

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1347th
MEETING**

Monday, 9 December 1963,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 29:

The Korean question: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea 193

*Chairman: Mr. C. W. A. SCHURMANN¹
(Netherlands).*

AGENDA ITEM 29

The Korean question: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/5512 and Corr.1, A/5512/Add.1, A/C.1/887, A/C.1/889, A/C.1/892, A/C.1/893, A/C.1/894, A/C.1/L.333, A/C.1/L.334)

1. The CHAIRMAN welcomed the representative of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK), Mr. Baykan, to the Committee table. He invited the Committee to consider first the two draft resolutions before it (A/C.1/L.333 and A/C.1/L.334), which were of a purely procedural nature.

2. Mr. COOK (United States of America) said his delegation believed that the United Nations programme for the settlement of the Korean problem was the one best devised to serve the interests of all the Korean people and of international peace, and that continued Assembly support for that solution also offered the best hope for reunification of the country.

3. It was regrettable that the Committee should again be faced with the question of whether or not the North Korean régime should be invited to participate in its work. The question was not merely procedural; it had to be decided whether it was appropriate or useful to send such an invitation to a régime which had consistently refused to recognize the competence and authority of the United Nations. In contrast, the Government of the Republic of Korea, which had been recognized as lawful by the General Assembly in 1948, had repeatedly recognized the competence and authority of the United Nations. Moreover, it had placed its hopes in the United Nations for the solution of the problem of unification.

4. At the seventeenth session of the General Assembly, the Committee, reaffirming the decision that it had taken in 1961, had adopted a resolution^{1/} stating that the North Korean Government might participate in the discussion if it first unequivocally accepted the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the Korean question. The resolution had, however, gone on to note that the North Korean régime, in messages to the Committee and other

statements, had rejected the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the Korean question, and the Committee, considering that by that attitude the North Korean régime had rejected its invitation to participate in the discussion, had invited only a representative of the Republic of Korea to take part in the discussion without right of vote. That resolution had been approved by an overwhelming majority of the Committee.

5. On 25 September 1963, in a statement transmitted to the President of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General (A/C.1/889), the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the North Korean régime had once again described discussion of the Korean question in the United Nations as "illegal". Somewhat illogically, the North Korean régime, in the same statement, asked permission to participate in the discussion. The North Korean position had also been stated in a memorandum communicated to the Secretary-General by the representative of the Soviet Union (A/C.1/893). The Republic of Korea, for its part, in a letter addressed to the Secretary-General by its Minister for Foreign Affairs (A/C.1/894), had reaffirmed its acceptance of the competence and authority of the United Nations.

6. He was convinced that the United Nations would be able to find a solution to the problem of Korean unification which was consonant with the objectives laid down by the General Assembly. The programme approved by the Assembly in 1947 had been carried out with the full co-operation of the South Korean authorities. Since the establishment of the Republic of Korea, a United Nations Commission had continuously observed the elections held in South Korea, reporting to the United Nations on those elections and on the development of representative government in the country. In the north, the authorities had not even permitted the Commission to enter the territory and had boycotted the General Assembly's programme. In 1950, the North Korean régime had launched a major aggression against the Republic of Korea, which had been repelled by United Nations forces. Those facts, as well as the recent statements of the North Korean régime, proved that there was no point in inviting that régime to take part in the discussion, for from the attitude that it had adopted it was clear that no constructive contributions could be expected from it.

7. For all those reasons, his delegation urged the Committee to adopt the United States draft resolution (A/C.1/L.333), under which only representatives of the Republic of Korea would be invited to take part in the discussion of the question, without right of vote. For the same reasons, it strongly opposed the draft resolution submitted by Mongolia (A/C.1/L.334), which was almost identical with the draft resolution that had been rejected by the Committee at the previous session (A/C.1/L.318).^{2/}

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 28, document A/C.1/885.

^{2/} Ibid., document A/5383, para. 7 (a).

8. Mr. RAMIREZ PANE (Paraguay) observed that having recently had an opportunity of visiting the Republic of Korea, he had been able to confirm the fact that for the people of that country, the Korean question remained a matter of the utmost importance. At all social levels, he had found great confidence in the ultimate achievement of the aims of the United Nations, a feeling of gratitude to UNCURK and a firm conviction that the presence of the United Nations forces was necessary in order to help the Korean people safeguard themselves against renewed communist aggression and in order to preserve peace and security in the region. Both government and opposition representatives had declared their total support for the purposes and principles of the United Nations. The members of UNCURK had confirmed the sincerity of the convictions of the South Korean people and had emphasized that they had complete freedom to travel and to observe the situation in the Republic of Korea, whereas they had never been in a position to fulfil their mandate in the northern part of the country.

9. Ever since 1948, representatives of the Republic of Korea had always been invited to participate in the First Committee's discussions concerning their country. It had been only at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly that the Committee had decided to invite a representative of the North Korean régime, provided that it first accepted the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the Korean question. That condition had not been fulfilled, either at that session or at the following one. At the seventeenth session, in view of the hostile attitude of the North Korean authorities, the Committee had decided not to renew its conditional invitation.

10. The views of the North Korean authorities regarding the competence and authority of the United Nations had remained unchanged, as was clear from recent statements made by the North Korean Minister for Foreign Affairs. There was no doubt that by inviting a régime that questioned its competence to participate in the discussions, the Committee would be taking a step which would not only be futile but would also undermine the prestige and influence of the Organization.

11. Morally and legally, there was only one possible solution, namely, to invite the Republic of Korea, whose Government, the only one recognized by the Organization, accepted the competence and authority of the United Nations to deal with the Korean question. His delegation therefore fully supported the draft resolution submitted by the United States (A/C.1/L.333).

12. Mr. KHOSBAYAR (Mongolia) stated that the Korean question was a purely internal matter, which must be settled by the Korean people themselves without any outside interference. However, under pressure from certain Governments, the question had once again been included in the Committee's agenda. The United States, continuing its policy of discrimination against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, had submitted a draft resolution on the subject which was inconsistent not only with reason and justice but also with the principles contained in the Charter of the United Nations. If the United Nations really wished to help the Korean people to solve the problem of their country's peaceful reunification, if it really wished to strengthen peace in the Far East, it should invite representatives of both parties concerned to state their views.

13. On the strength of those considerations, his delegation, renewing the course of action taken by it at the sixteenth session, had submitted a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.334) under which the Committee would invite representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the Republic of Korea to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the question. It hoped that the members of the Committee would support that draft resolution, which was the only one capable of enhancing the Organization's authority. Lastly, it requested that priority be given to its draft resolution, since it took all aspects of the matter before the Committee into account.

14. Mr. SZEWCZYK (Poland) expressed his support for the Mongolian draft resolution, by which the Committee would invite representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the question before the Committee. He also supported the Mongolian request that priority should be given to that draft resolution.

15. In the United States draft resolution, provision was made only for inviting a representative of the Republic of Korea. The United States delegation persisted in the view that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea could participate in the debate only if it first recognized that the United Nations was competent to settle the question of the reunification of Korea. But there was nothing in the Charter, in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly or in United Nations practice to justify such an attitude.

16. Although his delegation's evaluation of the régime in South Korea was totally different from that of the United States, it nevertheless considered it necessary that both parties should be heard, in accordance with the fundamental principle of justice and international law, if any real progress was to be made towards solving the Korean problem. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, moreover, had stated that his Government would not recognize any United Nations resolution adopted without its participation.

17. He therefore urged other delegations to approach the question in a constructive spirit, without discriminating in any way against either of the parties concerned.

18. Mr. KOVALENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that in the General Assembly's General Committee (153rd meeting) his delegation had opposed the inclusion of the so-called Korean question in the agenda of the eighteenth session. The experience of sixteen years of futile debate had shown that the discussion of such questions benefited neither the peoples concerned nor the cause of peace throughout the world. On the contrary, it could well create tensions and jeopardize the success of the General Assembly's work.

19. Since in spite of those objections, the Korean question had been placed on the agenda, the Soviet delegation wished to associate itself with the delegations which were attempting to prevent the debate from taking place in circumstances which were irregular because of the absence of representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It was said in the statement of 25 September 1963 of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic (A/C.1/889) that so long as the Korean question was discussed at the United Nations, representatives of that Government

should take part in the debate. Like any independent State, of course, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea could not accept any conditions restricting its rights and its sovereignty.

20. Contrary to what the representative of the United States seemed to think, the fact that the First Committee had acted unreasonably in the past was no reason for it to persist in its errors. On the contrary, it should take a decision which was in keeping with the realities of the case and facilitated a solution of the problem. In the light of those considerations, the USSR delegation supported the Mongolian draft resolution and the request that priority should be given to it in the voting. He hoped that for the sake of the Korean people and of the prestige of the United Nations all delegations would support the Mongolian draft resolution.

21. Mr. ANUMAN RAJADHON (Thailand) said that the Korean war had been unique in being a conflict between one country, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and an international organization, the United Nations, which had not hesitated to take up arms against an aggressor in order to defend international peace and security. Similarly, the discussion of the Korean question represented a contest between the rule of force and the rule of law. The question was not a cold-war issue, for it was not a conflict between the East and the West, but an issue which involved the United Nations and the two Korean Governments and whose outcome would decide whether the United Nations could survive as the guardian of peace and the last hope of mankind.

22. In perpetrating an unprovoked act of armed aggression against the Republic of Korea in June 1950, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had committed an act of hostility against the United Nations, for that had been an effort to settle by force a problem that had been under the direct jurisdiction of the United Nations, namely, the establishment of a unified, independent, democratic Government of all Korea. The troops sent in response to the Security Council's request had made it possible to stop the aggression, but the threat to peace from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and its ally was still present, and the question of the unification of Korea was far from being solved.

23. During the sixteenth and seventeenth sessions of the General Assembly, the Committee had rightly rejected the attempts made to secure the invitation of representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of the Korean question. Another such attempt was being made now by the Mongolian delegation in its draft resolution. It was to be hoped that the Committee would reject that proposal, for the Organization could not extend an invitation to participate in its debates to a régime which had been guilty of aggression, had persistently refused to co-operate with the United Nations for the unification of Korea by peaceful means and repudiated the competence and authority in the matter of the United Nations. The Committee would thus affirm that despite the obstacles and difficulties created by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the United Nations was determined to carry out its task in Korea, which it considered vital to the preservation of international peace.

24. The draft resolution submitted by the United States was self-explanatory. Whereas the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had, by its rejection of the

competence and authority of the United Nations to deal with the Korean question, forfeited its right to representation in the General Assembly, the Government of the Republic of Korea had time and again reaffirmed its adherence to the purposes and principles of the Charter; it fully accepted the competence and authority of the Organization and had always co-operated fully with UNCURK. The contrast between the attitudes of the two Korean Governments had been underlined in the report of UNCURK (A/5512 and Corr.1, paras. 17-18). Only the representatives of the Republic of Korea, therefore, should be invited to participate in the discussion of the Korean question. The Thai delegation accordingly fully supported the United States draft resolution, which was in complete consonance with the lofty ideals of the United Nations.

25. Mr. NYOUNDOU (Gabon) said that the United Nations could not without repudiating its principles invite the North Korean Government to take part in the Committee's debates, since that Government would merely, as had certain colonial Powers, challenge the competence of the United Nations and refuse to comply with its resolutions. It was certainly imperative to settle the Korean question, for the presence of troops on both sides of the 38th parallel represented a serious danger to international peace and security. But the question could not be settled satisfactorily except through the United Nations. The North Korean Government should therefore perhaps be given more time to think the matter over; it must accept the competence of the Organization before being invited to participate. On the other hand, there was no reason why an invitation should not be extended to the representative of the Republic of Korea, the attitude of which towards the United Nations was worthy, positive and co-operative. For that reason the Gabon delegation would support the United States draft resolution.

26. Mr. LAMANI (Albania) said it was time that the General Assembly turned its back on the unjustifiable procedure it had followed at past sessions in allowing the representatives of the South Korean puppet authorities to participate in the Committee's debates while denying that right to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, an independent and sovereign State which was pursuing a policy entirely devoted to peace and whose Government enjoyed the full support of the people of North Korea and the sympathy of all the Korean people. That procedure was contrary to the Charter and to the tradition of international law. Moreover, in view of the threat to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea posed by the presence of United States armed forces on its borders, it was most important that its Government should participate in the Committee's debates, particularly on the question of the withdrawal of United States troops from South Korea. It was therefore essential that the General Assembly should invite the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of the Korean question.

27. Mr. MATSUI (Japan) said that in spite of the recent favourable developments in East-West relations, positions on the Korean question remained unchanged. The problem was essentially that of the reunification of Korea, and no satisfactory and durable solution to that problem would be possible if it was not worked out through peaceful means under the supervision of the United Nations. While the Republic of Korea was ceaselessly exerting its efforts towards that goal, recognized the competence and authority of

the United Nations to deal with the question and declared its adherence to the purposes and principles of the United Nations—as had been reaffirmed by that country's Minister for Foreign Affairs in his recent letter to the Secretary-General (A/C.1/894)—the North Korean authorities denied the right of the United Nations to deal with the Korean question and had on numerous occasions manifested their hostility to the United Nations, in particular in a statement dated 25 September 1963 (A/C.1/889). Under those circumstances, it was futile to issue once again to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea the invitation which the General Assembly had addressed to it during its fifteenth and sixteenth sessions and which that Government had rejected with defiance. For that reason the Japanese delegation would support the United States draft resolution, under which only the representative of the Republic of Korea would be invited to participate in the Committee's work.

28. Mr. DATCU (Romania) said it was regrettable that in spite of the general trend to co-operation which had characterized the First Committee's work since the beginning of the session, certain delegations still took a discriminatory and unrealistic approach to the so-called Korean question. In the General Assembly's General Committee (153rd meeting), the Romanian delegation had, as at previous sessions, opposed any discussion of the report of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. Only the Korean people were competent to decide on the procedure for the unification and rehabilitation of their country.

29. The attempts that had been made to bring the Korean question before the General Assembly once more without allowing the two parties concerned to participate in the debate made the profound unfairness of the discussion even more obvious. The United States draft resolution expressed a position that was completely devoid of objectivity, one-sided and discriminatory. Clearly such a proposal could not serve as a basis for a reasonable solution of the problem and for a relation of tension in the area. No decision on the question of Korea could be carried out if it was not accepted by the two parties directly concerned or if it was taken without the participation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

30. The position of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, expressed in the statement of its Ministry of Foreign Affairs (A/C.1/889), was entirely in keeping with the purposes and principles of the United Nations, which all States should respect. The Romanian delegation therefore firmly opposed the United States draft resolution and fully supported the Mongolian draft resolution. It also supported the Mongolian proposal that the latter draft resolution should be put to the vote first.

31. Mr. KIZIA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said he regretted that the favourable climate that had prevailed at the beginning of the session had given way, in the statements of pro-Western representatives, to a cold-war atmosphere. Those who were praising a Government in whose territory foreign bases were situated while trying to blacken the reputation of the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were defying the basic principles of the United Nations by trampling underfoot the rights of a sovereign State. For the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was a sovereign State, whose legislature and Government had been created by the will of

the people and which was competent to decide all questions of internal and external policy. It was therefore essential that the Korean question should be discussed in the presence of the legitimate representatives of the Korean people; any decision taken in other conditions would be futile and inoperative. For that reason the United States draft resolution under which only the representative of South Korea would be invited, represented a completely wrong approach to the question. On the other hand, the Mongolian draft resolution, which provided for inviting the representatives of North Korea and South Korea, was in keeping with the letter and spirit of the Charter. The Ukrainian delegation therefore hoped that all Member States motivated by a constructive spirit would vote in favour of the Mongolian draft resolution. Moreover, it supported the Mongolian delegation's proposal that that draft resolution should be put to the vote first.

32. Mr. RAKOTOMALALA (Madagascar) said that he would have been glad to vote for the Mongolian draft resolution if the documents before the Committee did not show that, while the Republic of Korea agreed unreservedly to abide by the decision of the United Nations, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea challenged the Organization's right to deal with the question of Korean reunification and refused in advance to comply with its decisions. That attitude was unacceptable, for the United Nations had already rejected similar claims with regard to apartheid, the African territories under Portuguese administration, Southern Rhodesia, etc. There was therefore nothing to be gained by inviting representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in the Committee's debate. His delegation could not vote for the Mongolian draft resolution, for the proposal which it embodied would not be the most effective and realistic way of achieving the reunification of Korea.

33. Mr. HAJEK (Czechoslovakia) noted with satisfaction that the General Assembly had been able to find positive, realistic solutions to some important problems, thus helping to dissipate the cold-war atmosphere and strengthen the authority of the United Nations. It was therefore all the more regrettable that the Committee should have before it a question which was, in the fullest sense, a legacy of the cold war and a survival of the past. The problem had arisen at a time when many States now Members of the United Nations had still been under colonial rule and when a coalition led by the colonial Powers had been able to manipulate the majority in the United Nations for aggressive purposes in violation of the letter and spirit of the Charter. If the proposals of the socialist countries had been adopted, normal conditions would prevail in Korea and the question now before the Committee would not arise. The very existence of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea constituted intervention in the domestic affairs of the Korean people. The present situation was one in which two States existed: one, North Korea, was completely independent; the other, South Korea, was under a foreign occupation based on the usurped authority of the United Nations. Some delegations praised the latter régime—just as they had once praised that of Syngman Rhee, which had been driven out by the Korean people—and, at the same time, criticized the Democratic People's Republic of Korea precisely for being the true representative of the people of South Korea and for opposing all intervention by the United States, even if it was unlawfully protected by the authority of the United

Nations. Yet, if any positive results were to be achieved, it was essential to apply a principle recognized in the domestic law of all States and in international law, i.e. to conduct discussions with the participation of all parties concerned, since they alone could find a solution. The United States draft resolution would condemn the Committee's debate to utter sterility and make a solution impossible. For those reasons, his delegation appealed to the members of the Committee to follow the dictates of reason and invite the representatives of the two Korean States to take part in the debate; it would therefore support the Mongolian draft resolution and oppose that of the United States.

34. Mr. HSUEH (China) said that, for the reasons already stated by a number of delegations, China would vote against the Mongolian draft resolution and for the United States draft resolution. In view of the Korean Communists' repeated rejection of the invitation which the Committee had initially addressed to them in 1961, his delegation saw no purpose in reaffirming that offer, even in the preamble; it therefore requested a separate vote on the second preambular paragraph of the United States draft resolution and would vote against that paragraph if it was retained in its present form.

35. Mr. PRANDLER (Hungary) said that the question was not whether the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was refusing to co-operate with the United Nations but whether the United Nations was willing to co-operate with that Government. His delegation felt that any discussion of the question without the participation of representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was unlawful in view of the principle of the equality of States. Moreover, no sovereign State could agree that its participation in the debate should be made subject to humiliating conditions which would prejudice the discussion itself. The fact was that the United Nations was not competent to deal with the question of Korea; even if it was, however, the least that could be asked was that the other party should be invited to participate in the discussion without any conditions. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea therefore had good reasons for saying, in its statement of 25 September 1963 (A/C.1/889), that it would resolutely reject any "resolution" on Korea drawn up arbitrarily without the participation and consent of its representative. That was why his delegation felt that only the adoption of the Mongolian draft resolution would enable the Committee to help eliminate that remnant of the cold war from the United Nations.

36. Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic) said that his country was still in favour of extending an invitation to both parties; that was a position of principle which it was adopting without reference to the substance of the question. If the Committee was called upon to vote on a proposal to extend an invitation to both of the parties concerned with the Korean question, his delegation would vote in the affirmative.

37. Mr. CAMPBELL (United Kingdom) did not feel that the debate had brought to light any new factor in the situation which would justify changing the decision taken the year before. The proper course to follow was therefore that indicated by the United States draft resolution; his delegation would vote for that draft resolution and against the Mongolian draft resolution. He saw no justification for granting priority to the latter draft

and thought it preferable to vote on the texts in the order in which they had been submitted.

38. Mr. SIDIKOU (Niger) said that it was essential for the United Nations to act in an effective and consistent manner. His country refused to concede to any State the right to deny the Organization's authority to concern itself with disputed issues; too much should not be conceded in the attempt to preserve the atmosphere of co-operation which had characterized the current session, for justice and logic must prevail. Accordingly, his delegation would vote for the United States draft resolution. It would have liked to be able to support the Mongolian draft resolution and thus indicate its concern that the two interested parties should be invited, but it could not do so because the text did not explicitly recognize the authority of the United Nations. It nevertheless hoped that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would eventually come to realize that the unity and stability of Korea were matters of concern to the United Nations and would then take its place among the responsible representatives of all States.

39. Mr. ASTAPENKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that in his statement the United States representative had objected to the participation of representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the discussion of the Korean question and at the same time had demanded that the Democratic People's Republic should recognize a decision taken without its participation. Those demands were contrary to the elementary rules of justice and bore witness to a preconceived view which tended to prevent objective consideration of the question. The Byelorussian SSR was opposed to that approach, just as it was opposed to any discrimination and any interference in the domestic affairs of the Korean people; it thought it quite natural that representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should be invited to participate in a debate which concerned them. Accordingly, his delegation would support the Mongolian draft resolution and felt that it deserved priority.

40. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia) observed that while the first three paragraphs of the statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea dated 25 September (A/C.1/889) appeared to reject the authority of the United Nations, the last paragraph indicated that the North Korean authorities wished to participate in the discussion in the United Nations. For that reason, his delegation would vote for the first preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 2 of the United States draft resolution (A/C.1/L.333) and would abstain on the second preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1; it therefore requested a separate vote on each paragraph of that draft resolution. It would also vote for the Mongolian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.334).

41. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) recalled that in the General Committee and the General Assembly his delegation had voted against placing the Korean question on the agenda in the belief that it would be likely to re-introduce a cold-war atmosphere in the debate. Events had merely confirmed those misgivings, and the attitude taken by the United States obliged his delegation to explain its vote. An attempt to exclude one of the parties concerned from participation in the debate, far from contributing to a solution of the problem, would help to perpetuate the division of Korea and to increase tension in that part of Asia. If the United States felt that the task of the United Nations was to work for

the unification of Korea, and if such unification was not to be achieved by force or the threat of force, he wondered how that objective could be accomplished if representatives of the two parties did not participate in the debate.

42. The United States demanded that, as a condition for participation, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should agree in advance to abide by any solutions proposed by the United Nations. However, the United Nations had already on one occasion taken a decision, under the influence of certain countries, which had made it a shield for intervention in Korea. Since that was so, it was indeed incongruous to seek to impose a prior condition of that nature on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It had been argued that it would be paradoxical to extend an invitation to a country which was unwilling to recognize United Nations decisions, but it would surely be even more paradoxical to try to unite the two parts of a country while refusing to extend an invitation to one of them. Bulgaria therefore considered the United States draft resolution unacceptable and felt that the Mongolian draft resolution, on the other hand, deserved the support of all those who truly desired the unification and rehabilitation of Korea. His delegation would vote for the latter draft resolution and urged that it should be given priority when the vote was taken.

43. Mr. JABRI (Syria) said that his delegation failed to see how a United Nations body could help to solve the problem under discussion without giving a hearing to the two parties concerned. By seeking to prevent one of the parties from participating in the debate, the United States draft resolution removed certain basic elements from the issue. In any litigation, the two parties appeared and no judgement was handed down until all the witnesses had been heard. Just as a court would not prejudge the testimony of a witness, the Committee could not prejudge the position of North Korea and prevent its representatives from expressing their views. The United States draft resolution clearly had political implications which had nothing to do with the Committee's consideration of the Korean question. His delegation would therefore vote for the Mongolian draft resolution and abstain in the vote on the United States draft resolution.

44. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Congo, Leopoldville) found it difficult to agree that the leaders of North Korea, who had refused in the past and still refused to co-operate with the United Nations in seeking the unification and rehabilitation of Korea, could claim the right to be heard in the General Assembly. Accordingly, his delegation could not vote for the Mongolian draft resolution. It would support the United States draft resolution, thus expressing its confidence in the United Nations and its desire to strengthen the Organization's authority.

45. Mr. KOVALENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, because of the discriminatory nature of every part of the United States draft resolution, his delegation would cast a negative vote on each paragraph.

46. Mr. KHOSBAYAR (Mongolia) said that his delegation had requested priority for its draft resolution because the United States resolution was unilateral and restrictive in character, whereas the Mongolian text was broader in scope and recommended participation by both of the parties concerned.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that the Mongolian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.334) did not meet the requirements of rule 121 of the rules of procedure. If the Committee had no objection, however, it could be put to the vote.

It was so decided.

48. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Mongolian proposal that draft resolution A/C.1/L.334 should be put to the vote first.

The proposal was rejected by 52 votes to 13, with 30 abstentions.

49. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States draft resolution (A/C.1/L.333). At the request of the representatives of China and Ethiopia, a separate vote would be taken on each paragraph.

The first preambular paragraph was adopted by 73 votes to 10, with 14 abstentions.

The second preambular paragraph was adopted by 64 votes to 11, with 23 abstentions.

Operative paragraph 1 was adopted by 63 votes to 10, with 23 abstentions.

50. The CHAIRMAN stated that a roll-call vote had been requested on operative paragraph 2.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

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

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

Abstaining: Iraq, Jordan, Mali, Nepal, Nigeria, Senegal, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Algeria, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Finland, Ghana, Indonesia.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 73 votes to 10, with 15 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 64 votes to 10, with 24 abstentions.

51. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the Mongolian draft resolution (A/C.1/L.334).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Ghana, Hungary, Indonesia, Mali, Mongolia, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia.

Against: France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium,

Bolivia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Leopoldville), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador.

Abstaining: India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Liberia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Tunisia, Upper Volta, Austria, Brazil, Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey, Finland.

The draft resolution was rejected by 54 votes to 25, with 20 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.