

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

## PLENARY MEETING

## SEVENTH SESSION

Thursday, 23 April 1953, at 10.30 a.m.

## Official Records

Headquarters, New York

## CONTENTS

	Page
Question of impartial investigation of charges of use by United Nations forces of bacteriological warfare: report of the First Committee (A/2384) ( <i>concluded</i> ) and report of the Fifth Committee (A/2389) . . . . .	713
Complaint by the Union of Burma regarding aggression against it by the Government of the Republic of China: report of the First Committee (A/2391) . . . . .	717
Complaint of non-compliance of States still detaining members of the Greek armed forces with the provisions of resolution 382 A (V), adopted by the General Assembly on 1 December 1950, recommending "the repatriation of all those among them who express the wish to be repatriated": report of the President . . . . .	719
Suspension of the seventh session . . . . .	719

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

*In the absence of the President, Sir Gladwyn Jebb (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), Vice-President, presided.*

**Question of impartial investigation of charges of use by United Nations forces of bacteriological warfare: report of the First Committee (A/2384) (*concluded*) and report of the Fifth Committee (A/2389)**

[Agenda item 73]

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will recall that at its last meeting it decided to postpone a decision on the draft resolution of the First Committee on this item pending the submission by the Fifth Committee of a report on the financial implications of that resolution. That report is now before the General Assembly [A/2389]. The report of the First Committee [A/2384] having been presented to the General Assembly at its last meeting, we shall now proceed to reach a decision on the draft resolution contained therein.

2. Ato ZAUDE (Ethiopia): My intention in intervening at this time is not to engage in a detailed examination of the matter before us, but simply to explain the position of my delegation on the question under review. It is my feeling that every member of the General Assembly approaches this problem with the utmost seriousness and with a sense of responsibility towards world public opinion, whose conscience and feelings of justice have been called into play in connexion with the discussion of this problem. My delegation, in common with the others, views this question with serious-

ness and with concern, not only because we are aware that the charge of germ warfare is aimed at the United Nations forces in Korea and would tend to bring discredit upon our collective efforts to resist aggression in that part of the world, but also because such charges might well in the end undermine the United Nations if the latter does not seek, and indeed demand, that they be fully investigated. It is therefore the duty of all loyal Members of the Organization to show the world their determination to adopt all the measures necessary to probe the accuracy of such charges.

3. The United States Government has time and again sought to bring the accusation to the full light of day by proposing in the Security Council the adoption of a draft resolution calling for an impartial investigation. However, that draft resolution in favour of the establishment of an impartial investigating committee failed of adoption because of the negative vote of one of the permanent members of the Council.<sup>1</sup> Despite this fact, and despite the repeated official denials by the United Nations Command, the authorities of the United States Government, and by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the charges have continued undiminished to the present day, contributing greatly to the aggravation of world tension.

4. It is apparent from the course of the discussion in the First Committee that the validity of the evidence adduced in support of the charges has been flatly denied by many Members of the Organization. Their evidence

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Seventh year, 587th meeting.*

is in turn questioned. Naturally, as one of the Members participating in the collective United Nations action in Korea, Ethiopia cannot remain indifferent to such charges and, for its part, cannot accept them. However, Ethiopia is not asking that the other Members accept its view or those of other States associated in the action in Korea on the validity of the charges or the evidence presented in support of them. Ethiopia, as one of the delegations which sponsored the draft resolution under discussion in the First Committee, merely asks that the validity of these charges be carefully probed by an impartial international committee in order that the truth be established for the whole world to see.

5. If those bringing the charges against the United Nations forces in Korea really believe in the accuracy of their claims, they will readily vote for the establishment of the proposed committee and for an impartial investigation on the spot. With the establishment of a committee composed of members whose impartiality and integrity are unquestioned, a satisfactory solution could be achieved.

6. The present draft resolution seeks such an honourable solution, and it is to be hoped, therefore, that no one will take exception to such a position and that all Members will wish to see such a resolution adopted by a unanimous vote.

7. Mr. GROSS (United States of America): The campaign of lies charging the United Nations forces in Korea with waging germ warfare continues. Only last week, Radio Peiping proclaimed that United Nations planes over North Korea had dropped—I quote from the broadcast—"germ-carrying flies, spiders, and white insects on populated areas along railway lines and on coastal areas". Only last week, the representative of the Soviet Union abused the forum of the United Nations to characterize as "facts" similar false charges which have been made in the past. Why has it been impossible to lay at rest charges so gross and so false? We have demanded that those who manufacture and spread the lies should either agree to an impartial investigation or cease a course of conduct which breeds international tension and suspicion.

8. What we have proposed is not a debate on the charges, but their investigation. A lie may be spread in United Nations documents and uttered at our council tables and in the very halls of this Assembly, but the truth or falsity of the charges made cannot be established in documents or in debates. By this draft resolution, we proclaim the simple fact that this issue can be settled in laboratories and not over loudspeakers.

9. The representative of the Soviet Union has announced [427th meeting] his intention of voting against this draft resolution. He gives two reasons. He asserts that an investigation has already been carried out by what he called objective organizations and commissions. We all know the nature of these chosen instruments of Soviet propaganda. The representative of the Soviet Union also attempts to hide behind the thin pretext that the North Korean and Chinese communist authorities should have participated in the discussion as to whether these charges should be investigated. What does this draft resolution propose? The resolution will

put before the Chinese and North Korean authorities the question of whether they are willing to have these charges investigated under the auspices of representatives of Brazil, Egypt, Pakistan, Sweden and Uruguay, gathered together as a United Nations commission. If it is the intention of the communist authorities to reject such an investigation, they do not have to come here to give us that answer. If they realize at last the untenable position which they have taken, and if they accept this investigation, they will have the opportunity to say so when the President of the General Assembly transmits this resolution to them.

10. The USSR vote against the draft resolution is therefore a vote against an impartial investigation. It is a condemnation of the fairness with which the representatives of these five countries might be expected to investigate these charges. The course followed by the Soviet Union Government in persistently and wilfully rejecting an impartial investigation of these false charges—which that government itself makes and spreads—is reprehensible in the extreme. It compounds two crimes: speaking evil and concealing evil. It is a symptom and a product of the Iron Curtain mentality and it intensifies the fears and suspicions of decent world opinion. It is utterly and completely iniquitous.

11. We shall vote for this draft resolution and are confident of its wide acceptance in the General Assembly.

12. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The USSR delegation has already had an opportunity of giving its views on the question before the General Assembly, that of the impartial investigation of charges of the use of bacteriological weapons by United States armed forces in Korea. In my last statement [427th meeting], I explained the reasons why we had voted against this draft resolution in the First Committee and why we intended to vote against it in the plenary General Assembly.

13. In view of the fact that the United States representative has just made a statement here repeating his futile denials of facts duly ascertained by the authoritative international commissions, to which I referred last time, I feel I must say a few words on the subject.

14. The USSR delegation considers, as it has done in the past, that it is absolutely unnecessary to set up any new commission for the investigation of those charges because such investigations have been carried out a number of times by fully authoritative international commissions and because the facts referred to in our debates and discussions and in the complaints of the Korean and Chinese communities concerned, namely, the use of bacteriological weapons in the fighting, have already been quite clearly established from documentary evidence.

15. To-day, the United States representative has declared that if the USSR delegation protests against such a new investigation, and against the setting up of such a commission, that can only mean that it is against an impartial investigation. Of course, this statement is absolutely unfounded. The USSR delegation has always been in favour of conducting any really impartial investigation. If the United States also held that view, it could not object to the invitation of representatives of the People's Republic of China and the People's Demo-

cratic Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of this question, since these two countries are directly concerned in such a discussion. Nevertheless, when the USSR delegation and the delegations supporting it insisted in the First Committee that the representatives of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and of the People's Republic of China should be invited to take part in the consideration in the First Committee, of the proposals submitted by the United States delegation and now expressed in the draft resolution on which the Assembly will have to vote, this met with strong objections from none other than the representative of the United States delegation.

16. To talk of an allegedly impartial investigation in such circumstances is to stoop to new depths of hypocrisy and falsehood. We believe, and it should be self-evident, that the discussion of such a question without the participation of the representatives of the People's Republic of China and the People's Democratic Republic of Korea could not and cannot give the desired results, since it is impossible to examine any question impartially if only one of the interested parties participated while the other interested party is arbitrarily and unjustly prevented from doing so in any way. How can there be any talk of an absolutely impartial investigation when we have a situation in which one of the interested parties takes part in the investigation while the other takes part neither in the investigation nor even in the discussion of the question whether or not such an investigation is desirable and necessary?

17. That was why the USSR delegation could not support such a proposal, and its attitude has not changed. We cannot support the draft resolution adopted by the First Committee on the matter, for the reason which I have just explained. We consider that there is no need, in these circumstances, to set up a new commission to investigate the facts, which, however much it may be denied, have been established before the eyes of the whole world by authoritative, international and impartial commissions.

18. The establishment of such a commission would be the more unacceptable since the whole discussion and solution of these questions in the First Committee and in the General Assembly are taking place, as we see, in the absence of the governments of the countries most directly concerned in the matter. This is a violation of the fundamental rules of international law and of the principles of the United Nations Charter.

19. In view of these considerations, the USSR delegation voted against this draft resolution in the First Committee and, furthermore, feels obliged to recall that this text absolutely ignores the question of an appeal to States—including the United States of America, the author of the resolution—which have not acceded to or ratified the Geneva Protocol to accede to or to ratify that instrument, and that this question still remains unsolved. Nevertheless, this is an important question which, in our opinion, demands a solution without delay.

20. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*): We now have to take a final vote, in the light of the Fifth Committee's report, on the draft resolution relating to an investigation of the charges of the use of bacteriological warfare submitted to us by the First Committee.

21. In explaining my delegation's vote I must repeat here what I said in the First Committee: that when this charge was made it was received in an exemplary manner by the delegation of the country which was the main object of the accusation.

22. Faced with the charge of using bacteriological warfare, the United States of America requested an investigation. Twice in the Security Council it requested such an investigation, and it has now done so in the General Assembly. It is extraordinary that we should be faced with this veritable contradiction: that those most closely connected with the formulation of the charges should be unwilling to accept an honest and impartial investigation, and that such an investigation should be requested, in exemplary fashion, by the delegation of the very country upon which the charges most directly fall.

23. It has been argued that the draft resolution before the General Assembly is irregular because neither the representative of the North Korean Government nor the representative of the Government of the Chinese mainland was heard by the First Committee. But in the First Committee we should never allow this question to give rise to a new debate of a political nature.

24. The First Committee has heard and noted this accusation and has reached its decision on the United States Government's proposal for an investigation of the charges. Was anything more required at that stage than a decision to investigate the charges made? It is certain that when the commission begins its work—if the draft resolution is adopted here as it was in the First Committee—and when the case is investigated with the help of the competent experts, all the parties concerned will be able to state their views, and it will be possible to formulate in practical terms charges worthy of examination by the commission. We shall then avoid being diverted again into a debate on political questions which not only have nothing to do with the case, but would mean the continuance of the present situation, to which the United States representative has very justifiably referred today: that is, the persistent formulation of charges, while the accusers refuse—at least they did so in the First Committee—to agree to a commission of inquiry.

25. For this reason and although my country has the honour to be mentioned in this draft resolution, I cannot refrain from repeating here, on behalf of my delegation, the views we put forth in the First Committee in support of the draft resolution now before us. The motives which have induced us to support the draft resolution, to support the inquiry requested by the United States delegation, are stated clearly in the fifth paragraph of the preamble, which says merely this: "Desiring to serve the interests of truth".

26. That is the motive which inspired the representatives who asked for the inclusion of this item in the agenda and for the carrying out of an investigation, and whom we have supported by our statements and our vote on this proposal.

27. Mr. CHAUVET (Haiti) (*translated from French*): I stated recently in the First Committee that the views of small nations which act as arbitrators in controversies between the great Powers are of great importance. Their representatives take an entirely objective view and vote without prejudice or ulterior

motive. For that reason my delegation believes the establishment of a commission of investigation to be the first step in support of the sacred right of self defence. The mind recoils at any kind of obstruction or restriction which might endanger or destroy the sacred right of defence. We should be running the risk of poisoning public opinion if we did not state that the innocence or guilt of the accused must be established.

28. The purpose of the proposed investigation commission, composed of neutral States, is to throw light on the disturbing question of bacteriological warfare.

29. We must beware of the distortion which would result from a campaign to disparage the armed forces of the United Nations. In this maze of paradoxes, attempts are being made to produce something tangible by accusing the United Nations of having used bacteriological weapons. In such circumstances, what we need is an investigation in the interests of truth. We must shine the bright light of justice where the accusation has cast its shadows. Belief in this apocalyptic threat of bacteriological warfare must not be allowed to gain ground. Mankind will not resign itself to the possibility of any such collective suicide. If we want to be reasonable and just, we must help the commission of investigation in its task.

30. There is no real need to invite the communist representatives of China and North Korea to appear here as witnesses. We are doing something much better: we are proposing to visit them in their own country, where they can say all that they have to say and produce all their evidence, if need be.

31. That being so, my delegation sees no reason why we should not give our unanimous support to the draft resolution before us.

32. Yesterday afternoon, in a happy frame of mind, the USSR representative Mr. Vyshinsky referred, somewhat humorously and ironically, and it may be with a great deal of truth, to what he called the troublesome minority. Let us, then, advance a little farther, let us take one more step, and perhaps we shall reach the road leading to what our forefathers called "the joy of living"; perhaps we shall arrive at a point where hope will shine brightly.

33. Mr. KYROU (Greece): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee. The First Committee did not proceed to any investigation, which it was incapable of doing, as it is purely a political committee. It has recommended the setting up of a commission composed of five States, namely, Brazil, Egypt, Pakistan, Sweden and Uruguay, to "carry out immediately an investigation of the charges that have been made".

34. None of these States is an interested party; that is to say, none of them has forces in Korea. When this commission arrives on the spot, it will come into contact with the interested parties, that is, on the one hand, the United Nations forces in Korea, and, on the other, the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and the North Korean authorities. In any case, this commission will not follow the example set by the "unbiased" commissions referred to by Mr. Vyshinsky, commissions which were set up quite unilaterally and without any offer being made to the interested parties for their participation.

35. Mr. NOEK (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from French*): The Czechoslovak delegation already had occasion in its speech to the First Committee on 27 March, to state its position of principle on the question of an investigation into the use of bacterial weapons in Korea.

36. The fact that the representatives of the governments of the countries which had complained that the United Nations armed forces had used bacterial weapons against the population are being deliberately excluded from the discussions on so important a question constitutes a flagrant violation of Article 11, paragraph 2, Article 32, and Article 35, paragraph 2, of the Charter.

37. Many other less serious cases could certainly be quoted in which the United Nations had respected the provisions of Article 32 and invited the parties concerned to participate in the discussions. The exclusion of the lawful representatives of China and North Korea from our discussions has had the inevitable result of preventing a fair and objective examination of the question.

38. The Czechoslovak delegation cannot, therefore, consider that this is an impartial and objective examination of the question and is, accordingly, obliged to vote against the draft resolution which has been submitted to the General Assembly by the First Committee.

39. Mr. BORBERG (Denmark): The Danish delegation did not take part in the discussion of this item in the Committee. It did not think it necessary. It wants, however, to explain its vote. It will vote in favour of the draft resolution. No information has been brought to the knowledge of the Danish delegation inducing it to doubt the statements made by the Unified Command, but, out of respect for the sixteen countries having forces in Korea and offering this impartial investigation, we are, as I have said, going to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

40. The PRESIDENT: Since no other representative has asked for permission to explain the vote of his delegation, the Assembly will now proceed to vote on the draft resolution of the First Committee [A/2384]. 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 South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey.

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

*Abstaining:* Burma, India, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 51 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.*

41. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): The delegation of Saudi Arabia abstained in the vote on the draft resolution taking into account the statement of financial implications submitted by the Fifth Committee with regard to the appropriation of sums to cover the expenses that would be entailed by a special commission for the investigation of charges concerning bacterial warfare in Korea because, from our past experience in the United Nations, we have learned that, unless such commissions are admitted to the territories in which they are supposed to carry out their investigations, resolutions of this kind remain paper resolutions which are ineffectual and cannot be implemented.

42. An example of such a resolution was that adopted in connexion with the prisoners of war [*resolution 427 (V)*]. The commission then constituted by this Organization was never admitted to the territories where it was supposed to carry out its investigation. Unless the contending parties in the United Nations come to an understanding as to the constitution of such commissions, it is, in our opinion, futile and a waste of time to discuss such resolutions.

43. It is, indeed, deplorable that an *impasse* should exist among the major Powers of the United Nations on the methods to be adopted for an impartial investigation. Inasmuch as we should have liked to see the question cleared up in a satisfactory manner, we had no choice but to abstain.

**Complaint by the Union of Burma regarding aggression against it by the Government of the Republic of China: report of the First Committee (A/2391)**

[Agenda item 77]

*Pursuant to rule 67 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss item 77 of the agenda of the General Assembly.*

44. The PRESIDENT: Since it has been decided not to have a general discussion on this item, statements in connexion with it will be limited to explanations of vote, and I assume that, in accordance with custom, such explanations will be limited to seven minutes' duration.

*Mr. Thors (Iceland), Rapporteur of the First Committee, presented the report of that Committee (A/2391).*

45. U MYNT THEIN (Burma): Representatives will recall that yesterday, in the First Committee, the delegation of Burma abstained from the vote on the draft resolution now before the General Assembly. In explanation of that abstention, I stated that the draft resolution fell short of what we considered to be appropriate and justifiable. Representatives will understand that we should naturally have preferred that the First Committee should adopt our own draft resolution.

46. My Government, however, cannot help but be touched by the obviously sincere and sympathetic attitude taken by Member States towards this delicate issue. In particular, my Government takes note of the almost unanimous verdict of the First Committee—a verdict which shows that the United Nations accepts the justice of our complaint. I need hardly tell the

General Assembly that Burma could not be impervious to the solicitude so clearly displayed in the statements of various delegations in the First Committee. That solicitude is reflected in the draft resolution itself. Nor could Burma be unimpressed by the demonstration of unanimity in the First Committee yesterday.<sup>2</sup>

47. We believe that, with the solid moral backing of the United Nations and the practical assistance of those nations which can help us, the problem that besets us can be brought to a satisfactory conclusion.

48. Hence the Burmese Government, as the Government of a nation dedicated to democratic ideals, to peace and to peaceful methods, has instructed the Burmese delegation to identify itself with the draft resolution now before the General Assembly and to vote for it.

49. Once again, I should like to take the opportunity of expressing Burma's gratitude to members of the General Assembly for the understanding which was showered upon us during the course of the debate in committee.

50. Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): In giving its almost unanimous approval to the Mexican delegations' proposal for the solution of the thorny question raised under item 77 of our agenda, the First Committee has taken a great step forward on the tortuous path to international peace and security.

51. The unanimity achieved a few days ago [*427th meeting*] in the vote on the constructive Brazilian resolution was unquestionably a happy augury of better days for our Organization. My delegation is happy to have contributed to the reinforcement of our new-found optimism, thereby proving to the world that even in questions as complex and difficult as the one before us, the General Assembly is capable of harmonizing the numerous and divergent opinions of its members and reaching solutions based on firmness, due reflection and high principles.

52. I wish to repeat my thanks to those delegations which offered us their excellent suggestions and wise advice, and thus helped us to see clearly the fundamental points of agreement. I thank them all for their cordial support.

53. May I express the hope that at our next regular session we shall have the satisfaction of hearing the distinguished representative of Burma tell us that the situation which led to his justified complaint no longer exists and that peace has returned to his afflicted country.

54. Mr. TSIANG (China): When the draft resolution now before the General Assembly was put to the vote in committee, I abstained. Earlier, in the paragraph-by-paragraph voting, I voted for paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 and abstained from the vote on the other paragraphs. If the President puts the draft resolution to the vote paragraph by paragraph today, I shall vote in the same way as in committee. That will also be the case if the draft resolution is put to the vote as a whole—in other words, I shall abstain from the vote. I wish now to say a few words to explain the way I voted in committee and the way I shall vote here in the Assembly.

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, First Committee, 612th meeting.*

55. The item under discussion is entitled "Complaint by the Union of Burma regarding aggression against it by the Government of the Republic of China". In the First Committee the representative of Burma tried to prove that my Government had committed aggression against Burma. The Committee wisely and justly omitted that charge from its draft resolution; in fact, the draft resolution as a whole does not mention China or my Government at all. Since the draft resolution does not mention aggression by my Government or my country, there is no reason why I should vote against it. I did vote for paragraphs 3, 4 and 5, which impose on all States certain obligations. In so far as those obligations involve my Government, my Government will try to meet the wishes of the General Assembly.

56. The draft resolution, in the other paragraphs, passed judgment on certain "foreign forces". What these "foreign forces" are, the draft resolution does not say. In the course of the debate, of course, it was made plain who these "foreign forces" were. Now, I am the representative of my Government; I am not a representative of these so-called "foreign forces". What these "foreign forces" have done in Burma I do not know; I have no accurate or detailed knowledge. But it occurs to me that this is the first time in the proceedings of the United Nations that judgment has been passed on grave charges without an investigation on the spot. That kind of procedure is unwarranted. I feel that these charges should be studied and examined more carefully before the General Assembly passes judgment on these matters. It is for these reasons that I abstained, in the Committee, from voting on those paragraphs.

57. Mr. FERRER VIEYRA (Argentina) (*translated from Spanish*): The States Members of the United Nations are bound to comply with the provisions of the Charter, which lays down certain fundamental rules of conduct for the international community. On the other hand the United Nations is bound to fulfil its obligations towards its Members. This is a reciprocal duty—the duty of the Members to comply with the provisions of the Charter and the duty of the Organization to give its Members due guarantees that it will in fact maintain international peace and security.

58. The United Nations is founded on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members. The latter must refrain, in their international relations, from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. That is a fundamental principle.

59. The draft resolution on Burma unanimously approved by the First Committee reflects the universally held view that the sovereignty of States must be respected in every way.

60. My delegation believes that in adopting this draft resolution, one of the most important ever approved by the United Nations, the Organization has faithfully fulfilled its obligations. My delegation is happy to have contributed to the adoption of the text as it now stands.

61. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) (*translated from French*): My delegation will certainly vote for the draft resolution before us. It will do so for two reasons: first, because it provides for a just solution of the prob-

lem caused by the presence and hostile acts of foreign forces on Burmese territory; and secondly,—and this is to us a more important reason still—because in the resolution, and particularly as a result of the amendments which my delegation has presented and which have been incorporated in the text, the principle is laid down that not only are hostile acts committed by foreign forces against a country condemnable but that the mere presence of foreign forces on the territory of another country, contrary to the will of its people and government, are also to be condemned. We consider the affirmation of that principle by this Assembly a valuable precedent for good relations between peoples.

62. The PRESIDENT: Since no other delegation wishes to explain its vote, the General Assembly will proceed to the vote of the draft resolution of the First Committee [A/2391].

*The draft resolution was adopted by 59 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

63. Mr. ASHA (Syria): The Syrian delegation is indeed happy that the General Assembly has reached unanimity on the last day of its work by adopting this resolution. This is a source of profound confidence and hope in the future of our Organization.

64. We must not forget that the paramount objective of the United Nations is to find solutions to the difficult issues and problems which inevitably face the world from time to time. Nor must we forget that our work in the past has been neither encouraging nor helpful in finding solutions to the problems which were brought before us. In many cases expediency and accommodation seemed to be the paramount considerations in lieu of justice; to use an American expression, "arm-twisting".

65. The Syrian delegation has as its objective in this Organization the true interpretation of the principles of the Charter, and it has in the past dealt, and will continue in the future to deal, with all problems on their own merits, working for their solution in accordance with justice. We are confident, therefore, that the adoption of this resolution with such unanimity will lead to the solution of problems which may arise as a result of foreign troops being stationed in the territory of sovereign States against the express will of peoples and governments. We hope that such resolutions will be adopted unanimously for the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of any sovereign State.

66. Mr. ARAOZ (Bolivia) (*translated from Spanish*): The discussion which took place in the First Committee on the last item of the agenda of the resumed seventh session of the General Assembly, concerning the charge of aggression by foreign armed forces, brought by the delegation of the Union of Burma, has received high praise as one of the most outstanding debates in the history of the United Nations.

67. The representative of Burma received the attention of all the members of the Assembly; by reason of his sensible, dignified, objective and straightforward position on so controversial and difficult a problem he earned for his Government and people an outstanding tribute.

68. My delegation did not take part in the general debate, in the discussion on the draft resolutions or in the explanations of vote and does not intend to enter into the details of the problem at this stage. It need not stress the unquestionable merits of the Mexican delegation, which brought out the unanimous desire of the United Nations to find a solution to a case based upon the principles of international justice. Nor does it need to refer to the co-operative efforts of the delegations of Argentina and Chile, but it does wish to express here, in the name of the people of Bolivia, its warmest tribute to the people of Burma, who are fighting, as did the people of Bolivia, for their national liberation.

69. Nothing will receive stronger support from Bolivia than any action designed to maintain inviolate the principle of the self-determination of peoples which, with its respect for the sovereignty and integrity of the members of the international community, strengthens world peace and security. For those reasons the proposed solution of the Burmese complaint is a constructive and encouraging step, which will enable underdeveloped countries to cherish the hope that they will succeed in their endeavours to advance along the road of progress, freedom and welfare.

**Complaint of non-compliance of States still detaining members of the Greek armed forces with the provisions of resolution 382 A (V), adopted by the General Assembly on 1 December 1950, recommending "the repatriation of all those among them who express the wish to be repatriated": report of the President**

[Agenda item 70]

70. The PRESIDENT: Before adjourning this meeting, I wish, on behalf of Mr. Pearson, the President of the General Assembly, to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the report of the President [A/2388] under item 70 of the agenda. This report has been made by the President in accordance with the request made by the Assembly in its resolution 702

(VII) of 17 March 1953. This resolution requested the President of the General Assembly "to consult to this end with the governments in question and to report back to the General Assembly before the close of its current session".

**Suspension of the seventh session**

71. The PRESIDENT: The adjournment of this meeting represents, of course, the conclusion of matters immediately before the Assembly under the agenda of the seventh session. It does not represent the adjournment of that session, inasmuch as the Assembly decided at its 427th meeting as follows: "to recess the present session upon completion of the current agenda item", and to request the President of the General Assembly "to reconvene the present session to resume consideration of the Korean question (a) upon notification by the Unified Command to the Security Council of the signing of an armistice agreement in Korea; or (b) when, in the view of a majority of Members, other developments in Korea require consideration of this question."

72. In the temporary absence of Mr. Pearson, it would not, as I see it, be becoming for me to attempt anything in the nature of a speech. Nor indeed would it be fitting, seeing that—as I have just said—the General Assembly is merely taking a recess. Let me therefore simply say this. The present phase of our work, which is today concluded, has been on the whole, I think, happy and satisfactory. Let us hope that it will not be long before we all meet again to discuss the organization of peace following an armistice in Korea, on the conclusion of which so much depends. When and if this comes about, we must trust that our labours will be conducted in that atmosphere of objectivity and good temper which has happily characterized our recent debates. If I may for a moment employ the language in which one of our colleagues, at any rate—the representative of the Soviet Union—always feels quite at home, we shall then indeed have to hail *auspicium melioris aevi*.

*The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.*