



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 61:	
The question of West Irian (West New Guinea) <i>(concluded)</i>	459
Agenda item 17:	
The Korean question:	
(a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea	461

Chairman: Mr. Francisco URRUTIA (Colombia).

AGENDA ITEM 61

**The question of West Irian (West New Guinea)
(A/2694, A/C.1/L.109, A/C.1/L.110, A/C.1/
L.111) (concluded)**

Mr. WESTERBERG (Sweden) wished, first, to make it clear that his delegation's attitude to the draft resolution submitted by Indonesia (A/C.1/L.109) had not been based on a restrictive interpretation of the provisions of the Charter relating to the competence of the Organization, an interpretation which might well prove harmful to the prestige of the United Nations. Therefore, when Sweden had voted against the inclusion of the item in the agenda (477th plenary meeting), it had done so because it had felt that a debate on the question, based on the reasons advanced by Indonesia, would serve no useful purpose, the more so since Sweden could not regard the problem as one relating to a people's right to self-determination.

The Swedish delegation had felt that a decision by the General Assembly in conformity with the proposal submitted by Indonesia, in the light of the debate on the question, might be interpreted as an endorsement by the United Nations of a transfer of sovereignty from one State to another. For those reasons, it had found it necessary to vote against the eight-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.110). It had been prepared, however, to vote in favour of the Colombian amendment (A/C.1/L.111), because that amendment placed the emphasis on the interests and rights of the inhabitants of West New Guinea.

Mr. ANDERSEN (Denmark) stated that one of the reasons which had prompted his delegation to vote against the inclusion of the item in the agenda had been the fear that, in the present circumstances, a debate on the question would not contribute to a solution of the problem. Unfortunately the debate had concerned that apprehension.

In those circumstances, the Danish delegation did not think that it would be helpful if the General Assembly adopted a resolution of the kind proposed by either Indonesia or by the eight Powers. While the wording of those two texts differed, they seemed, in

fact, to be alike in substance. Neither of them formally called for a final decision by the United Nations. The eight-Power draft resolution did not even formally invite the parties to resume negotiations. Its two operative paragraphs would be ineffective if the negotiations mentioned in the Indonesian draft resolution were not resumed. The implication, therefore, was that negotiations must be undertaken with a view to effecting a transfer of sovereignty. That meant that the draft resolution did not provide any basis for free negotiations. It did not even suggest that the dispute should be referred to the International Court of Justice, a procedure which might, perhaps, have provided the most reasonable way out of the current deadlock.

5. In addition, Mr. Andersen wished to say that his delegation attached great importance to the interests of the inhabitants of the territory. The inhabitants, however, had not been able to express their wishes, and neither of the draft resolutions before the Committee made any reference to their interests or to their development towards self-government.

6. For those reasons, Denmark had felt it necessary, in spite of its sincerely friendly feelings towards Indonesia, to vote against the eight-Power draft resolution, just as it would have voted against the Indonesian draft resolution had it been put to the vote.

7. Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) explained that, although he had previously said that he would abstain in the vote on the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.110), he had later decided to vote in favour of it, both on account of the international situation, and especially in view of the statements made by the representatives of Yugoslavia and Cuba.

8. The difficult international situation made it incumbent upon the United Nations to express the hope that the problem would be settled, but without thereby prejudging the legal positions of the parties.

9. On the other hand, the Peruvian delegation had always believed that, in the present problem, the primary consideration was the rights and interests of the inhabitants of the territory. The draft resolution submitted by Indonesia (A/C.1/L.109) made no reference whatsoever, direct or indirect, to that principle. With regard to the eight-Power draft, Mr. Belaúnde recalled that, in addition to voicing certain criticism of a formal nature, he had said (734th meeting) that some reference should be made in the draft to the rights and interests of the inhabitants of the territory. Unfortunately, part of an amendment submitted by Colombia (A/C.1/L.111) to that effect, which could have been added to the operative part of the joint draft resolution, had been withdrawn. But the representatives of Yugoslavia and Cuba, two of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution, had stated categorically (732nd and 735th meetings) that the reference in paragraph 1 of the operative part to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations applied to the rights and interests of

the inhabitants of the territory. That had prompted the Peruvian delegation to vote in favour of the draft.

10. The draft resolution which had been approved confined itself to expressing the desire that the parties should reach agreement, without in any way prejudging their legal positions; the parties could enter into negotiations or even, if they so wished, request the International Court of Justice for an opinion on the legal interpretation to be placed on the treaty. But whatever the position of either party, its action must be governed by the principles of the Charter.

11. Mr. Belaúnde did not believe that the draft resolution should create any difficulties between Indonesia and the Netherlands and hoped, on the contrary, that both countries would interpret it as the expression of the sincere desire of the General Assembly that the parties should come to an agreement, the paramount consideration in such agreement being the rights and interests of the inhabitants of the territory.

12. Mr. SARPÉR (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted against the inclusion of the item in the agenda, as well as against the eight-Power draft resolution, because, in its opinion, the United Nations was not authorized, within the meaning of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter to intervene in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of Member States.

13. Mr. TOV (Israel) said that his delegation had not taken part in the debate, but had followed it with great interest and attention. Israel would have been in a very difficult position had it tried to overcome the legal objections provoked by the Indonesian draft resolution. It had felt, on the other hand, that the principles mentioned by the representative of Mexico (731st meeting) should have been formulated in a draft resolution, and it had deplored the fact that that had not happened. When the eight-Power draft resolution had been submitted, Israel had felt that it offered a favourable change. But paragraph 2 of its operative part had appeared to be unnecessary, because, while favouring direct negotiations in principle, Israel did not consider it healthy to follow the tendency of anticipating the inclusion of items in the agenda of coming sessions of the General Assembly. That was why it had voted against the inclusion of paragraph 2 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution. There was one fundamental reason, however, which had forced Israel to abstain from voting, and that was the fact that the population of the territory of West New Guinea was not mentioned in the eight-Power draft resolution. Israel had felt that the Colombia amendment would overcome that difficulty, and regretted that that amendment had virtually disintegrated and had not been included in the joint draft resolution. Under the circumstances, Israel had been forced to abstain from voting.

14. Mr. MAZA (Chile) said that the Chilean delegation had not taken part in the general debate or in the debate on the proposals which had been put forward, but that it considered it necessary to explain its vote.

15. On the question of procedure, it had voted in favour of considering the Colombian amendment first, because it felt that the established custom in deliberative bodies of voting first on amendments should be respected.

16. On the proposal itself, the Chilean delegation had abstained. That attitude could not have surprised the Indonesian delegation, because the Indonesian Ambassador, Mr. Sudjono, who had just left Chile, had been duly informed of it.

17. The Chilean Government considered that the item which had been under discussion had nothing to do with the principle of the self-determination of peoples, since there did not appear to be any movement favouring self-determination among the inhabitants of West New Guinea; moreover, according to the information Mr. Maza had received, those inhabitants had not reached a sufficiently advanced stage of civilization to be able to express their wishes freely. Furthermore, there was no racial unity between the inhabitants of West New Guinea and those of Indonesia which could afford an *a priori* justification for unification.

18. It was therefore clear that the question was purely and exclusively a political dispute between two Governments concerning sovereignty over a specific territory which, under the terms of existing treaties, must remain in *statu quo* until the negotiations had led to a result.

19. For those reasons, and given the present state of the question, the Chilean Government considered that the purpose for which the United Nations had been established would not be furthered if the Organization were to succumb to the dangerous temptation of trying to force Member States to negotiate on a question which did not involve international peace and security.

20. The Chilean Government ardently hoped that the dispute between Indonesia and the Netherlands could be settled by means of friendly conversations, freely entered into, between the two Governments; it hoped that, as had been agreed in the treaties of 1949, the problem could be peacefully settled by the parties, without endangering the peace of the world.

21. Mr. ENTEZAM (Iran) said that there was no doubt that a dispute existed between two Member States concerning the question of West Irian, and regretted that negotiations in the past had not succeeded in resolving the problem. However, Iran did not wish to lose hope that in the future such negotiations would bring about the desired results. It was in that hope that Iran had voted in favour of the eight-Power draft resolution.

22. Mr. KREMER (Luxembourg) said that the attitude of his delegation in voting against including the item in the agenda had been based on the fact that it did not regard the Assembly as competent to deal with the question. Any discussion of the question by the Assembly, therefore, constituted an intervention in the domestic affairs of a State, and, as such, was contrary to the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. Any discussion of a matter of that nature was likely to aggravate the situation.

23. Nothing that had been said during the debate had been able to persuade the Luxembourg delegation that its position had been ill founded. It had therefore been unable to support the draft resolution, and had voted against it.

24. Mr. SERRANO (Philippines) said that in the general debate his delegation had refrained from any expression of views on the merits of the question. It believed that when a question was brought before the United Nations, the nature and extent of the United Nations intervention should depend *pro tanto* upon the nature and extent of the assistance the parties sought.

25. In the Indonesian draft resolution, the United Nations was simply informed that a dispute was in

existence concerning West Irian. No reference was made in the draft to the merits of the respective claims. Indonesia stated merely that it wanted the negotiations to be resumed with the assistance of the Secretary-General in order to reach a solution.

26. Such being the temper of the draft resolution, the Philippines delegation had taken an attitude of absolute impartiality on the merit of the case and had announced (733rd meeting) that it would vote in favour of the draft resolution only to the extent that it sought the continuance of such negotiations.

27. However, it had developed in the course of the debate that there were certain parts in the Indonesian draft resolution which had the effect of prejudging the issue between the parties, or which touched partially upon the merits of the case. In the view of the Netherlands as well as of other delegations, those alleged defects were carried over, in a different form, to the eight-Power draft resolution. That being the case, and to avoid any misinterpretation of its position of strict impartiality on the merits of the issue, the Philippines delegation had abstained from voting on the eight-Power draft resolution.

28. On the Colombian amendment, the discussion had disclosed that it suggested, in effect, self-determination for the inhabitants of West Irian, implying thereby that their present status was that of a non-self-governing people. That was what the Netherlands contended but Indonesia denied. Since that amendment, therefore touched on the merits of the issue, the Philippine delegation had likewise abstained from voting on it.

29. Mr. Serrano reserved the position of his delegation on the case before the General Assembly.

AGENDA ITEM 17

The Korean question:

(a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/2711, A/2786, A/C.1/L.112, A/C.1/L.113, A/C.1/L.114)

30. Mr. Yakov MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, as the First Committee was about to consider the Korean question, his delegation wished to submit a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.112) to the effect that the Committee decide to invite the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China to participate in the consideration of the question. It was impossible to expect an objective consideration of the Korean question in the absence of those representatives, and it would be out of the question to expect a solution which would, in their absence, have any legal and technical meaning. Those representatives had taken part in the Geneva Conference on Korea and had submitted constructive proposals designed to ensure a definitive solution of the Korean question. There was no doubt that in future negotiations on this question those representatives would again have a weighty contribution to make.

31. The Soviet delegation was confident that its proposal to invite the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China to participate in the consideration of the

Korean question would command the support of all those who truly sought to bring about a peaceful settlement in Korea.

32. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) wished to submit a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.113) to the effect that the Committee decide that the representative of the Republic of Korea be invited to participate, without having the right to vote, in the debates of the Committee on the Korean question.

33. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America) wished to support most strongly the draft resolution of the representative of Thailand to invite a representative of the Republic of Korea to participate, without having the right to vote, in the debate on the Korean question. The Republic of Korea had been the innocent victim of the aggression which had called for the collective action of the United Nations, and it was the party primarily concerned with the question which was going to be discussed.

34. As to the draft resolution submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union, to invite the representatives of the Communist régimes, which had been found to be guilty of aggression in Korea, the representative of the United States wished to express, in the strongest possible terms, the opposition of his delegation. Those régimes had no right to participate in that discussion. They had done nothing to purge themselves of the aggression. They had, in fact, continued to demonstrate their aggressive intent, since they continued to defy the accepted norms of international behaviour and the recommendations of the United Nations. Communist China continued to hold hundreds of captured United Nations personnel in violation of the armistice agreement, and recently thirteen captured Americans had received prison sentences on false charges.

35. He wished to emphasize most strongly that it was the view of his Government that the Communist régimes had no right to participate in the deliberations of the Committee on the Korean question.

36. Mrs. SEKANINOVA-CAKARTOVA (Czechoslovakia) said that the discussion in the Committee directly affected the vital interests of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China, whose security had been directly threatened in the Korean war and was so closely linked with a peaceful settlement of the Korean question. It was therefore only just and reasonable that their representatives should take part in the deliberations of the Committee. To reject their participation would be contrary to the basic principles of democracy, as well as to the principles and practice of the United Nations which had, on many occasions, invited interested parties to participate in discussions. Their exclusion would be both illogical and impractical, for there could be no doubt that their absence would be detrimental to the discussions in the Committee.

37. In the past, proposals to invite the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the People's Republic of China had been rejected on the pretext that they were engaged in a war against the United Nations. The falsity of those allegations, which had just been reiterated by the representative of the United States, had already been clearly shown at the time when they were first made and was all the more obvious at the present time, after the armistice and the Korean Conference at Geneva. Their only purpose could be to thwart any real possibility of a positive solution.

38. The discussion had served to underline the abnormal situation arising out of the fact that the people of China were not represented in the United Nations; that situation was all the more abnormal since recent events, and the Geneva Conference in particular, had again shown the significant international role played by the People's Republic of China.

39. Under present circumstances, when the Chinese people were still deprived of their lawful right in relation to the United Nations, it was essential that their representative be invited to participate in those discussions. A peaceful solution of the Korean problem was possible only on the basis of agreement between the parties concerned, in the same way in which the cessation of hostilities had been achieved.

40. The conclusion of the armistice had been made possible by the Governments of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the People's Republic of China, supported by the USSR, and after its conclusion those Governments had made constant efforts to attain a peaceful solution of the Korean question.

41. To construe measures taken by the Government of the People's Republic of China, in accordance with international law and in the interests of its internal security in a case which had no connexion with the Korean question, as an argument against inviting its representative was entirely unfounded.

42. The Czechoslovak delegation therefore fully supported the draft resolution submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union to invite the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the People's Republic of China to participate in the discussion of the Korean question.

43. Mr. LIU Chieh (China) wished, first, of all, to support wholeheartedly the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Thailand to invite the representative of the Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion. He wished to oppose, equally emphatically, the draft resolution of the Soviet Union to invite the Chinese and Korean Communists to participate in the work of the Committee. The Chinese and Korean Communists stood condemned as aggressors. Referring to the declaration of the sixteen Powers which had taken part in the Korean Political Conference at Geneva (A/2786, Annex) to the effect that the Communist delegations had rejected every effort to obtain agreement, that they had repudiated and rejected the authority and competence of the United Nations in Korea and had labelled it as the tool of aggression, he maintained not only that the Chinese and Korean Communists had no right to be present, but that it was completely futile to entertain the idea that their participation would be helpful to the Committee's deliberations.

44. Mr. NUTTING (United Kingdom) said that it would hardly be fitting for the United Nations to accede to the request made by the representative of the Soviet Union for the participation of China and North Korea in the discussion. At the Geneva Conference the Communist Governments had rejected the authority of the United Nations in this matter and, therefore, his delegation could not possibly vote for the seating of representatives of those Governments as observers or as participants in this discussion.

45. On the other hand, the Republic of Korea had joined the United Nations Command in resisting aggression, and for that reason his delegation was of the opinion

that the representative of the Republic of Korea was entitled to attend the discussions on the question.

46. Mr. SKRZESZEWSKI (Poland) said that there was no doubt that a fundamental condition for the comprehensive and objective consideration of the Korean question was to ensure to all States concerned the right to submit their points of view during the debate. Only if that condition had been fulfilled could the Korean problem be brought to the point of final solution. For those reasons his delegation wholeheartedly supported the Soviet Union's draft resolution that representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the People's Republic of China be invited to participate in the debate on the Korean question.

47. In connexion with the Korean question the General Assembly faced many important and controversial issues; the problem of the political conference mentioned in paragraph 60 of the Armistice Agreement,¹ the question of the armistice and its implementation, withdrawal of the armed forces, unification of Korea and elections as well as other issues—issues which were either general or specific in character whether political or organizational. All of those problems, however, had at least one common denominator in that they touched upon the most vital interests of North as well as of South Korea. Problems of that nature could not and should not be examined without the participation of representatives of both parts of Korea. The General Assembly could not simply ignore the universally known fact that the Korean question could not be solved, or even successfully examined, without the participation of the People's Republic of China. The United States and its allies which had agreed to the invitation to the People's Republic of China to participate in the Geneva Conference, had to admit, *ipso facto*, that it was impossible to bring about peace in Asia or, for that matter, in the world, without the participation of the People's Republic of China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

48. There was a host of precedents in the practice of the General Assembly for inviting States concerned to participate in its debates. Consideration of such a question without the participation of the parties concerned would violate the fundamental legal principle of *audi alteram partem*, in other words, the principle of letting the other side be heard. The representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the Chinese People's Volunteers had taken part in the armistice negotiations and had contributed their share to bring about the cessation of hostilities in Korea. In signing the cease-fire agreement they had assumed a number of obligations jointly with the United Nations Command. He wondered how it was possible in logic on the one hand to recognize the Armistice Agreement and, on the other hand, to deny the other party to that Agreement the right to participate in the discussion of a problem which related directly to the fulfilment of the obligations contained in that Agreement. Furthermore the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China had taken an active part at Geneva as representatives plenipotentiary of States interested in the solution of the Korean question. Their concrete proposals had consti-

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Eighth Year Supplement for July, August and September 1953*, document S/3079, appendix A.

uted important contributions to the proceedings of the Conference.

49. In opposing the invitation to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the People's Republic of China, the representative of the United States, instead of offering arguments, had resorted to inventions and slander, as was very well known. By doing so, the representative of the United States had hoped to prevent the truth from coming out, the truth which would be heard from the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China. The representative of the United States had started out by pressing charges against those representatives in their absence and then had denied them the right to take part in the debate, thus making it impossible for the absent parties to defend themselves.

50. An invitation to representatives of the People's Republic of China and of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would contribute to a positive solution of the question. It would facilitate the debate and would create an atmosphere propitious to a peaceful settlement.

51. Mr. Yakov MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation was not surprised at all at the position taken by the representative of the United States. Over a number of years the position of the United States on the present question had remained unchanged. Once again, and without any justification, the United States delegation had called the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China aggressors and had urged that in those circumstances the representatives of those countries should not be invited to participate in the discussion on the present question. In this respect he would ask the representative of the United States whether, before the Korean War, the United States delegation would have agreed to invite representatives of North Korea to submit their case on an equal footing with the representatives of South Korea. If the issue of inviting the representatives of North Korea was to be considered in the light of this question, it would be quite clear that the arguments submitted by the United States delegation against inviting them were entirely flimsy and groundless.

52. For the present he would not enter into an examination of the question of the responsibility for aggression in Korea, but he would recall that while the USSR delegation had previously submitted documentary evidence to show who had started the war in Korea, the United States delegation, in spite of a promise to submit such evidence, had not done so up to now. Even now the leaders of South Korea were appealing for a resumption of war against North Korea. The report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/2711), now before the General Assembly, had also stated that the South Korean authorities were opposed to a peaceful settlement of the Korean question. Apparently such a course was in line with the intentions of some circles in the United States, and it was for that reason that the United States delegation had given strong support to the draft resolution, submitted by the representative of Thailand, to invite the representatives of South Korea alone.

53. In his statement, the representative of the United States had also invoked past history. He had, however, not mentioned who was responsible for that

historical record. The States Members which had intervened in Korea on the side of the United Nations, together with an equal number of their sympathizers, had in the past defeated all proposals to invite representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take part in the discussion of the Korean question. As a result of the initiative taken by the People's Republic of China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and with the support of the USSR, hostilities in Korea had ceased. The next task was to arrive at a peaceful solution of the Korean question as a whole. Certainly, there could be no serious consideration, let alone a solution of the question unless the representatives of North Korea and China were first invited to take part in such a discussion. The stand taken by the United States delegation made it clear that the United States and those delegations which supported the United States stand were not interested in dealing seriously with the question of finding a solution of the Korean problem.

54. The reference made by the United States representative to the case of the thirteen United States spies who were arrested and duly convicted in China could not be taken seriously by the Committee as there was no logical connexion between that case and the question of extending an invitation to the representatives of North Korea or of the People's Republic of China to participate in the present debate. After all, the People's Republic of China was not at war with the United States or with the United Nations.

55. With regard to the statement of the United Kingdom representative to the effect that the Communist countries had called the United Nations a belligerent, that description should not be objected to. The United Kingdom and other Members of the United Nations had fought in Korea and thus North Korea and the People's Republic of China were justified to call the United Nations a belligerent party. Actually it was not a question of the United Nations, it was a question of a certain group in the United Nations which had intervened in the Korean War with their armed forces. That group was also now preventing an objective examination of the Korean question.

56. Since fifteen delegations had submitted a report on the Korean Political Conference at Geneva (A/2786) which gave a false picture of the position of North Korea and of the People's Republic of China, it was fitting that the Committee invite the representatives of those countries against which charges were levelled in that report. To fail to do so would not only be irregular but would also be contrary to the terms of the United Nations Charter. The Security Council had invariably invited both parties whenever it had examined any dispute which endangered international peace and security. In this connexion, he also recalled that the First Committee, while dealing with the Greek question at the third session of the General Assembly, had heard the representatives of Albania and Bulgaria, although they were not Members of the United Nations and had also been accused of having had aggressive intentions. When the question of the internationalization of Jerusalem had been discussed at the fourth session, the representative of the Hashemite Kingdom of the Jordan had been invited to take part in the discussions of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. Similarly, when the question of German elections had been discussed at the sixth session, the representatives of both West and East Germany had been heard by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee. Moreover,

when the Security Council had discussed the question of the Island of Taiwan in November 1950, the representative of the People's Republic of China had taken part in the discussion. Thus it was the established practice of the United Nations to give a hearing to both sides in a given dispute. In the interest of an objective and constructive discussion on the present item, it was absolutely necessary to extend an invitation to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the People's Republic of China.

57. Mr. MENON (India) said that his delegation would submit the following amendment (A/C.1/L.114) to the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.112) which had earlier been placed before the Committee: that the preamble be deleted, that the words "the Republic of Korea," be inserted before the words "the Democratic People's Republic of Korea" and that the words "without the right to vote" be added after the words "the Korean question".

58. His delegation submitted the above amendments because it believed that all parties concerned in the present discussion of the question had to be invited to participate. In some cases the United Nations had already followed that policy, as, for example, when it had invited the representative of the People's Republic of China to the Security Council meeting. Such an invitation did not involve the question of diplomatic recognition by any State or of admission to the United Nations.

59. Although the United Nations, through the medium of the United Nations Command, had operated as one of the belligerents in the Korean War, it was also, in a larger sense, the world organization before which Members, non-Members and even groups of people could appear. His delegation would also vote in favour of inviting the representative of the Republic of Korea in the same way as it would support an invitation to the representatives of the other States concerned.

60. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation would support the USSR draft resolution to invite the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the People's Republic of China to participate in the discussion of the Korean question. Experience had shown that the examination of the Korean question without their participation could not lead to any positive results. The Governments of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the People's Republic of China were vitally interested in the question of the unification of Korea. The Supreme People's Assembly of North Korea had addressed itself to the National Assembly of South Korea and had proposed a number of joint actions with a view towards achieving the peaceful unification of Korea in 1955. That showed the interest of the North Korean people in the unification of their country. Moreover, the allegations of aggression made against the People's Republic of China and against North Korea were completely baseless and were, in fact, contrived in order to prevent those two Governments from participating in efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement of the Korean question.

61. Mr. BARRINGTON (Burma) said that he assumed that the Committee would make a serious attempt to resolve the Korean question: his delegation would therefore support any proposal designed to have the People's Republic of China, the Democratic People's

Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea represented in the discussion of the present item.

62. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) said that his delegation would support the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Thailand, to invite the representative of the Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of the present item.

63. The delegation of Iraq was not in favour of the USSR draft resolution because North Korea was not only an aggressor but also had not abided by the terms of any of the United Nations resolutions. In this respect he wished to ask the representative of the USSR whether North Korea was now ready to accept United Nations resolutions and to respect the Organization's authority. If there was a real change of attitude and if there was proof of such a change, his delegation would support the amendment submitted by the representative of India.

64. Mr. SHUKAIRI (Syria) said that since the First Committee was dealing with the question of Korea, it was fair that the two parties in Korea be invited to put their case before the Committee. His delegation supported the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Thailand and would also propose that the USSR draft resolution be amended in order to extend the invitation only to the representatives of North Korea and of South Korea.

65. Sheikh AL-FAQIH (Saudi Arabia) said that he would support the amendment submitted by the representative of Syria. He also proposed that the USSR draft resolution be voted on in parts, each of the countries which it was proposed to invite to take part in the discussion being voted on separately. His delegation had always believed that all parties directly concerned in disputes had to be invited to submit their case before the United Nations. That principle was not applicable to the peoples of both North and South Korea. However, that principle could not be interpreted in such a way as to extend it to the People's Republic of China as the USSR draft resolution had proposed.

66. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America) declared that his delegation would not support the amendments submitted by the representatives of India and Syria. He noted that some delegations had wished to vote in favour of inviting one State and again inviting others. In the event that either of the amendments should be accepted by the Committee, the USSR draft resolution would become an omnibus resolution and would create some confusion. He would, therefore, suggest that a vote be taken on the draft resolutions submitted by the representatives of Thailand and of the USSR, and that the amendments offered be rejected.

67. Mr. SERRANO (Philippines) said that his delegation would support the proposal to extend the invitation to the representative of the Republic of Korea and would oppose inviting the representative of North Korea and of the People's Republic of China since the latter had been declared aggressors by the United Nations. The precedent invoked in this respect did not apply in the present case, because the United Nations had not declared any of the countries in question an aggressor. The rights to a hearing and to a fair play, invoked by the representative of the Soviet Union, were merely incidental to the principle of the supremacy of law and order, and no country could

voke those incidental rights without having previously recognized the principle from which they emanated. Were North Korea and the People's Republic of China to give an assurance that they would recognize that principle and abide by the decision of the United Nations, the question of their participation in the present debate could be considered.

3. Mr. SARPER (Turkey) said that his delegation would support the draft resolution submitted by the Thai delegation and would oppose the USSR draft resolution to invite the representatives of Peiping and North Korea to take part in the present debate. As regards the question of the representative of the USSR as to whether the attitude towards the North Korean authorities had been different before the war in Korea and started he would recall that the United Nations Commission on Korea had been unable to gain access to North Korea and had never received any replies to the various communications that it had addressed to the North Korean authorities. He could almost say that the North Korean authorities had never recognized the United Nations, not even before the aggression had started. It would, therefore, be unthinkable to extend an invitation to the representative of a régime which had constantly refused to recognize the authority of the United Nations.

4. Mr. Yakov MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that, with reference to the question put by the representative of Iraq, if the People's Republic of China were permitted to occupy its legitimate seat in the United Nations and if decisions were taken with the participation of its representatives in a discussion and in voting, then the People's Republic of China would certainly abide by those decisions. But decisions were imposed upon others, without granting them even the right to submit their case, then no self-respecting State could accept those decisions.

5. With regard to the statement of the representative of Turkey that the North Korean authorities had not recognized the authority of the United Nations from the very beginning, he suggested that Mr. Sarper, an old-time participant in the work of the United Nations, should recall that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had been the first to ask that its representatives be permitted to submit its case during the examination of the Korean question. However, the legitimate request of North Korea had been rejected. In the absence of the representatives of North Korea, a resolution had been adopted which imposed certain obligations on North Korea, and it was natural that the North Korean authorities had refused to abide by a resolution which had been adopted in their absence.

6. He concluded by reiterating his earlier demand that, in order to have an objective and constructive discussion of the Korean question, it was essential that the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the People's Republic of China participate in the discussion.

72. Mr. KISELYOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that his delegation would support the draft resolution, submitted by the USSR delegation, to invite the representatives of the Peoples Republic of China and of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of the Korean question. The draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Thailand (A/C.1/L.113) was supported by those States which had participated in the intervention in the Korean War. The supporters of the Thai draft had repeated the old charge that the North Korean forces had attacked South Korea. Time and again this charge had been refuted with documentary evidence by the representative of the USSR and by others, and it had been concluded that the troops of the South Korean Government first crossed the 38th parallel in June 1950.

73. At the Korean Conference at Geneva, the representatives of the People's Republic of China and of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had participated actively and had submitted a number of proposals for the peaceful unification of the country. It would, therefore, be in the interest of a constructive debate in the Committee that the representatives of those two Governments be given a chance to submit their case when the Korean question was being discussed. The Committee would be ill-advised to ignore the opinions of 11 million people of North Korea, let alone the 600 million people of the People's Republic of China.

74. Mr. FRANCO Y FRANCO (Dominican Republic) said that the Republic of Korea had been a victim of aggression and that the North Korean authorities and the Government of Communist China had openly violated the decisions of the United Nations and had defied its authority. One did not invite the guilty—when necessary they would be called upon to appear. His delegation would, therefore, oppose extending an invitation to the representatives of North Korea and of the People's Republic of China, as proposed by the USSR, and would vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Thailand.

75. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand) said that, since he was opposed to the USSR draft resolution, his delegation would also vote against the amendments to that draft resolution. However, he was in favour of extending an invitation to the representative of the Republic of Korea to participate in the present debate, and his delegation had submitted its own resolution to that effect.

76. Mr. SARPER (Turkey) pointed out that North Korea could not be a member of the United Nations Commission for the Unification & Rehabilitation because North Korea had not been and had not since become a Member of the United Nations. As a United Nations commission that body was composed of Members of the Organization only.

The meeting rose at 1. p.m.