which the United States Government has been pursuing since the Second World War. The Korean war is of interest especially to the United States monopolists, who frankly state that the United States cannot escape impending economic crisis unless its economy receives support in the form of enormous expenditure on armaments. That explains why the United States command is not striving for a speedy settlement of the Korean war by peaceful means and is still behaving so brutally.

455. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR appeals to representatives in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly to call upon the United States command in Korea to stop the mass shooting of prisoners of war, the torturing and ill-treatment of unarmed people, the practice of forced signatures, threats, and the desecration of human dignity, and to guarantee human rights and life to prisoners of war in accordance with international law.

456. We must call for the strict punishment of the United States war criminals in accordance with the norms of international law and the dictates of human conscience, so that there shall be no repetition of the inhuman crimes of the United States war criminals, who are flagrantly flouting the norms of international law and of human ethics.

457. The Byelorussian delegation calls upon the plenary meeting of the General Assembly to adopt the USSR draft resolution, which would bring to an end the bloody misdeeds in Korea. This is what the peoples of the whole world are demanding and we must listen to the voice of the peoples of the whole world.

458. Mr. BARANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The peoples of the world have learned with indignation of the new crime perpetrated by the United States military command in Korea. A further evil deed has been added to the innumerable evil deeds of the American interventionists. As has already been pointed out, 82 more Korean and Chinese prisoners of war were killed and 120 wounded by the American guards on 14 December 1952 in the United States camp on Pongam Island. It has been irrefutably established that the shootings on Pongam Island, like the atrocities committed against prisoners of war on Koje Island and Cheju Island, at Pusan and in other United States camps in Korea, are aimed at the systematic extermination of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war by the United States armed forces. The annihilation of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war is being carried out according to a plan, with the knowledge and encouragement of the United States high command in Korea. As the *New York Herald Tribune* reported recently, Colonel Caldwell, the commander of the United States forces responsible for guarding prisoner-of-war camps in Korea, sanctioned the brutality against prisoners of war. He cynically stated that the camp commander had not used more armed force than was required.

459. In a statement at the current session of the General Assembly we have already drawn attention to the report of the International Committee of the Red Cross exposing the crimes committed by United States military authorities against Korean and Chinese prisoners of war. Today the representative of the

United States termed this exposure criticism and said that the defects in the prisoner-of-war camps had been remedied. It is not, however, a question of defects in the prisoner-of-war camps. The Red Cross Committee's report speaks of the systematic mass killing of prisoners of war.

460. A few days ago the International Committee of the Red Cross published a further statement based on the study of additional facts about the brutalities committed by United States soldiers against Korean and Chinese prisoners of war. In that statement the Red Cross Committee drew attention to the fact that the actions of the United States command in Korea were directly contrary to the Geneva Convention on prisoners of war and in particular to article 42, which prohibits the use of weapons against prisoners of war. The United States delegation has tried to conceal this statement in the same way as, on its orders, the International Red Cross Committee's report—to which earlier speakers have referred—was previously concealed by the Secretariat.

461. In defiance of the generally recognized norms of international law and in flagrant violation of the requirements of the Geneva Convention on prisoners of war, the United States armed forces in Korea are still inflicting atrocities on Korean and Chinese prisoners in an attempt to induce them to refuse to be repatriated. According to official United States figures alone, 542 Korean and Chinese prisoners of war were killed and wounded in American camps in Korea in October and November, that is to say while the General Assembly was spending more than six weeks discussing the Korean question. Dozens of new victims of arbitrary American action in the prisoner-of-war camps in Korea were added to their number in December. Literally not a day passes without additional murders and shootings being added to the list of evil deeds perpetrated by the United States interventionists against prisoners of war. Even against the background of the brutal occurrences on Koje Island, the crimes committed on 14 December by the United States military authorities in the camp on Pongam Island are remarkable for their extreme brutality and unheard of cruelty.

462. The United States representative has tried to distort the facts which gave rise to the bloody occurrences on Pongam Island. Let us consider what really happened, as against the United States representative's false assertions. When the Korean and Chinese prisoners of war on Pongam Island were "interrogated" and reclassified as civilians they demanded to be repatriated. The United States guards at the camp replied to this lawful demand, based on the provisions of the Geneva Convention, with machine-gun fire. The prisoners who fell under the fire were finished off by the guards.

463. The United States representative was unable to refute a single one of the accusations in the USSR representative's statement. He simply tried to brush the accusations aside, because there is nothing that the ruling circles in the United States can say to justify themselves. With cynical cold-bloodedness, the United States representative enumerated all the measures taken in United States camps to crush the protests of the prisoners of war. He said, with obvious

regret, that the American butchers had been unable to suffocate the prisoners of war on Pongam Island with gas and that the United States guards at the camp had therefore resorted to firing on the prisoners of war. He repeated once again the assertion, frequently made by the United States delegation in the First Committee during the discussion of the Korean question, that the Korean and Chinese prisoners do not want to be repatriated and are demanding protection against repatriation. We have indicated the falsity of such assertions and have cited many facts to show that in truth the Korean and Chinese prisoners of war are demanding repatriation. The events on Pongam Island are only a further proof that prisoners of war are being forcibly detained in the United States camps.

464. The events on Pongam Island expose still more clearly the barbarous measures which United States ruling circles use in order to detain the prisoners of war and prevent their repatriation. These events are a further proof that the so-called voluntary repatriation carried out by the United States military authorities in Korea is really an arbitrary and gross attempt to coerce the prisoners of war and is accompanied by brutal retaliation against those prisoners who protest against being kept prisoner by force.

465. The courageous and stalwart Korean and Chinese patriots have fought and are fighting with all their strength and every means at their disposal against the United States command's violation of their right to repatriation. This opposition by the prisoners of war to their enforced detention by the American butchers cannot be suppressed by any of these violent measures, whether killings or shootings, which have long since eclipsed the brutalities of the hitlerite régime.

466. In his attempt today to whitewash the United States Government, the United States representative only confirmed the fact that the mass brutalities and the atrocious shootings of prisoners of war in the camps were not confined to Pongam Island, but were the policy of United States ruling circles. The shooting of prisoners of war, the killing of civilian population, the barbarous bombing by United States aircraft of defenceless and peaceful towns, villages and even isolated huts in Korea, the provocative raids and shelling of the neutral zone where the armistice talks were being conducted and, finally, the provocative attacks on the representatives of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea at the talks are all part and parcel of the plan for the mass extermination of the Korean people which is being carried out by United States ruling circles. The atrocities against Korean and Chinese prisoners of war and the extermination of the civilian population indicate the desire of those who direct United States foreign policy to do everything within their power to continue this ruthless war, which is in the interest of the United States monopolists.

467. The United States representative resorted to a worn-out and hackneyed stratagem. He characterized the USSR delegation's demand that the General Assembly should consider the mass shooting of prisoners of war on Pongam Island as propaganda. This time, however, the United States Government cannot escape responsibility.

468. Apparently attempting in that way to support its long-time partner, the United Kingdom delegation tried by tactless evasions and crude, misplaced mirth, which rang out cynically in the discussion of such a vital question, to interrupt the USSR representative's statement. By his behaviour today the United Kingdom representative betrayed his delegation's concern at the events on Pongam Island. The concern is not surprising, since reports in even the reactionary British Press show that the popular masses in the United Kingdom are demanding of their rulers why the United Kingdom Government, one of the partners in the aggression in Korea, is permitting the systematic extermination of Korean and Chinese prisoners in the United States camps in Korea.

469. The bloody events on Pongam Island have been given world-wide publicity. They have provoked the indignation of the world and a clearly unfavourable reaction even among ruling circles in countries engaged in the aggression in Korea. It is well-known by now that under the pressure of public opinion three leading United Kingdom newspapers demanded an investigation of the shooting of prisoners of war on Pongam Island. My colleague, Mr. Kiselyov, has already referred to the statement by the United Kingdom Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the House of Commons. According to the *New York Herald Tribune*, Mr. Nutting even demanded, in connexion with the atrocities perpetrated on Pongam Island, that control over the prisoner-of-war camps in Korea should be taken from the United States and given to some other country.

470. I would ask the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom whether they consider that the discussion in the British Parliament of the evil deeds of the United States soldiery is Soviet propaganda too. Does Mr. Lloyd really maintain that his very close colleague—the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs—was speaking under the influence of Soviet propaganda?

471. All this idle talk of propaganda is obviously intended to distract world public opinion from the crimes perpetrated by United States soldiers in the prisoner-of-war camps in Korea and to enable the ruling circles of the United States, the United Kingdom and the other American partners in the aggression in Korea to evade responsibility for the crimes committed against the Chinese and Korean prisoners of war. The same intention underlay today's statements by the representatives of other countries participating in the United States aggression in Korea. The representatives of these aggressive countries—and they alone—have come forward unanimously to the defence of their senior partner, while at the same time disclaiming responsibility for the crimes committed by United States forces in Korea with the participation of their smaller allies.

472. The Turkish representative called the Soviet Union's charge that the United States command in Korea was guilty of the mass murder of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war an "affront" to all the countries fighting in Korea. We do not quarrel with that. It is obviously quite correct. In fact, the crimes committed in Korea are the responsibility not only of the United States Government, but also of the govern-

ments of those countries which to the best of their ability have helped the United States in its systematic extermination of prisoners of war and civilians in Korea. The aggressors will more than once have call to remember this responsibility.

473. The broad masses of the people in many countries have been seized with indignation at the evil deeds of the United States military authorities in Korea. They demand that the brutalities against Chinese and Korean prisoners of war should stop and that the persons responsible for the crimes perpetrated on Pongam Island should be called to strict account.

474. The United Nations, in whose name the United States aggressors are waging the Korean war, cannot ignore the events on Pongam Island or wash its hands of the atrocities which the United States military authorities are committing against prisoners of war under the United Nations flag.

475. The USSR delegation, voicing the demands of the Soviet people, has brought before the General Assembly the question of the mass killing of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war by the United States military authorities on the island of Pongam. The USSR delegation feels that this question is undeniably urgent and important in view of its nature and international significance and it therefore proposed that it should be considered without delay, regardless of the time.

476. The Ukrainian delegation whole-heartedly supported that proposal and it fully and unconditionally supports the USSR draft resolution on this question, which provides for consideration of the criminal activities of the United States authorities in Korea with regard to prisoners of war and insists that the United States Government should take immediate steps to put an end to the brutalities against Korean and Chinese prisoners of war and call those guilty of the crimes to strict account. Anyone sincerely desirous of restoring peace in Korea and of seeing an end to the reprisals of which the prisoners of war are victims will vote in favour of the USSR draft resolution.

477. Mr. HOPPENOT (France) (*translated from French*): I would not be speaking at so late—or rather so early—an hour were it not for the fear that my silence might be construed as some sort of hesitation on my part to associate myself with the statements made by various speakers in support of the position taken by the United States delegation some hours ago.

478. This afternoon, in the General Committee [85th meeting], Mr. Gromyko told us that he was basing himself only on official American documents and articles which had appeared in the American Press. If there is one thing of which I am sure, it is that, if events such as those he is denouncing were taking place in the camps of Chinese and North Korean prisoners of war, we would not learn of them through official documents or through the Press of Peking, Pyongyang or even Moscow. Convincing proof of that is the deep silence and oblivion surrounding the fate of so many Italian, Japanese and even French prisoners who found themselves in Soviet prison camps as a result of the last world war. In other words, the free nations which we represent are not afraid to discuss the question

which the USSR delegation has brought before us for what are only too clearly propaganda purposes. I say only too clearly propaganda purposes, because if the Soviet Union delegation really wanted to shed light on the events which it is denouncing by distorting them and to prevent a recurrence of them, it would have approached the problem from a different angle.

479. This question of prisoners of war is a complex and distressing problem. As Mr. Lloyd stated, it arises in Korea in especially difficult circumstances, which leave the United Nations authorities no choice but to take certain steps which may be criticized and, sometimes, regretted. But we are certain that those authorities, which have thrown the camps open to inspection by the International Red Cross, heed all that criticism and that the United States authorities, which bear the burden of that responsibility on behalf of the United Nations, know how to correct the errors brought to their attention.

480. Like the representative of the United Kingdom and like the great majority in this Assembly, we feel confident that the United States authorities, in exercising their authority over the prisoners, will temper their responsibility for the maintenance of order in the camps with the humanitarian duties imposed upon them by the Geneva Convention not only towards prisoners of war, strictly speaking, but also towards civilian internees or prisoners taken during guerilla operations. I am sure that when the United States delegation explained in the General Committee, and again here a little while ago, that the prisoners whose deaths were reported recently were not, strictly speaking, prisoners of war but civilians, it was not attempting to evade the responsibility of the authorities, under the Geneva Conventions, to treat civilians brought into prisoner-of-war camps with the same humanity and the same respect for their obligations under the Convention as other prisoners.

481. These considerations will explain the position of my delegation on the USSR draft resolution. When we hear the representative of the Soviet Union claim, as he did recently, that 4,000 Korean and Chinese prisoners have been sent to the United States to serve as guinea-pigs in atomic experiments, that accusation, the vileness of which is exceeded only by its absurdity, clearly shows us how the USSR delegation, waging a propaganda of pure hatred, intends to exploit events which should, or which perhaps must, be impartially investigated but which should not be used to arouse hatred in such a debate as this.

482. The French delegation could not become a party to such exploitation and it will therefore vote against the USSR draft resolution.

483. Mr. RAFAEL (Israel): The exhaustive deliberations on the question of Korea during this session of the General Assembly seemed to indicate that the question of the prisoners of war was the only obstacle to the attainment of peace in Korea. The delegation of Israel joined with fifty-three other nations represented in this Organization in support of a resolution which contained all the elements necessary to bring about a just and swift solution of this thorny problem. Its rejection by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and by the North Korean

authorities is one of the most saddening acts and a blow to peace of far-reaching significance. The responsibility for the continued suffering, devastation, bloodshed and prolonged detention of the prisoners of war lies squarely on those who rejected that resolution. The implementation of that resolution would have resulted in the early release and repatriation of the prisoners and the complete restoration of peace. No demonstrations, no uprisings and no use of force would have been necessary. As much as we deplore the loss of life in these latest incidents, even more are we incensed by the fact that, day by day, more lives are sacrificed and vaster devastation is spread over the unhappy land of Korea, for the sole reason that a group of States refused to heed the appeal of the overwhelming majority of the United Nations and of the nations of the world, which have offered an honourable, just and practical solution to end the war in Korea.

484. The combination of fact and fiction contained in the charges hurled from this rostrum against the Unified Command, and the timing and nature of their presentation, preclude any possibility of their serious consideration.

485. My delegation welcomes the decision of the Unified Command to conduct an investigation of the prisoner riots. Before all the facts and details are known, it would be premature to draw any conclusion. And certainly it would be a matter of utter irresponsibility and injustice to subscribe to the conclusions expressed in the speeches and in the draft resolution submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union.

486. My delegation hopes that the Assembly will dispose of this dark chapter of charges and recrimination and will concentrate all its thoughts and efforts in the weeks to come on one goal alone: the attainment of peace in Korea.

487. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): On the instructions of the Soviet Union Government, the USSR delegation has submitted for the consideration of the General Assembly the question of the mass murder of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war by the United States military authorities on the island of Pongam. The USSR delegation has explained why this question should be treated as a matter of urgency. It drew the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that the mass murders of Chinese and Korean prisoners of war in American camps represent a systematic attempt to annihilate the prisoners of war, as is shown by the numerous atrocities committed by the United States military authorities upon the persons of prisoners of war in the camps on the islands of Koje, Cheju and Pongam, and at Pusan and other places.

488. The discussion of this question has shown, in the first place, that objections to our proposal have been raised by the United States, the country which is conducting the intervention in Korea and waging the aggressive war that it has imposed upon the Korean people. Objections have also been raised by those participating with the United States in the aggressive war in Korea. I shall not enumerate them, for you all know them. But were those speakers openly supported by other countries which are not taking part

in the Korean war? The truth is that, judging by results, the Government of the United States, and those participating with the United States in the Korean war, can by no means be said to have won this debate. It is to no purpose that these gentlemen strut and swagger, pretending that it is they who have come out the winners.

489. A characteristic feature in the case of all of them was that they attempted to evade the question raised by the Soviet Union. They spoke about everything of which they had, or thought they had, any knowledge. The French representative, for example, went so far as to make quite absurd allegations to the effect that there are Japanese, German and even French prisoners of war in the Soviet Union, in spite of the fact that this question has no relation to the agenda item we are now discussing in the General Assembly. Perhaps the reason for this is the lateness of the hour. Of that I am unable to judge: the French representative knows better than I.

490. What did the representative of the United States tell us? It was obvious that he was reading out to us a text previously prepared for him by the competent persons acquainted with the facts of the case. With business-like accuracy, he methodically explained the factual situation, describing how the crimes were prepared against the Chinese and Korean prisoners of war on the island of Pongam. He was in no way perturbed by the fact that the result of all these preparations was that 82 persons were killed and more than 100 wounded. That aspect of the matter was evidently of no interest to him; what he was interested in were the details of the manner in which all this was planned.

491. I wonder whether delegates have given due attention to the fact that, as the American representative emphasized in his speech, it was the opinion of the American military authorities that the Korean and Chinese prisoners of war—whom, contrary to the facts of the situation, the American representatives refuse to call prisoners of war—were only preparing to run away, that in reality no attempt to escape was made and there was no act of indiscipline: there were only a number of signs indicating that the prisoners intended to run away. And it was to prevent that escape that guns were used, it was for that reason that machine-guns were posted and brought into use.

492. We are not surprised that the representative of India did not associate himself with that point of view. And even the representative of France—though shamefacedly, timidly and irresolutely—began that part of his speech which was relevant to the subject by saying that the Geneva Convention contains absolutely no justification for such actions against prisoners of war.

493. What is to be said about that part of the United States representative's speech which dealt with the substance of the USSR proposal? He called the proposal propaganda. These tactics are familiar to us. Like the Government of the United States of America, whenever the American representatives in the United Nations have their backs to the wall and have no argument of substance to adduce against any of the assertions made, more particularly by the USSR delegation, all they can produce is the standardized and stereotyped phrase: "That is Soviet propaganda." Can we describe the fact that 82 people have been killed as propaganda?

Is it propaganda if more than 100 Korean and Chinese prisoners of war have been wounded? This is no propaganda, but the truth.

494. When I speak these words, some representatives—belonging to the United States, United Kingdom and some other delegations—try to force a smile. Those are not new tactics, however. We are all aware that your smiles are forced and affected; that they are put on for demonstration purposes, and no more; and that in actual fact your mood is far from cheerful.

495. The representative of the United States affirmed that the purpose of the USSR draft resolution was to slander the United States. But what do we refer to in our draft resolution, in our statement, in the explanatory memorandum which we distributed with the appropriate letter from the USSR delegation [A/2355]? We state that the American military authorities in Korea are engaged in systematic murder, not to speak of the acts of violence and terror, upon the persons of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war. We have tried to adduce the facts. Those who are willing to listen to those facts cannot ignore them. When, however, we adduce these facts, giving the corresponding figures, we are told that all this is propaganda. If that is propaganda, it is difficult to find words with which to describe a crime against the elementary, generally admitted principles of international law, a crime which is committed every day by the American militarists on Korean soil against both the civilian population and the Chinese and Korean prisoners of war.

496. In that part of his speech in which he endeavoured to show that, in raising the question of prisoners of war, the USSR delegation was wrong because the prisoners involved were civilians, the United States representative—to put it mildly—did not speak the truth, a circumstance to which I have already drawn attention in connexion with the United States representative's speech in the General Committee [85th meeting]. The fact is that prisoners of war were called civilians by the American military authorities, or—as the said authorities cunningly describe the operation—the prisoners of war were "reclassified" as civilians. The prisoners of war have not stopped being prisoners of war on that account, however.

497. The statement of the representative of the United States at this meeting, like those made by the Secretary of State of the United States of America in the First Committee [512th meeting] and in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly [380th meeting] at the beginning of our session, shows that the ruling circles and Government of the United States of America do not want to stop the war in Korea, although from their words it would appear that they too are striving to achieve a settlement of the Korean question. We have every reason to describe such statements as false and hypocritical, as statements calculated to mislead public opinion in the United States and elsewhere.

498. Let me say a few words about the speech of the United Kingdom representative. Mr. Lloyd has already spoken a number of times about the visit he made to the prisoner-of-war camps in Korea. We heard his accounts in the First Committee [515th meeting] when the Korean question was discussed. It is very strange, however, that we have received from these communications no information deserving of attention

which would contribute towards a solution of the Korean question or even of that part of the Korean question which has to do with prisoners of war. It may be that the American military authorities did not admit the United Kingdom representative to the most interesting places in Korea. Perhaps that is the reason for the meagreness of the information revealed to us by the United Kingdom representative in the First Committee during the discussion of the Korean question and at this plenary meeting of the General Assembly during the discussion of the USSR proposal.

499. We have analysed on an earlier occasion three examples adduced by the United Kingdom representative in the First Committee. If these examples prove anything, however, they prove only that as a result of his journey to Korea the representative of the United Kingdom Government received no information which would bear out to any extent the correctness of the attitude of the Government of the United States of America with regard to the need for the forcible detention of the majority of the Chinese and Korean prisoners of war in Korea.

500. How does public opinion react to the Soviet Union proposal, and, consequently to the attitude adopted by the other Powers who object to it? The representative of the United Kingdom touched upon this question. We also know something about how public opinion reacts towards the Soviet Union's attitude, towards the attitude of the USSR Government and the Soviet State, which has firmly and consistently supported the cause of peace, and has stood for the settlement of the Korean question from the very beginning of the war in Korea. We know something, for example, about the attitude adopted in China. Let Mr. Lloyd ask the Chinese what opinion the Chinese people has of the USSR Government's proposal and of the attitude adopted by the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom.

501. It seems to me that if the situation is approached objectively, the conclusion to be drawn is not at all to the advantage of the Government of the United Kingdom, for the truth of the matter is that the Chinese people has—if the expression may be used—piled up mountains of hatred against the aggressors, against those who committed the bloody aggression against the Korean people.

502. The representatives of Greece and Turkey have spoken here. It could have been said even yesterday who would speak in favour of the position adopted by the United States. These gentlemen made use of the standard expressions and insinuations which usually abound in their speeches in the General Assembly and its political committees. We did not expect any other speeches from them or from the representatives of those countries whose statesmen and political leaders trade their independence, curry favour with the United States of America, and are ready to stand at attention before every illiterate American corporal who comes to inspect the American military bases in Turkey or Greece. Evidently, they have borrowed a number of expressions from the programme which was submitted to the United States Congress only recently, submitted, by the way, by one of the members of the present United States delegation. As we said on an earlier occasion, that programme expressly states that correspondents and

radio commentators must conclude all speeches, contributions to the Press and radio broadcasts with a condemnation of the USSR Government.

503. These gentlemen, however, obviously consider that if it is possible to discuss such a programme in the United States Congress, particularly in connexion with the so-called "Mutual Security Act"—an act providing for the appropriation of \$US100 million for espionage, subversive activity and sabotage against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies—it is also permissible to do so at the General Assembly. That is their affair, but I think it should be pointed out that such odious attacks on the Soviet Union only expose their authors, who seek to curry favour with the United States of America.

504. The statement by the representative of New Zealand was of some interest. He also, though perhaps in a somewhat milder way, expressed general support for the delegations of the United States and the United Kingdom. In addition to what was said by them, he adduced a further argument. In his opinion, it was an argument capable of removing some of the odium attaching to the attitude adopted by the Government of the United States of America and to the crimes committed by the American militarists in Korea. He referred—as to an achievement—to the fact that all the information relating to the murder of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war in Korea by the American soldiery is widely published. The argument, therefore, is as follows: "Though we commit murder, we give wide publicity to our actions." That is a peculiar kind of logic. It is the logic of people who have grown so accustomed to these crimes, whose perception has grown so blunted—as, indeed, the Press blares forth such news almost every day—that they do not realize that such statements make them look ridiculous and that they are placing their government in a situation which can be described only as that of an accomplice of the Government of the United States in the Korean adventure and in its efforts to continue the aggressive war against the Korean people.

505. In conclusion I should like to point out that, though its representatives in the General Assembly attempt to maintain an optimistic tone, and urge the rejection of the USSR draft resolution—as though political victory were always on the side of those who reject a given proposal by a majority of votes—the United States of America, will not succeed, in spite of such manoeuvres, in evading the heavy responsibility which its Government bears before public opinion throughout the world for the bloody and bestial crimes committed against the Korean and Chinese prisoners of war in Korea.

506. I consider it necessary once more to state that the USSR delegation urges the adoption of its draft resolution [A/2355] by the General Assembly and deems it advisable to declare in advance, that all States which do not find in themselves sufficient strength to raise their voice in protest against these bestialities committed by the American militarists in Korea will also be assuming a heavy responsibility.

507. Ato ZAUDE (Ethiopia): I shall not at this time attempt to discuss the Korean problems which have been exhaustively considered and disposed of in the First Committee. I intervene at this stage simply to clarify the position and vote of my delegation.

508. The General Assembly is called upon hastily to adopt the draft resolution now before us, and thus to condemn the United States armed forces in Korea. The allegation is that the camp commander was guilty of inhuman acts against prisoners of war. We have been told that prisoners of war were murdered because they chanted patriotic nationalist songs; but there was no attempt to substantiate all aspects of the incidents, especially the allegation that the disciplinary action taken by the camp commander was not preceded by warnings or other such means of avoiding armed attack.

509. In the absence of such detailed information, it would seem premature, and therefore unjust, to pass judgment against the Unified Command for the alleged crime. Hence, my delegation will vote against the draft resolution now before the Assembly. My delegation, however, associates itself with other Member States which have favoured a thorough investigation of the incident and expressed the desire that an investigation should be undertaken.

510. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution (A/2355). A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Cuba, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

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

Against: Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, 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, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica.

Abstaining: Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen, Afghanistan, Burma.

The draft resolution was rejected by 45 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

511. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq): My delegation voted against the draft resolution of the USSR for several reasons, some of which are the following.

512. First, we cannot condemn a Member State for having committed criminal acts on the basis of an accusation the validity of which is not proven to us. It would have been more appropriate if the Soviet Union delegation had asked for a public investigation, but the condemnation of a Member State as a criminal before verification of an accusation certainly could not enlist our support.

513. In the second place, we cannot consider the language used in the USSR draft resolution as consonant with the spirit of the Charter. It does not foster friendly relations among nations, and it does not lead to international friendship and understanding. We sincerely hope that the USSR, the People's Republic of China and the North Koreans will still be able to accept the Indian resolution on the prisoners of war, as a means of bringing about peace in Korea and terminating all these problems.

514. In the third place, the Iraqi delegation has consistently recognized North Korea as an aggressor, and it has consistently considered the United Nations as fulfilling its function under the Charter by its intervention. It is the United Nations and not the United States of America that is fighting in Korea. The USSR draft resolution used such phrases as "American camps", "American military authorities", "criminal acts by the United States", "the Government of the United States of America". We feel that the use of the name "United States" instead of the name "United Nations" is a negation of the fact that it is the United Nations that has intervened in Korea and not the United States of America, as such.

515. For these reasons, my delegation could not subscribe to the USSR draft resolution. We do not think that that draft resolution enhances the chances of peace in Korea, and for that reason we voted against it.

Communication by the President

516. The PRESIDENT: Before the General Assembly adjourns, I have a short announcement to make.

517. The General Assembly will recall that at its 401st plenary meeting held on 5 December it adopted a resolution [615 (VII)] under the item "Treatment of people of Indian origin in the Union of South Africa". Under that resolution, the United Nations Good Offices Commission was established, the membership of which was to be based on nominations by the President of the General Assembly. I should like to announce to the General Assembly that I have appointed the following members to this Commission: Cuba, Syria and Yugoslavia.

518. I should like to draw attention also to the resolution adopted at the same meeting on the question of the race conflict in South Africa resulting from the *apartheid* policy of the Government of the Union of South Africa. According to this resolution, a commission was established, and at that time the membership was not determined by the General Assembly. If the General Assembly agrees, I would suggest that this commission should be composed of the following persons: Mr. Hernán Santa Cruz, Mr. Ralph Bunche and Mr. Jaime Torres Bodet.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.45 a.m., 22 December.