



CONTENTS

	Page
Statement by the representative of Uruguay.....	463
Agenda item 24: Appointment of members of the Peace Observation Commission	463
Agenda item 17: The Korean question:	
(a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.....	464
Report of the First Committee	
Agenda item 69: Prohibition of propaganda in favour of a new war....	469
Report of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Political Committee	
Agenda item 25: Economic development of under-developed countries:	
(a) Question of the establishment of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development	
(b) Question of the establishment of an international finance corporation	
(c) International flow of private capital for the economic development of under-developed countries	
(d) Land reform	
Reports of the Second Committee and the Fifth Committee	473

President: Mr. Eelco N. VAN KLEFFENS
(Netherlands).

Statement by the representative of Uruguay

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Before proceeding with the agenda of this meeting I wish to inform the Members that the representative of Uruguay has requested permission to address the Assembly very briefly in connection with the closing meeting of the general conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) which is taking place today at Montevideo.

2. If there are no objections, I shall call upon the representative of Uruguay.

3. Mr. MARQUES CASTRO (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*): Today, in Montevideo, the capital of my country, the work of the eighth general conference of UNESCO, one of the noblest subsidiary organs of our international Organization, which has been going on for the past month, is drawing to a close.

4. As I had occasion to say here a few days ago, UNESCO has been able to discharge its important task in an atmosphere of true democracy and complete freedom in Uruguay. During the session which is ending today, UNESCO has adopted resolutions of such importance that they have already been described as historic.

5. Uruguay is proud of having offered its hospitality to such an illustrious institution and my delegation would like to pay a tribute in this General Assembly to UNESCO, which gathers together so many eminent representatives of universal thought, science and culture.

AGENDA ITEM 24

Appointment of members of the Peace Observation Commission

6. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The item before us is one which the Assembly decided to discuss directly in plenary meeting.

7. Mr. DE HOLTE CASTELLO (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): I do not think the Colombian draft resolution [A/L.183] needs any introduction. All we have done is to change the membership of the Peace Observation Commission by substituting Honduras for Colombia.

8. The Colombian delegation has always held that all countries should occupy seats in the General Assembly and in its subsidiary bodies in rotation. Having already served on the Commission and having been re-elected, the Colombian delegation feels that we should withdraw and that Honduras will be a very worthy successor in the work that we have been able to do.

9. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): If there are no other speakers, I shall put to the vote the draft resolution proposed by Colombia [A/L.183].

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

10. Mr. Yokov MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I wish to explain the Soviet delegation's vote on this draft resolution.

11. The Soviet delegation voted in favour of the membership provided for in the resolution adopted by the General Assembly, bearing in mind that it has always maintained that the Chinese representative on this Commission should be and can only be a person appointed by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

12. The Soviet Union delegation considers it necessary to make this explanation of its vote so that it may appear in the records of the General Assembly.

13. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The statement of the representative of the Soviet Union will be included in the verbatim record of this meeting.

14. Mr. CARIAS (Honduras) (*translated from Spanish*): On behalf of my delegation, I wish to thank the Colombian delegation in particular for nominating Honduras, and the other Members of the Assembly for having thus honoured my country.

AGENDA ITEM 17

The Korean question**(a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea**

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/2853)

Mr. Thorsing (Sweden), Rapporteur of the First Committee, presented the report of that Committee and then spoke as follows:

15. Mr. THORSING (Sweden) (Rapporteur of the First Committee): In a statement made before the Assembly in the general debate, one representative used the words "hardy perennials" to describe certain problems which we have had before us year after year. I regret to say that the question now before the Assembly belongs to that category. I do not say that in any spirit of levity. Except for Korea itself, there could be no Member of this Assembly more eager than my own country to see this dangerous problem solved very quickly. As Rapporteur of the First Committee, I think I am not wrong in saying that all sixty members of the Committee hope that it will soon be possible to weed out of our field of work this perennial which is so very dangerous for the growth of the beneficial crop of peace.

16. Although there were differences of opinion in the First Committee on certain provisions of the draft resolution which that Committee had submitted to the Assembly in its report [A/2853], I would draw the Members' attention to the fact that paragraphs 2 and 3 of the operative part were adopted without a negative vote.

17. I think that I interpret the consensus of the members of the Committee when I express the hope that nothing may be said or done in this Assembly which may weaken, or, even worse, destroy the foundations upon which the future of a united and democratic Korea may be built.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the First Committee.

18. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I shall now give the floor to any delegations which wish to explain their votes on the draft resolution proposed by the First Committee.

19. Mr. Yakov MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation considers it necessary to make the following statement in explanation of its vote on the draft resolution before the General Assembly.

20. The consideration of the Korean question in the First Committee has shown that the United States of America, together with some other countries which participated in the intervention in Korea on the side of the United States, continue to oppose the adoption of measures aimed at achieving a rapid settlement of the Korean question. The delegations of these countries refuse to undertake a serious, business-like and thorough examination of this question. As in the past they continued to prevent, illegally and in violation of the United Nations Charter, the granting of an invitation to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China to take part in the discussion of this question as the delegations of the USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia, India, Indonesia, Burma, Yugoslavia and many other countries had urged. Consequently, the Korean and Chinese peoples were unable to make their views known to the General Assembly.

As in the past, discussions took place without the participation of the representatives of these countries.

21. The upshot of the statements made by the United States delegation and the other delegations which supported it was that no practical measures for a peaceful settlement in Korea should be taken because the time was supposedly not ripe to resume negotiations.

22. That attitude indicates that the United States, as in the past, is endeavouring to maintain the *status quo* in Korea, and at the same time using a considerable part of that divided country as its colonial and military base in the Far East. The establishment of a unified and really independent democratic Korean State is not part of its plans.

23. In pursuit of that goal, the United States with the help of some of the Western Powers, is trying to present a distorted picture of the facts of the Geneva Conference on the Korean question, to discredit the positions of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union at that Conference, and thereby to conceal and justify the United States refusal at Geneva and in the General Assembly to undertake further negotiations on the peaceful settlement of the Korean question.

24. However, the one-sided and tendentious version of the Geneva Conference disseminated by the delegations of the countries which took part in the intervention in Korea, can in no way diminish the significance of the generally recognized fact that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the People's Republic of China and the USSR, which previously took a commendable initiative for the cessation of hostilities in Korea, did everything in their power at the Geneva Conference to achieve the adoption of agreed decisions which would ensure the rapid re-establishment of Korea as a unified, independent and democratic State. That indeed, was the purpose of the practical and constructive proposals made by the delegations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the People's Republic of China and the USSR for the holding of all-Korean free elections to be carried out by the Koreans themselves under impartial international supervision and in the absence of foreign occupation forces in Korea.

25. However, these proposals were rejected at Geneva by the United States delegation, which from the very outset attempted to use the Conference, by means of various far-fetched pretexts, to ensure that no agreement on the Korean question would be achieved by negotiations on a footing of equality among all the countries concerned, and to continue the notorious United States policy of dealing with this question "from a position of strength".

26. That is also why the representatives of countries which took part in the intervention in Korea, so insistently emphasized and tried to widen the differences between the States concerned with the Korean question, instead of making serious efforts to find a basis for agreement.

27. That policy was reflected in the false allegations that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union would reject the idea of establishing by peaceful means a single, independent and democratic Korea with a representative form of government and the principle of all-Korean free elections to be held under impartial international supervision.

28. The transparency of such allegations is perfectly clear to anyone who is even slightly acquainted with the documents of the Geneva Conference. In reality the situation is exactly the opposite. It is the People's Republic of China, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Soviet Union which persistently press for an agreement on the basis of these principles. That is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the Soviet delegation voted in the First Committee for those principles, as contained in the draft resolution which was considered by that Committee.

29. The Soviet Union insists that free elections should be held in Korea under impartial international supervision. In the first place, there are differences of opinion on how the elections are to be carried out. We believe that the elections should be held by the Koreans themselves in conditions of freedom which would preclude foreign interference and pressure on the electors. The United States of America and some of the countries which support it are attempting to impose on the Korean people election procedures which would enable them, with the help of foreign troops in South Korea, to extend the anti-democratic Syngman Rhee régime throughout Korea.

30. It should be clear that these attempts are certainly doomed to failure. The important Korean problem is ripe for solution, but it cannot be settled unless the vital interests of the Korean people and the need to strengthen peace and security in the Far East are taken into account.

31. The Korean question can and should be settled by means of direct negotiations between the interested States. The Soviet Union for its part is exerting and will continue to exert every effort to ensure that the Korean people achieve their legitimate right to establish a united, independent and democratic State. We believe that all necessary conditions exist for the removal of negotiations aimed at a rapid and peaceful settlement of the Korean question. It is not in the interests of peace to postpone the settlement of the Korean question and to leave Korea divided into two parts and occupied by foreign forces.

32. Accordingly, the Soviet delegation, on instructions from its Government, proposed that a conference on the Korean question should be called in the near future to be attended by all interested States. This proposal was rejected by the United States delegation and the delegations of those countries which took part in the intervention in Korea on the side of the United States. Consequently those who opposed the adoption of that proposal are thereby assuming the responsibility for the further postponement of the settlement of the Korean question.

33. The above-mentioned delegations proposed their own draft resolution, which is nothing more than the usual attempt to impose upon the United Nations a one-sided, tendentious and biased version of the Geneva Conference, and at the same time to propose conditions for the settlement of the Korean question which are acceptable to the United States.

34. The United States of America does not wish to take into consideration the opinions of the other interested States and apparently cherishes the hope that it can again propose a solution which is acceptable only to itself. However those hopes which were illusory in the past, are just as illusory at the present time. That kind of approach to the solution of controversial international

questions cannot promote peace and international co-operation.

35. The adoption of such a resolution cannot bring the solution of the Korean question nearer. Moreover, as the delegations of India, Burma and other countries correctly pointed out, the adoption of that draft resolution would lead to new difficulties and complications which would hamper the peaceful settlement of the Korean question and to the perpetuation of the division of Korea.

36. Consequently, that draft resolution is inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. Its adoption would be another blow to the prestige of this Organization. The Soviet delegation will vote against it because it is in direct contradiction to the position of the Soviet Union, which is striving for a rapid settlement of the Korean question. The individual unexceptionable provisions of the draft do not alter the fact that it is illegal and unacceptable as a whole.

37. It has also been proved that the further existence of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea is not only unnecessary but harmful to the settlement of the Korean question. The Soviet delegation therefore submits a draft resolution [A/L.184] providing that this Commission should be abolished.

38. Mrs. SEKANINOVA-CAKARTOVA (Czechoslovakia): I should like to state that the Czechoslovak delegation supports the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union, providing that the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea should be abolished. The Commission was established by General Assembly resolution 376 (V) of 7 October 1950. It was adopted at a time when the interventionist troops which occupied a considerable part of Korean territory believed that they would conquer all of Korea. From the very outset, the Commission's activities were designed to justify the military intervention in Korea, which was styled a United Nations action, and to support the policy of a permanent partition of Korea.

39. The nature of the Commission can be seen from its very membership, since the troops of five out of seven of its members participated in the military action in Korea. We cannot and do not consider this Commission to be an impartial body, worthy of the name of a United Nations organ. On the contrary, it is an instrument of foreign interference in Korean affairs and an obstacle to the peaceful solution of the Korean question. This Commission can in no way contribute either to the unification or to the rehabilitation of Korea, and in its report [A/2711, para. 5] the Commission explicitly admits that it "remains unable to contribute to the realization of the unification of Korea".

40. Indeed, this Commission does nothing. It does nothing to oppose the constant efforts made in South Korea to destroy the armistice and it does nothing to combat the calls for the march to the north and for a renewal of the war. On the contrary, it tolerates these aggressive plans and by its very presence supports them. The peaceful settlement of the Korean question requires that this organ be disbanded.

41. The Czechoslovak delegation opposed the establishment of the Commission, and, in accordance with the position it has maintained at past sessions of the General Assembly, and in keeping with its concept of the

high responsibility and authority of an organ entrusted with representing the United Nations, the Czechoslovak delegation fully supports the proposal submitted by the Soviet delegation for the dissolution of this Commission which has proved useless and harmful.

42. At the same time, I should like briefly to explain the position of my delegation with regard to the draft resolution which the First Committee had submitted to the General Assembly in its report [A/2853].

43. This draft resolution, adopted in the absence of the representatives of the countries directly concerned—the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China—is based on the report [A/2786] of the fifteen states which participated in the Korean war. As the discussions in the First Committee have confirmed, this report seeks to pass off the armed intervention of the United States in Korea as a collective action of the United Nations. It gives a one-sided and biased picture of the Geneva Conference and misrepresents the positions and the proposals of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union.

44. Ever since the conclusion of the Korean Armistice Agreement [S/3079], which was achieved by the initiative of the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and the Central Peoples' Government of the People's Republic of China, supported by the Soviet Union, those countries have worked untiringly for the achievement of an agreement on the peaceful settlement of the Korean question. The General Assembly proved itself incapable of ensuring the convening of the political conference provided for in the Korean Armistice Agreement.

45. At the Geneva Conference of the five great Powers in which the other countries concerned participated, a conference held on the recommendation of the Berlin Conference, the sixteen countries which had taken part in the military action in Korea broke off the negotiations, although some progress had been achieved and proposals for an agreement on the main principles had been submitted.

46. The intention of the draft resolution is to obtain, through the approval of the report of the fifteen Powers, an endorsement of the so-called principles as a pre-condition to agreement. The draft resolution is thus based on the concept of the endorsement of the will of one of the sides instead of on negotiations and mutual agreement. This characteristic is also underlined by the reservations made by some delegations in the First Committee about the meaning and the consequences of the approval of the report.

47. The establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea is primarily a matter to be solved by the Korean people themselves. At the Geneva Conference the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union submitted proposals regarding elections in Korea, proposals which are conducive to a just solution of the Korean question and which enable the Korean people to express their will freely and without any foreign interference. At the same time, these proposals provide for genuinely impartial supervision of the elections.

48. The so-called principle of free elections contained in the report of the fifteen-Powers aims in fact at elections under the supervision of one of the belligerent sides and in the presence of interventionist armed forces,

in circumstances which would deprive the Korean people of the possibility of freely expressing its will. The fifteen-Power proposal is intended to extend to the whole of the country the present regime in South Korea, the wholly undemocratic character of which even the tendentious report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea is not able to conceal.

49. The Czechoslovak delegation considers that an early settlement of the Korean question by peaceful means would not only serve the interests of the Korean people who, after the suffering and destruction of war, has every claim to a life of peace in a unified country, but would also contribute to the strengthening of world peace. Just as the cessation of hostilities could only be achieved by agreement between the parties directly concerned, so the peaceful solution of the Korean problem is possible only by agreement.

50. The draft resolution before us, based on the one-sided report of the Geneva Conference, in which so-called principles are presented as pre-conditions to agreement, cannot contribute to a peaceful settlement of the Korean question.

51. For all these reasons the Czechoslovak delegation will vote against the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee.

52. Mr. SKRZESZEWSKI (Poland) (*translated from Russian*): The Polish delegation will vote against the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee [A/2853].

53. In explaining my vote, I wish to draw attention to the following considerations which guided us in voting against this draft resolution adopted by the First Committee.

54. The Polish delegation has already analyzed the situation in Korea during the general debate of 6 December in the First Committee and emphasized the need for further negotiations in a spirit of agreement and co-operation for the settlement of the Korean question, which despite the cessation of hostilities, continues to be a serious threat to peace in Asia and throughout the world.

55. Through its participation in the Repatriation Commission and in the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in Korea, Poland assumed the difficult task of supervising the implementation of the Armistice Agreement; this, it considered that it was its special duty to emphasize the necessity of ensuring strict fulfilment of the conditions of the Agreement, as one of the prerequisites for the maintenance of peace in Korea.

56. We felt compelled to draw the Committee's attention to the difficulties facing us in the fulfilment of our supervisory duties, difficulties created by those who would like to hamper the work of our representatives. We also felt compelled to call attention to the established facts that in several areas the so-called United Nations Command failed to carry out the recommendations set forth in the Armistice Agreement concerning, among other things, the rotation of personnel, the prohibition of any increase in the military potential of the army and the repatriation of prisoners of war.

57. All the experience gained in the Korean question and in particular the experience of the Armistice Conference in Panmunjom, and the experience of the Geneva Conference indicates that the Korean question can be settled only on the basis of agreement among all the

interested parties and of decisions which are in line with the national aspirations of the Korean people and with the need to promote peace in Asia.

58. The Polish delegation welcomed the conference of Great Powers and other countries at Geneva, hoping that agreements would be reached on the Korean question under conditions of relaxed international tension. The events which took place at the Geneva Conference showed that there were real possibilities of reaching agreement. That was due to the constructive view of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. It was also due to the positions of some other States which, as was apparent from the statements of their representatives, were prepared at some points during the Conference to seek means of settling the question in a spirit of agreement and co-operation.

59. Contrary to the version of the Geneva Conference that the fifteen Powers which participated in the Korean war are trying to impose, in their report [A/2786] the real reason why no agreement was reached in Korea was that the United States adopted an uncompromising attitude, refused to come to an agreement and did not conceal the fact that it was only prepared to accept a solution which would mean the extension of the Syngman Rhee regime throughout Korea.

60. The extremely uncompromising attitude of the United States on Korea is illustrated by the fact that it did not even agree to a declaration repudiating the use of armed force in settling the Korean dispute, and rejected the idea that further consultations and negotiations were necessary.

61. That attitude was confirmed by the discussions in the First Committee. During the discussions the United States delegation maintained its policy of dealing with the interested parties on an unequal footing, thus violating the Armistice Agreement and the spirit of the Geneva Conference as well as the generally accepted principle that international disputes can be solved only if all the parties concerned are accorded the right of equal representation. The refusal to allow the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China—a great Asian Power which has a special responsibility with respect to questions relating to peace in Asia and throughout the world—to take part in the discussions of the Korean question in the First Committee proved that the United States was continuing its policy of imposing its one-sided decisions.

62. I must also refer to another aspect of the discussions in the First Committee. Apart from the draft resolution which the Committee adopted, the Soviet Union proposed a draft resolution of its own recommending further negotiations for a peaceful settlement of the Korean question. The Committee also had before it a draft resolution submitted by India, which was primarily designed to break the deadlock on the Korean question. The First Committee could have come to an agreement on the basis of the Indian draft. However, the United States by imposing its point of view on the Committee, prevented the achievement of positive results.

63. The Polish delegation will vote against the draft resolution as a whole submitted by the First Committee. This draft is designed to maintain the deadlock on the Korean question and to prolong the life of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilita-

tion of Korea. This Commission is a pawn in the hands of the forces opposing the unification of Korea by peaceful means and obstructing the efforts for a peaceful settlement of the Korean question as a whole. That is clear from this Commission's activities and report. Accordingly, the Polish delegation supports the Soviet Union draft resolution for the abolition of the Korean Commission.

64. The Polish delegation considers that the Korean question can be settled only in a spirit of agreement among all the interested parties. Bearing in mind the importance of this question to the Korean people and to the peoples of the whole world, the Polish delegation is prepared to seek, together with other delegations, solutions which would promote peace and meet the vital needs of the Korean people themselves.

65. Mr. LALL (India): The delegation of India cannot but note with satisfaction that the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in its report [A/2853] is substantially the draft resolution which was submitted by my delegation to the First Committee as a draft resolution prior to the one which is now recommended to the General Assembly for adoption. I will not recall the circumstances in which the delegation of India decided not to press a vote on its own draft resolution. But, as I have said, this draft resolution in fact reproduces most of the clauses which were offered first to the Committee in the Indian draft resolution. To that extent, this draft resolution certainly is one of which we approve.

66. We must, however, comment on paragraph 1 of the operative part which expresses approval of the report on the Korean Political Conference [A/2786]. The report on the Korean Political Conference must be related to resolution 711 (VII) of the General Assembly, the appropriate clause being sub-paragraph 5 *d* in which it is stated that the United Nations will be kept informed, at appropriate times, of progress in this matter.

67. We regard the report on the Korean Conference as an interim report which has essentially been brought before the United Nations for its information; and we feel that, in view of the limited progress which was made at Geneva, it would have been more appropriate for the Assembly merely to take note of it. In our view, at this time, it is supererogatory for the Assembly to express approval of this report.

68. Apart from this fairly important procedural aspect of the matter, it seems to us that there is an important point of substance involved which really makes it extremely difficult for us to agree to the idea of approval of this report. This is so because approval of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution would set our seal on the view that elections in Korea can only be held under the supervision of the United Nations. This view is unrealistic, in the first place. Secondly, it reverses a recent trend wherein the stress has been on impartial international supervision rather than on supervision under the authority of one organization which, no matter how important that organization is, is not unfortunately entirely representative in present conditions. Thirdly, the approval of the report on the Korean Political Conference involves the approval of certain inconsistencies. Paragraph 4 of that report deals with conducting the elections under appropriate supervision and under the authority and auspices of the United Nations, whereas paragraph 1 which crystallizes two principles,

deals with supervision by the United Nations. In these circumstances, what are we doing? We seem to be confusing an important issue. We cannot but feel that the time will come when this same Assembly, in its own wisdom, will wish to modify its position so as to realize its own objective to achieve a unified, independent and democratic Korea.

69. We therefore regret the drafting of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee. For that reason, we will have to abstain on the vote on that draft resolution.

70. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Does any other representative wish to explain his vote? If not, we will vote on the two draft resolutions before us.

71. In accordance with established practice, and out of courtesy to the First Committee, I call upon the General Assembly, if there is no objection, to vote first on the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee [A/2853]. The representative of Poland has asked for a vote paragraph by paragraph. We will therefore proceed on that basis. Will it meet the Polish representative's wishes if I first put the preamble as a whole to the vote, and then the various operative paragraphs one by one?

72. Mr. SKRZESZEWSKI (Poland) (*translated from Russian*): Unfortunately I cannot agree to that, and would ask the President to put each paragraph to the vote separately.

73. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In that case we will take a vote on each paragraph of both the preamble and the operative part. Perhaps, however, the representative of Poland will agree that we can put the first two paragraphs of the preamble to the vote together, as they merely recite facts not subject to discussion.

74. Mr. SKRZESZEWSKI (Poland) (*translated from French*): I agree, Mr. President.

75. Mr. Yakov MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I should like a separate vote to be taken on each paragraph as was originally requested. The point is that the substance of these individual paragraphs is different and delegations may wish to vote differently on each one. It would therefore be better if we voted separately on these two paragraphs of the preamble.

76. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America): Is it claimed by the representative of the Soviet Union that there has been no report which has been received or even noted? The intention in these two paragraphs is not to have the General Assembly pass judgment; the Assembly would merely take note of having received the reports.

77. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The question asked by the representative of the United States is legitimate, but the representative of the Soviet Union, like all other delegations, is entitled to ask for a vote paragraph by paragraph, if there are no objections.

78. Mr. SARPER (Turkey): The original request for a separate vote was made by the representative of Poland. Since he has withdrawn his request, do we have another motion on the part of the representative of the Soviet Union?

79. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): As the representative of the Soviet Union has asked for a vote paragraph by paragraph, I shall put to the vote separately the individual paragraphs of both the pre-

amble and the operative part of the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee in its report [A/2853].

The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 50 votes to 5, with 1 abstention.

The second paragraph was adopted by 52 votes to 5.

The third paragraph was adopted by 57 votes to none.

The fourth paragraph was adopted by 58 votes to none.

The fifth paragraph was adopted by 59 votes to none.

Paragraph 1 of the operative part was adopted by 44 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 59 votes to none.

Paragraph 3 was adopted by 59 votes to none.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 54 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

80. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I shall put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 52 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

81. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I call on the representative of France on a point of order.

82. Mr. HOPPENOT (France) (*translated from French*): The total has been different in nearly every vote. May I ask the secretariat of the Assembly to count the votes a little more carefully, one by one, and not by just glancing round the Assembly?

83. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): In defence of the secretariat I should like to point out to the representative of France that it sometimes happens that some delegations do not vote at all. We will, with the secretariat's apologies, put again to the vote the draft resolution as a whole. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, 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

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

Abstaining: India, Indonesia, Syria, Burma.

The draft resolution was adopted by 50 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

84. Mr. Yakov MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I should like to make a brief comment on the United States representative's statement before the vote on the second paragraph of the preamble.

85. What matters is not that a report has been received, but that, instead of being a report on the Political Conference, it is a tendentious account submitted by the delegations of some of the countries which took part in this Conference. Therefore, irrespective of whether it

has been received or not, the report can serve no purpose in the solution of this problem. Accordingly, the Soviet delegation requested a vote by division on that paragraph and has voted against it.

86. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We will regard that comment as an explanation of vote.

87. If no other delegations wish to explain their vote, I call upon the Assembly to vote on the draft resolution proposed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [A/L.184].

The draft resolution was rejected by 48 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 69

Prohibition of propaganda in favour of a new war

REPORT OF THE *Ad Hoc* POLITICAL COMMITTEE
(A/2844)

Mr. Derinsu (Turkey), Rapporteur of the Ad Hoc Political Committee, presented the report of that Committee.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Ad Hoc Political Committee.

88. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I will now ask Members of the Assembly wishing to do so to explain their votes on the draft resolution proposed by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee.

89. Mrs. SEKANINOVA-CAKARTOVA (Czechoslovakia): In explaining the position of the Czechoslovak delegation regarding the draft resolution submitted to the General Assembly by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee in its report [A/2844], I should like to stress once again the far-reaching significance of the cessation of propaganda in favour of a new war, for the strengthening of peace and friendship among nations, and to emphasize how urgent it is for the United Nations—an organization created for the maintenance of international peace and security—to make the necessary recommendations to this end.

90. The discussion in the Committee has fully borne out the justification for the request made by the Czechoslovak delegation for the inclusion in the agenda of the ninth session of the Assembly of the item on the prohibition of war propaganda, and for the recommendation, by our Organization, that all countries take effective measures for the discontinuance of propaganda which is incompatible with the fundamental principles and purposes of the Charter. Not one of the delegations intervening in the debate has denied that war propaganda is being carried on in a number of countries, and a number of delegations concurred in the opinion that the General Assembly should take appropriate measures. The discussion has clearly shown what are the barriers to mutual understanding and the strengthening of peace.

91. The draft resolution submitted to the Assembly by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, however, does not reflect the course of the discussion. The amendments submitted in the Committee by the United States and some other countries were intended to stultify the Czechoslovak draft resolution and to prevent the Assembly from making effective recommendations on this important issue. The draft resolution now before us is the outcome of these efforts.

92. Unlike the Czechoslovak draft resolution, which is based on the unanimously adopted resolution of the Gen-

eral Assembly condemning all forms of war propaganda, it refers in the first place to resolutions 290 (IV) and 381 (V), which were the fruits of the majority vote in the cold war. The reaffirmation of these resolutions, which contain unacceptable provisions and which were inspired by and the result of slander against Czechoslovakia, the other peoples' democracies and the Soviet Union, is not intended to prevent propaganda in favour of enmity and war and cannot contribute to the promotion of peaceful co-operation.

93. In the text which is now before the General Assembly, reference to the provisions of resolution 110 (II), expressing the Assembly's unanimous condemnation of all forms of war propaganda, is suppressed.

94. In submitting its draft resolution on the prohibition of propaganda in favour of a new war to the ninth session of the General Assembly, the Czechoslovak delegation took into consideration the present international situation, characterized by a certain degree of progress in the relaxation of international tension, with one aim: to contribute to the further strengthening of peace. The new paragraphs now affixed to the preamble of the Czechoslovak draft are in diametric opposition to this objective, and the endeavour to remove even the heading under which this item was introduced to the agenda of this session is but another confirmation of this fact.

95. For all these reasons the Czechoslovak delegation is opposed to the adoption of the draft resolution contained in the report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee and submits to the Assembly its draft resolution [A/L.185], which is based on the unanimously adopted resolution 110 (II) and which, we are convinced, indicates the proper procedure which the General Assembly should follow in taking effective steps towards the prohibition of propaganda for a new war and toward the improvement of relations between States.

96. Mrs. WIERNA (Poland) (*translated from Russian*): The Polish delegation attaches great importance to the question of the prohibition of propaganda for a new war. Such propaganda, and the theory of the inevitability of war which is being fostered in some countries, have aggravated international relations and prevented the creation of the more peaceful political atmosphere which is so essential to the peaceful settlement of outstanding international problems. The Polish delegation considers that the United Nations should not overlook any means of helping to eradicate from international life all obstacles to the normalization of international relations.

97. The People's Republic of Poland will be in the forefront of all United Nations efforts and measures to relax international tensions, eliminate war propaganda and realize peaceful coexistence. The Polish delegation therefore considers that the Czechoslovak draft resolution [A/L.185] on the question of the prohibition of propaganda in favour of a new war submitted during this session is very timely and appropriate.

98. The Polish delegation considers that the adoption by the Assembly of the Czechoslovak draft resolution will serve the cause of peace and help to strengthen the authority of the United Nations; the adoption of a resolution stating the necessity of curbing war propaganda would be logically connected with other efforts to secure peace.

99. Apart from an appeal for the implementation of provisions unanimously adopted by the Assembly in

resolution 110 (II) condemning war propaganda, this draft resolution introduces a new substantive provision in the recommendation to Governments to take effective measures against such propaganda. In view of the fact that, seven years after the adoption of resolution 110 (II), war propaganda has not only not ceased but, as is shown by the facts, is constantly being intensified in certain countries, especially the United States, it is extremely important for the Assembly to adopt more effective measures than those provided for in resolution 110 (II). The United Nations might thus give strong support to those who really want to improve the international atmosphere and further to relax tension.

100. That is why the Polish delegation, which supported the Czechoslovak draft resolution in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, will vote now for that delegation's draft resolution, in the deep conviction that it serves the interests of peaceful co-operation among nations. At the same time, the Polish delegation considers that the draft resolution submitted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee to the General Assembly today, distorts the meaning and purpose of the Czechoslovak draft on the prohibition of war propaganda, since the Czechoslovak delegation's original text which was discussed in the Committee, was altered by amendments which had nothing in common with the prohibition of war propaganda.

101. The draft resolution contained in document A/2844 is a retrograde step even in comparison with what we achieved in 1947. It not only fails really to curb propaganda of hatred and for war, but avoids any mention of condemning such propaganda. The real meaning of the document is that it omits anything that might impose on Governments an obligation not only effectively to counter war propaganda but even consistently to implement resolution 110 (II), which censured propaganda.

102. The realistic methods for the prevention of war propaganda proposed by the Czechoslovak delegation have been replaced by hollow phrases about free exchange of information and ideas. The Polish delegation does not consider, however, that freedom of speech is synonymous with freedom to disseminate views prejudicial to the cause of peace.

103. Freedom of information and free exchange of opinions must not be used for war propaganda. It should be emphasized that the draft resolution submitted to the Assembly does not confine itself to omitting such a fundamental factor as condemnation of war propaganda and the measures to be taken against it. It also refers to resolutions 290 (IV) and 381 (V), against which a number of delegations, including the Polish delegation, voted at the time, in the belief that they could not advance the cause of peace and international agreement.

104. As the draft resolution in document A/2844 provides for no effective measures for condemning war propaganda and the war hysteria to which it gives rise, and in effect leaves full freedom of action for such propaganda, the Polish delegation considers that the draft resolution cannot help to improve international relations and will therefore vote against it.

105. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): In explaining its vote on these draft resolutions, the USSR delegation considers it necessary to draw attention to the following facts.

106. In resolution 110 (II) adopted unanimously on 3 November 1947, the General Assembly condemned all forms of war propaganda and requested the Governments of Member States to take appropriate steps to promote friendly relations among nations based upon the Purposes and Principles of the Charter. Despite this General Assembly resolution, however, war propaganda has not only not ceased but, on the contrary, is being conducted on an increasingly larger scale in a number of countries. In some countries, especially in the United States of America, the Press, radio and cinema give wide dissemination to incitement to war, the utilization of military bases for attacking and bombing the industrial and cultural centres of other countries, and the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

107. Although the General Assembly resolution of 1947 imposes on the Governments of Member States the obligation to take steps to promote friendly relations among nations and to encourage the dissemination of all information, to quote the resolution, "designed to give expression to the undoubted desire of all peoples for peace", in the United States not merely the reactionary Press, representing specific social groups, but persons holding responsible Government posts, are actively engaging in war propaganda.

108. It was shown in the Committee that, year in year out, the United States Press is flooded with slander and lies against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies and that absolutely inadmissible propaganda is conducted against peace-loving countries with a view to inciting riots, promoting sabotage, encouraging passive resistance and hampering economic and industrial activity in the people's democracies. It is no secret that the United States Congress also takes part in this propaganda. The United States Press propagandizes various plans for the use of military bases to prepare for attacks against the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and the people's democracies. The opportunistic nature of all this propaganda and all such aggressive plans is obvious to any sober-minded person.

109. The intensification of war hysteria in the United States and the growth of hatred and hostility among nations are furthered by the statements of important politicians and responsible leaders of the United States armed forces concerning the so-called policy of "mass retaliation" and preventive war against the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries.

110. The debate in the Committee showed that a special, and I should say, unfortunate notoriety in that connexion has been acquired by one of the leaders of the United States Republican Party, Senator Knowland, and by responsible leaders of the United States armed forces, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Carney, and the Commanding General of the Strategic Air Command, Major-General LeMay, who engage in open propaganda for preventive war. These men have disclosed the plans of a small but influential group in the United States which is interested in the maintenance of a warlike atmosphere, in war hysteria, in continuing war propaganda and in carrying on a campaign of hostility and hatred among nations. These men cannot accept the fact that, thanks to the efforts of peace-loving peoples, there has been a certain relaxation of international tension and that appreciable success has been achieved in improving international relations,

mainly owing to the cessation of war in Korea and Indo-China.

111. British Field Marshal Montgomery has recently joined their ranks and has been insistently urging in his public statements the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons against peace-loving peoples. One cannot read without indignation these appeals by the British Field Marshal, who, as a military man, is well aware that atomic and hydrogen bombs are weapons of aggression, weapons designed for the mass annihilation of peaceful populations and for the destruction of large cities, these centres of modern industry, culture and civilization.

112. The statements made in the Committee also brought to light many facts about the current unbridled propaganda for a new war to enable Western Germany to recapture lost territory. Western Germany is, of course, occupied by the forces of the United States, the United Kingdom and France, and the Governments of those countries consequently bear the primary responsibility for the existence of such propaganda. The United States bears similar responsibility for the hysterical propaganda for an armed aggression against North Korea, with a view to the forcible unification of North and South Korea, which is being conducted by that notorious warmonger, Syngman Rhee.

113. The facts adduced in the Committee clearly show that the General Assembly resolution condemning war propaganda is not being implemented in a number of countries. Seeing that there has been some relaxation of international tension, the propaganda for a new war which is being conducted in the United States of America and some other countries cannot be appraised otherwise than as an effort to prevent any further relaxation. The General Assembly cannot disregard these facts, since war propaganda is a serious obstacle to the further relaxation of international tension and to the improvement of relations among States. War propaganda is contrary to the provisions of the Charter and its dissemination constitutes a violation of the obligations which Member States have assumed under the Charter.

114. The General Assembly should call upon all States consistently to implement its resolution of 3 November 1947 condemning war propaganda. That is the very purpose of the draft resolution on the prohibition of war propaganda submitted by the Czechoslovak delegation.

115. The USSR delegation wholeheartedly supports this draft and will vote for it.

116. Mr. WADSWORTH (United States of America): From the speech of Mr. David, of Czechoslovakia, in the general debate last October [489th meeting], through the speeches of every Soviet-bloc representative in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee debate on this item, there was not one which did not use the Czechoslovak draft resolution, which has now been resubmitted to the plenary, as a jumping-off place for inflammatory attacks on free nations and particularly on my own country.

117. These attacks were against all sorts of statements. They were against ordinary Government information programmes. They were against statements of individual legislators, military people and retired officials. They were against articles in our free Press. And, wandering far afield from mere verbal statements, they were against our actions and our policies as nations. The one unifying feature was that all these

attacks were against any statements made in the free world about Soviet communism which was other than laudatory, or against those that advocated the building of defences against the spread of communism.

118. The Czechoslovak draft resolution was amended during the deliberations of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee in accordance with the proposals of ten Member nations, including the United States. These amendments had three simple purposes—and not one of those purposes was to protect in any way the dissemination of propaganda for a new war. First, they removed all the tendentious language of the original text, which was, as all here know, directed against one nation in particular. Second, they recalled that there are already on the books of the General Assembly two resolutions, 110 (II) and 381 (IV), condemning propaganda against peace, and they reaffirmed those two resolutions. Third, they recalled and built upon the broader resolution, 290 (IV), entitled "Essentials of peace". That part of the resolution is emphasized which "calls upon every nation . . . to remove the barriers which deny to peoples the free exchange of information and ideas essential to international understanding and peace".

119. The resolution on the essentials of peace makes good reading. It should be re-read by all of us, because it goes far beyond the matter of words or propaganda and sets forth the kind of deeds which are required if we are to have a peaceful world. But it is proper that the draft resolution adopted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee should give special attention to that part of the resolution on the essentials of peace which does in fact deal with words and communications. For what was called for there was nothing less than the ending of the artificial iron curtains which divide our world. The Committee's draft resolution recognizes that the iron curtain "constitutes a major obstacle to the strengthening of peace and genuine international co-operation and fosters the continuation of false and hostile propaganda against other States and peoples". In other words, we go on record as recognizing that hostile slogans and elaborate hymns of hate, which some nations have been hurling about the world, could never originate in an atmosphere of free communication and healthy competition of ideas.

120. By striking at the conditions of artificial isolation which make possible the massive mounting of hostile propaganda, this draft resolution deals realistically with those evil words and ideas which are the spiritual breeding-ground of aggression and war. It is the most constructive approach which the Committee could devise to this terrible problem of hate propaganda. The United States delegation believes it is a real contribution to the cause of peace and will vote in favour of the draft resolution adopted by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee, which, as we have been told by the Rapporteur, has been re-entitled "Strengthening of peace through the removal of barriers to free exchange of information and ideas".

121. Mr. QUIROGA GALGO (Bolivia) (*translated from Spanish*): The Bolivian delegation feels that the draft resolution approved by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee does not fully reflect the will to peace which inspires all the civilized peoples of the world regardless of the desires of certain groups for political, economic or ideological expansion.

122. My delegation has already made clear its view on this subject during the general debate which took place

at the beginning of the ninth session. We said then [490th meeting] that it was absolutely essential to lead a world-wide psychological crusade to remove from the minds of men the conviction that war was inevitable. Quoting the words of a French writer, I said that the atomic bomb was not dangerous in itself since it was merely an object, that man was the danger, because he was preparing to use the bomb.

123. The United Nations, through all its specialized organs and agencies, must therefore carry out this psychological crusade so that international public opinion is converted into the most powerful and effective instrument of control confronting the war-like designs of certain groups.

124. My delegation reserved the right to submit a draft resolution along these lines. Meanwhile it will vote for the draft resolution approved by the *Ad Hoc* Committee although it feels that it is not entirely satisfactory.

125. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): I can see no reason for the discussion of this item to be reopened in plenary session, but I feel bound to say this much: the Czechoslovak draft resolution was given thorough consideration in the Committee, and the Committee preferred to recommend by an overwhelming majority a text which was substantially different. The Committee has done good work and its report deserves endorsement by a decisive vote in the General Assembly.

126. It seemed to us that the motives of the Czechoslovak delegation in asking for the inscription of this item must have been purely propaganda and cold-war motives. It was indeed the first real evidence that we had had at this session that, in spite of the conciliatory mood of the early part of this Assembly, the Soviet bloc intended to use this session, like others in the past, as a platform in the cold war. Fortunately, the Committee knew better than to endorse the Czechoslovak approach, and it has placed before us a draft resolution which is a valuable reminder of what the essentials of peace are and what must be done if we are to create that international understanding which the Soviet cold-war manoeuvres do so much to destroy.

127. I therefore hope that the General Assembly will adopt forthwith by an overwhelming vote the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee's draft resolution.

128. Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): A representative of the Soviet bloc said in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee that the purpose of the sponsors of the amendments which have now become that Committee's draft resolution was to permit war propaganda. He said, according to the interpretation, that the sponsors' purpose was "to argue that war propaganda should go on unchecked". Referring to the statements of some other representatives, including that of Australia, the representative of the Ukrainian USSR asked how freedom to make statements of a war-like character could contribute to the cause of peace?

129. We, of course, have never maintained that war-like statements contributed to the cause of peace. On the contrary, our amendments recalled and emphasized previous resolutions condemning any expression of support for aggressive action.

130. What the Australian representative did state was that the means must be calculated to achieve the objective. The choice of methods for countering war-like propaganda lies between the negative means of suppressing news and opinion, and the positive means

of promoting greater understanding by encouraging free expression and the free communication of information. The choice of suppressive means would defeat the object. Such means lead to government's controlling opinion, and that, as history demonstrates, in turn leads to great dangers. As a matter of history, State control of information and opinion has too often been associated with aggression.

131. In our view, State monopoly of opinion and centralized mass regimentation of minds increase the danger of war in two ways. First, they make it easier for governments possessing such powers to adopt aggressive policies and carry out activities harmful to neighbouring countries, since the people of the aggressor State may be left in ignorance of such activities or, by propaganda, may be persuaded to accept them. Secondly, they necessitate the erection of barriers against information and views not acceptable to the government exercising the control and, as a result, the peoples of the State subjected to such control and the peoples of other countries misunderstand one another. That is only too likely to lead, and does in fact lead, to fear of one another, thus contributing to an atmosphere of distrust favourable to war preparations and propaganda.

132. The Soviet Union representative in the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee defended the barriers erected between Czechoslovakia and the rest of the world. He took the opportunity, incidentally, to put forth some propaganda in favour of coexistence. He spoke, among other things, of non-intervention in the affairs of other countries. He said that that was a principle of Soviet policy and that it had been repeatedly made clear that the idea of exporting revolution was absurd, that revolutions could not be exported or imported and could only grow out of the conditions of the country concerned.

133. That, unfortunately for the Soviet Union representative, does not answer the charge that the Soviet Union and its satellites assist and encourage subversive activity in other countries in order to undermine the authorities of those countries and help local revolutionaries to overthrow governments unacceptable to Moscow. Perhaps revolutions cannot be exported, but we are quite certain that subversive activities can be.

134. What are the realities of this question? It is perfectly clear that the aim of the Soviet group in presenting and supporting this Czechoslovak draft resolution is a one-sided verbal disarmament. What they want is to gag us while leaving themselves free to pour forth propaganda in favour of Communist domination. They want the United Nations to adopt a resolution which would leave Soviet propaganda machinery completely free to operate, but which could be appealed to by the Soviets as authority for the suppression of any voice raised in any democratic country to criticize the Soviet Union and to awaken the people of the world to the Soviet Union's policies of aggression and subversion.

135. The Australian delegation will oppose the draft resolution which has now been presented to the General Assembly by the delegation of Czechoslovakia.

136. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): As no other delegation wishes to explain its vote, the Assembly can now vote on the two draft resolutions before it.

137. As before, I should like to ask the Assembly whether it is prepared to vote first on the draft reso-

lution submitted to it by the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee in its report [A/2844].

138. As there is no objection, I now put that draft resolution to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted by 45 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

139. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): If it is the wish of the Czechoslovak delegation, I will now put to the vote the draft resolution proposed by the Czechoslovak delegation [A/L.185].

140. Before doing so, however, I call on the United Kingdom representative on a point of order.

141. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): I wish to raise a point of order. I think it is proper for me to move, under rule 93 of the rules of procedure, that the Assembly should not vote on the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Czechoslovakia. The report of the *Ad Hoc* Political Committee proves that that draft resolution has already been given thorough consideration and that, by an overwhelming majority, the Committee preferred to recommend to us the draft resolution which we have just adopted.

142. I therefore propose, in accordance with the second sentence of rule 93, that the General Assembly should decide not to vote on the Czechoslovak draft resolution.

143. Mrs. SEKANINOVA-CAKARTOVA (Czechoslovakia): In the first place, I should like to answer in the affirmative the question which the President put to me. Secondly, invoking rule 93, I ask the President to put the proposals to the vote in the order which they have been submitted.

144. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): We have two motions before us. The United Kingdom representative has, if I am not mistaken, proposed that the General Assembly should not vote on the draft resolution submitted by the Czechoslovak delegation. The representative of Czechoslovakia, however, has requested that her draft should be put to the vote. Both motions thus relate to the same matter and both are procedural. That being so, and unless the Assembly decides to the contrary, I will first put the United Kingdom motion, which was submitted first, to the vote.

145. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I wish to oppose the motion made by the United Kingdom representative. We are asked, on the basis of rule 93 of the rules of procedure, to decide now not to vote on the draft resolution. I would draw your attention, however, to the fact that, whereas the draft resolution proposed by the Czechoslovak delegation relates to the "Prohibition of propaganda in favour of a new war", the Committee's draft does not. It relates to quite a different matter, and even the heading of the item has been changed. That resolution is not headed "Prohibition of propaganda in favour of a new war", but "Strengthening of peace through the removal of barriers to free exchange of information and ideas".

146. In my opinion, the resolution in fact contains nothing relating to the strengthening of peace, but that is another matter. I merely wish to point out that even the heading of the resolution is quite different. I therefore consider that the United Kingdom representative is incorrect in asking that we should not vote now on the draft resolution submitted by the Czechoslovak delegation.

147. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): If I have understood him correctly, the representative of the Soviet Union is raising a preliminary question: whether the draft resolution proposed by the Czechoslovak delegation is different in kind from the draft on which we have just voted.

148. I think, however, that there is no need to make this preliminary question the subject of a separate vote, as those who express themselves in favour of the United Kingdom proposal will show, by their affirmative vote, that they regard the two draft resolutions as being of a like nature.

149. If no Member of the Assembly asks for the floor, I shall put to the vote the United Kingdom representative's motion, which is as follows: "The Assembly considers that it should not vote on the Czechoslovak draft resolution".

The motion was adopted by 32 votes to 5, with 19 abstentions.

AGENDA ITEM 25

Economic development of under-developed countries:

- (a) Question of the establishment of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development;
- (b) Question of the establishment of an international finance corporation;
- (c) International flow of private capital for the economic development of under-developed countries;
- (d) Land reform

REPORTS OF THE SECOND COMMITTEE (A/2847) AND THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/2848)

150. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): Together with the report submitted by the Second Committee [A/2487], the Assembly has before it a report submitted by the Fifth Committee [A/2848] under rule 154 of the rules of procedure and relating to the financial implications of draft resolution I proposed by the Second Committee.

151. May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of the Fifth Committee's report?

It was so decided.

Mr. Encinas (Peru), Rapporteur of the Second Committee, presented the report of that Committee and then spoke as follows:

152. Mr. ENCINAS (Peru), Rapporteur of the Second Committee (*translated from Spanish*): The Second Committee fortunately reached unanimous agreement on item 25 a of the agenda, concerning the establishment of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development. This agreement finds expression in draft resolution I, which appears in the report of the Committee [A/2847].

153. Although at the outset there were very divergent views on the practicability of this special fund and its immediate establishment, a spirit of compromise finally prevailed and, as a result of concessions on all sides, the Committee reached agreement on the draft resolution to which I have referred. The operative part of this draft resolution extends the appointment of Mr. Scheyven and requests him, with the assistance of the Secretary-General and of an *ad hoc* group of experts

and on the basis of appropriate consultations, to prepare a report giving a full and precise picture of the form or forms, functions and responsibilities which such a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development might have.

154. Draft resolution II, which the Second Committee now submits for the consideration of the General Assembly, embodies one of the Committee's historic decisions. This draft resolution marks a new development in international economic co-operation. It represents the actual beginning of an enterprise of which much is expected, one which is, in fact, not only an experiment but a hope.

155. The draft resolution, which was adopted with no dissenting vote, describes the basic measures which may in all probability lead to the establishment, within the framework of the United Nations, of an international finance corporation which would serve to stimulate private investment without governmental guarantees and would contribute materially to the economic development of the under-developed areas as well as to general world stability.

156. The draft resolution, which is designed to expedite the establishment of the corporation, takes note of the statement of the United States Administration of 11 November 1954, and requests the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to prepare draft statutes to govern the corporation. The draft statutes would be discussed by members of the International Bank and then submitted to the Economic and Social Council, after which they would come before the General Assembly at its tenth session.

157. The approval of these two draft resolutions, one on the fund for economic development and the other on the international finance corporation, and the various arguments raised in the discussion of them brought out one highly important fact: namely, that, despite the different shades of opinion and the many different ideological and national points of view, the majority of countries represented are agreed that, in order to foster the economic development of the under-developed countries, the flow of capital, whether public or private, to those countries which have such great need of it should be stimulated by international co-operation.

158. Within this broad agreement there have of course been, and still are, differences as regards methods and types of investment but in my humble opinion the first essential achievement is the general realization that the economic development of the under-developed countries requires urgent international action.

159. Under the sub-item on the international flow of private capital for the economic development of under-developed countries, the Second Committee approved draft resolutions III and IV.

160. Draft resolution III was approved with only one dissenting vote. The text was originally submitted by the Economic and Social Council, in resolution 512 B (XVII), for the approval of the General Assembly. This text was slightly amended by the Second Committee. The draft resolution makes a number of recommendations, to both capital-exporting and capital-importing countries, for stimulating the flow of private capital to those countries which are economically less developed. It also requests the Secretary-General to prepare annually a report on the international flow of private capital and its contribution to an expanding international economy, and on the measures taken by

Governments affecting such flow, or announced by them to be under consideration.

161. Draft resolution IV, which is also included in the annex, is designed to help settle international taxation problems, so that economic development may be more rapid and effective. This draft resolution, which was adopted without a dissenting vote, recalls the decision to discontinue the activity of the Fiscal Commission and requests the Secretary-General to continue his studies of the taxation by capital-exporting and capital-importing countries on the income from foreign investments, particularly those made in the under-developed countries.

162. Draft resolution V deals with the important question of land reform; it, too, was adopted without dissenting vote. This draft resolution endorses the latest resolutions of the Economic and Social Council on the subject and, considering the land reform problem from a general point of view, recommends that Member States, in implementing their land reform programmes, should not overlook the social, financial, technological and administrative problems which are inevitably involved. The draft resolution also advocates a land property system which would enable the greatest number of the rural population to own their own land and expresses its support for Member States which are carrying out land reforms in conformity with General Assembly resolutions.

163. These are the five draft resolutions which the Second Committee has approved on item 25. Only one of them received a dissenting vote. Each and every member of the Second Committee may be justly proud of this further demonstration of practically unanimous agreement. Yet it may well have another significance. This agreement has been achieved at a moment when the eyes of the world appear to be focused on an international economic programme. This means not only that a series of official projects which so far have existed only in debates and resolutions of the General Assembly will shortly be put into effect but also that international political tension may now give place to economic co-operation. At least, the impact of the cold war will gradually lose its force and a state of so-called competitive co-existence will be achieved in the economic field and particularly where the development of the under-developed countries is concerned.

164. I repeat, we may well be on the threshold of a new era in which the fear inspired by nuclear war will gradually be replaced by a vital form of competition which will bring prosperity to the under-developed countries.

165. Deploring man's inability to achieve in peacetime the deeds and sacrifices of which he is capable in times of war, William James counselled us to seek a moral substitute for war or, in other words, that impulse which in peace and for peace should make us act with the same self-denial and the same resolution which is displayed by the community in times of war.

166. If the hopes of many of us were fulfilled, if the desire for an era of true international co-operation in the economic field were to become a reality, then perhaps we should have found a moral substitute for war. If we are as close to it as I would hope, it would be impossible to over-estimate the economic and social mission of the United Nations.

167. I would venture to suggest that the Second Committee's achievement this year in elaborating these

five resolutions on economic development, which it now submits to the General Assembly, has been highly laudable.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Second Committee.

168. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I invite Members of the Assembly who wish to do so to explain their votes on the five draft resolutions recommended by the Second Committee.

169. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution V. We abstained in the vote in the Committee when this draft resolution was put to the vote. With the permission of the President, I will explain the motives which prompted us to do so.

170. May I call to the Assembly's attention the fact that the problem of land reform, which is the subject of the draft resolution submitted by the majority of the Committee for adoption by this Assembly, is an undetachable part of the problem of economic development and appeared before the United Nations almost simultaneously with the interest in economic development. It was the delegation of Poland which, drawing the attention of the fifth session of the General Assembly to the need for far-reaching land reforms as one of the prerequisites of economic development, introduced a draft resolution which, while recognizing the importance of the problem, requested proper reports and action.

171. The reports and the discussions which followed fully confirmed our contention that one of the reasons for the economic backwardness in the many economically under-developed countries was the fact that the aggressive conditions of landholding and the low productivity of the land were a barrier to economic development. The reports have shown that land reforms will change not only the landholdings but will also become an important factor in the field of industrialization by creating a need for agricultural machinery, on the one hand, and, through an increase in the income of the rural population will create or strengthen the internal market.

172. Land reform, just as economic development, is not an aim in itself. Land reform was never considered as an abstract plan; it was always considered from the point of view of existing conditions and from the need to improve the living conditions of landless small and medium-sized peasants. The resolutions which were adopted during the thirteenth session of the Economic and Social Council [370 (XIII)] and during the sixth session of the General Assembly [524 (VI)] took into consideration and made specific reference to this aim of securing and protecting the landless and the small and medium-sized farmers, and enumerated detailed measures which have to be undertaken as a basic part of land reform. Among such measures, they considered credit facilities, the eradication of indebtedness and the delivery of equipment, machinery, fertilizers and so on. The resolutions also treated the subject from the point of view of many social reforms which would secure landless, small and medium-sized peasants from many difficulties which they are now experiencing.

173. In the draft resolution which has now been submitted for adoption, this problem, in our opinion, has not been sufficiently stressed. Therefore, during the 323rd meeting of the Second Committee on 29

November 1954, the delegation of Poland requested the Committee to amend paragraph I of the operative part of the resolution in such a way as to stress that the land reforms are in the interest of landless, small and medium-sized farmers, and that they, the Members which institute them, should pursue fiscal and financial policies with a view to the expansion of the area under cultivation and the improvement of the methods of agricultural production. The amendment was not adopted and the resolution remained in the form in which it is now submitted.

174. In our opinion, paragraph I of draft resolution V limits the scope of the problem to one of the aspects of land reform. We have no doubt that this aspect—ownership—is a very important one. Yet providing ownership in itself will not solve all the problems with which the agrarian reform must deal. For these reasons, we consider the draft resolution as insufficient and as a step backwards in relation to the previously adopted resolutions.

175. May I also point out one thing more. There is reference, in the first paragraph of the preamble to a report entitled "Rural Progress through Co-operatives"¹ [E/2524]. My delegation considers that this programme contains many serious errors. It lacks objectivity, it gives an incorrect picture of the development of rural co-operatives in the USSR and in the countries of the popular democracy, and it has no bearing whatsoever on the programme of land reform. Therefore, we have considered and do consider that any reference to this programme should be deleted in this draft resolution.

176. In accordance with what I have just stated, I would ask the President, when putting to the vote draft resolution V in the report of the Second Committee, to put to the vote separately the first paragraph of the preamble starting with the words "Considering the Secretary-General's reports . . .". My delegation will vote against the paragraph and it will abstain on the draft resolution as a whole.

177. Mr. BUENO DO PRADO (Brazil) (*translated from French*): The Brazilian delegation would like to state the reasons which will lead it to vote for draft resolution I, concerning the establishment of a special United Nations fund for economic development approved unanimously by the Second Committee and contained in its report [A/2847]. My delegation's support of this resolution is based on three fundamental considerations. I should like to stress once again, for the record of this plenary meeting, that we have accepted it in a spirit of conciliation only. It is obvious that this compromise solution was made possible only by a sacrifice of the opinions and wishes of a considerable majority of Member States.

178. It is indeed regrettable that another year must be lost in the preparation of further detailed technical studies of the operation of a special fund. In fact, we shall remain at the stage of theoretical speculation which the operative part of the resolution attempts to describe as a step forward, on the ground that it relates to the future structure of the fund. A whole year will elapse before we ultimately specify the form or forms, the functions and the responsibilities of this new organ of international financial assistance. The tendency to procrastinate has again won the day. Despite this, however, we must show our confidence in the justice of the cause of the under-developed countries.

¹ United Nations Publications, Sales No: 1954.II.B.2.

179. The second reason why we shall vote for the draft resolution is that it would be illogical at this stage to abandon the hopes placed in United Nations efforts to attain the objectives of the Charter in matters of economic development. Above all, no one must think that our determination has ever weakened. Though the effectiveness of international co-operation waxes and wanes, the hope is ever present that new strength may be drawn from it; some conciliatory solutions, however precarious they may seem, often have the salutary effect of keeping the thoughts of nations turned towards the promise of the future.
180. The third and last reason is that Brazil remains faithful to the juridical principles on which the establishment of any lasting system of international peace is based. We consider that in modern times world economic co-operation is one of the cornerstones of the system of general security sought by the United Nations. In this connexion, we attach great importance to the fact that, despite the patent disparity of their immediate objectives, several Member States have succeeded in overcoming the mental reservations which the political exigencies of the moment caused them to make, in order to avoid taking a wholly negative attitude towards the establishment of the special fund. This made possible that unwonted occurrence, absolute unanimity in the Second Committee.
181. These reasons are strong enough to convince my delegation that the moral support given to the initiative of the great industrialized countries is something more than a token. It represents a first step towards rendering the effective financial assistance which the under-developed countries need. The statements which we have heard during our proceedings have shown that there was no longer any need to emphasize the moral significance of a majority vote.
182. It would be wrong to think that we look on the special fund merely as the implementation of a programme for the sole purpose of international financial collaboration. In my delegation's opinion, the fund serves one of the Organization's special purposes, since it will help to attain one of its fundamental objectives which must be regarded as sanctioned by the new body of law expressed in the normative system of the Charter. To attain that objective, it is incumbent upon Member States to make an effective contribution to general economic development.
183. We sometimes lose sight of this statutory obligation, which is eclipsed by so-called political considerations, based on the antiquated concepts of balance of power and of the strength of States. From time to time, however, the voice of public opinion reminds us that the time when these ideas were held is past and that in the terms of contemporary diplomacy, political factors are inseparable from economic factors.
184. The Charter, our basic document, defines in Article 1 the achievement of "international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms" as a statutory purpose arising out of the obligation, stated in the preamble, "to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples".
185. Of course, we must realize that at the present stage of world organization it would be difficult to request contributions for economic development on the basis of a right to international financial assistance. The attainment of the economic and social purposes of the United Nations will necessarily be the result of a series of resolutions, adopted by common agreement, as the pressure exerted by special interests on the policies of Member States gradually declines and they set themselves wider objectives.
186. During the debates which took place in the Second Committee, the representatives of the great industrialized Powers missed no opportunity to reiterate their belief in the fundamental concept of private enterprise. Nearly every day during the session they subordinated the idea of economic co-operation to the principles of private initiative.
187. We are certain, however, that in future free enterprise, as a part of the new international machinery for economic co-operation, will also put public interests first. Today already, certain investments which can be regarded as factors in economic development are supplemented by private capital which is beginning to play a part in such international financing.
188. The new countries and the under-developed areas have never doubted that the consolidation of their own economy must be based on a continuous growth of productivity, together with the progressive increase, not only of savings, but also of freedom of trade and private initiative. But they are also convinced that, if this programme is to be successfully carried out, especially in countries with vast, unexploited natural resources, then public capital and technical assistance must play their part, for both are essential for the establishment of conditions liable to attract private capital.
189. In this connexion, it is useful to recall the evidence of Mr. Milton Eisenhower, who stated on 29 July 1953, on his return from a goodwill mission to South America that in certain cases, public investments partially obtained from abroad must help to balance development by financing basic services, such as transport and communications, and that this, in turn, should stimulate private investment.
190. We are living in a period when the new countries and those which are emerging from the colonial phase urgently need capital. The distressing poverty of these countries leads to political and administrative instability, which have always proved propitious to the growth of movements fomenting the most dangerous social disorders.
191. We cannot deny that the economic development of the new countries has not always been conducted on very national lines. Nevertheless, whatever they have been able to achieve in respect of planned development on moderate socialist lines has shown that only the certainty that public funds, national or foreign, will not be lacking makes it possible to draw up plans for the methodical carrying out of extensive preliminary public works, such as drainage, construction of transport networks and electric power stations, without which the natural wealth of those countries can never be exploited on a commercial scale. These works require large long-term loans of the kind made under the development banking system rather than under the commercial banking system. Unless such a system of non-commercial banking operations is placed within the reach of countries which are able to use it in their own programmes, the flow of private capital will never be sufficient to meet their needs.

192. Logic therefore leads us to a very clear solution. It lies in a broad world agency of multilateral financial assistance, carefully planned to allow for both regional and international political interests, so as to enable countries to negotiate supplementary agreements or treaties of bilateral economic co-operation which would not be regarded by public opinion as instruments of purely diplomatic strategy.

193. The West is now faced with a vast and formidable "cold war" operation, which has recently been called "operation economic strangulation". The Western nations, led by the United States, are trying to meet this operation, which is being conducted in a spectacular manner in Asia and is also being undertaken in Latin America, by forming a strategic front and by economic co-operation. A recent article states that such an operation can not be combated by an illusory East-West trade but only by the expansion of the free world market through economic development surpassing anything the Communists can offer.

194. In that spirit, the Colombo Plan has been carried out in such a way as to provide fresh impetus for economic development in southern and South-East Asia. The financial assistance already offered to Asia amounts to approximately \$1,000 million a year. The total sum proposed for the Colombo Plan for 1951-1957 is \$1,888 million, 34 per cent of which will be reserved for transport and communications, 32 per cent for agriculture, 18 per cent for social services, 10 per cent for power production and 6 per cent for mining industries and manufacture.

195. Under the pressure of its policy requirements, the United States is being obliged to draw up a Marshall Plan for Asia, while seeking to ensure the participation of free Europe to the same end. According to Mr. Stassen, Director of the Foreign Operations Administration, this plan will be the most ambitious ever envisaged by the United States Government to protect American interests in Asia. The contribution of the United States of America has been estimated for next year at between 70 and 80 per cent of all the funds reserved for international financial aid, which amounted to \$5,200 million in 1954. It has already been acknowledged that this plan, like the original Marshall Plan, is part of the United States defence plan, on which its survival depends.

196. It is encouraging to see that the right course has been taken, at least in so far as Asia is concerned. But the stability of world economy is a problem which concerns the whole world. It is difficult to understand why a different economic policy should be applied to other under-developed countries, whose political co-operation is just as essential for the free world. Their soil also contains large quantities of the resources which will make it possible to face the future. It is these resources which must feed the 600 million human beings who will swell the world population in the next fifteen years. These countries are becoming increasingly aware of what must be done urgently to enable the world to ensure normal living conditions for this enormous contingent of human beings without creating new problems which would undoubtedly be much more serious than those which we now have to face.

197. Mr. GUERRA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution I on the establishment of a Special United Nations Fund for the Economic Development of under-

developed countries, in accordance with its invariable policy of supporting any move whose aim is to assist in securing funds to finance the economic development of such countries.

198. My country attaches particular importance to the establishment of the special fund, which will undoubtedly serve those ends. Everyone is familiar with the wide variety of phases through which this endeavour on behalf of the under-developed countries has passed. We believed that the draft resolution we are about to adopt constitutes a positive step towards the final phase, the actual establishment of the fund.

199. We are certain that this phase will be reached very soon. The advancement of two-thirds of mankind cannot be delayed on the strength of secondary considerations. If we really want to ward off the threat of aggression, we must attack it at its very root. The medium in which the social unease that is the forerunner of every subversive movement develops is the misery, hunger and neglect in which millions of human beings live today. It is a duty of those who have the means and resources to extend positive aid to the peoples that lack the techniques and resources with which properly to exploit their natural wealth. The special fund will make a substantial contribution to the development and stimulation of such activities.

200. My delegation is confident that at a General Assembly in the very near future we shall all be able to rejoice in having reached the final stage of this long journey. As to the draft resolution itself, we wish to say that the purpose of our participation was to reach an equitable and generally acceptable solution.

201. As we said in the Second Committee, we do not at present insist on the idea that the aims and objectives of the special fund should be given intensive publicity for the time being. We believe, however, that this idea should be put into effect. If that is done, all the peoples of the world will be able to appreciate what contribution the special fund will be able to make towards the stability and progress of world economy. Similarly, the peoples of the countries that make the largest contributions of capital to it will know in what their money is being invested.

202. In conclusion, we wish to state that we have absolute confidence in the manner in which Mr. Raymond Scheyven will perform the duties assigned to him by the United Nations and in the assistance that the Secretary-General of this Organization will extend to him.

203. Mr. UMARI (Iraq): I should like to make some brief remarks on the draft resolutions before us. I think these draft resolutions advance the cause of the development of under-developed countries considerably, particularly draft resolution II on the establishment of an international finance corporation, which as members of the Second Committee recognize, took the initial step towards the establishment of that great, and we hope, fundamental organization for the development of under-developed countries. Steps will be taken—these are outlined in the draft resolution—which we hope will bring about the establishment, in the not too distant future, of that organization.

204. My delegation regrets very much that progress on the special fund has not been as extensive nor as fundamental as it has been on financial co-operation, although the greatest part of our discussion on the establishment of financial aid was devoted to the subject

of the fund. The reason for this seems to be that a certain group of countries whose participation in such an organization is very important and indispensable, have not come around to taking a positive attitude on the subject. We hope and trust they will do so in the near future. The draft resolution has been couched in such terms as to facilitate such a change of attitude should it come about. Further, on the subject of the international flow of private capital, I do not think there is much I can contribute.

205. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The USSR delegation would like to explain its vote on resolutions III and V.

206. The USSR delegation will abstain from voting on resolution III on international flow of private capital for the economic development of under-developed countries, for the following reasons.

207. The USSR delegation's position on the question of the financing of the economic development of under-developed countries is that those countries should base their economic development on their own resources, that foreign capital should be but a supplementary factor in their economic development, and that it must be granted without any conditions which might lead to the political and economic subjugation of the under-developed countries. The USSR delegation is convinced that this position corresponds to the fundamental national interests of the under-developed countries.

208. It is generally recognized that the purpose of exporting international capital to under-developed countries is by no means to raise the living standards of their people or to further their economic development, but to derive the maximum profits from them. The exporters of foreign capital are trying to achieve in the under-developed countries still more favourable conditions for deriving still higher profits.

209. The draft resolution submitted by the Second Committee is motivated by these very interests of the exports of capital, and not by the interests of under-developed countries. Foreign capital is directed to those branches of the economy of under-developed countries in which it can bring the highest profits and not to the branches which need to be developed in order to achieve a multilateral development of that economy. It is enough to point out that the result of the export of capital to under-developed countries, and to the Latin-American countries in particular, is the promotion of a lop-sided, unilateral development of their economy.

210. Moreover, many data were adduced in the Second Committee to show that the exporters of foreign capital were deriving from the under-developed countries considerably larger sums in profits and interest than the amount of capital which they invested in those countries.

211. All this shows that the statement in the preamble of the draft resolution that private foreign capital allegedly contributes to the expansion and diversification of the economy of those countries and the raising of living standards is contrary to the facts.

212. The draft resolution invites the under-developed countries which wish to attract private foreign capital to subordinate their domestic policies, legislation and administrative practices to the interests of the exporters of capital. It was stated in the debates in the Second Committee that the adoption by some countries of recommendations contained in this draft resolution would in some cases even necessitate the amendment

of their constitutions. All this shows how far the sponsors and initiators of this draft resolution have gone in their endeavours to wrest even more favourable conditions for foreign investments from the under-developed countries.

213. At the same time, the draft resolution contains no provisions protecting the interests of the under-developed countries and, in particular, relating to the need to protect national industries from the ruinous competition of foreign capital, to the promotion of the development of the domestic resources which are the basis of a country's economic independence, and so forth. All this shows that the draft resolution as a whole is contrary to the purposes and objectives of the United Nations. On the basis of these considerations, the USSR delegation could not support this draft resolution, but abstained from voting on it in the Committee and will abstain from voting on it here.

214. The USSR delegation will also abstain from voting on draft resolution V, on the question of land reform, for the following reasons.

215. The Economic and Social Council has acknowledged the need to carry out land reforms in the interests of small and medium-sized farmers and landless agricultural workers. The General Assembly at its sixth session approved that resolution of the Economic and Social Council. The USSR delegation has already pointed out during the discussion of the question of land reform in the Second Committee that carrying out of land reforms in the interests of small and medium-sized farmers and landless agricultural workers was one of the essential conditions for raising the living standards of the agricultural population of the under-developed countries.

216. The report of the Secretary-General entitled "Progress in Land Reform" [E/2528],² that the need of carrying out such reforms is only now being acknowledged. In those circumstances, the General Assembly should see to it that the need for land reform in the interest of small and medium-sized farmers and landless agricultural workers should be recognized as widely as possible in under-developed countries. It was therefore proper and reasonable that the original draft resolution submitted to the Second Committee drew attention to the necessity of that kind of reform. Unfortunately, that clear provision was subsequently replaced by another.

217. In view of the fact that the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly have already taken a policy decision on land reform, we should adhere to that decision and make every effort to promote its implementation; we should not make new definitions to lead us astray and to complicate the issue.

218. In the Second Committee, the Polish delegation submitted an amendment to the draft resolution, providing for adherence to the previous decision. This amendment was in line both with the aforesaid decisions of the thirteenth session of the Economic and Social Council and of the General Assembly, and with the original draft resolution submitted by several delegations of under-developed countries. Unfortunately, that amendment was not adopted by the Committee.

219. The Polish delegation also submitted an amendment to the first paragraph of the preamble, which was also rejected by the Committee. In view of the rejection of these amendments, the USSR delegation,

² United Nations publication, Sales No.: 1954.II.B.3.

which considered them to be correct, abstained from voting on the draft resolution on land reform. The USSR delegation will therefore abstain from voting on the draft resolution now as well.

220. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): As no representative wishes to explain his vote, the Assembly will now vote on the draft resolutions in the Second Committee's report [A/2847].

Draft resolution I was adopted unanimously.

Draft resolution II was adopted by 50 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

221. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I would ask the President to put the second paragraph of the preamble and operative paragraph 1 a of draft resolution III to the vote separately.

222. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I shall put to the vote draft resolutions III and IV, taking into account the USSR representative's request.

The second paragraph of the preamble of draft resolution III was adopted by 47 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

Paragraph 1 a of the operative part of draft resolution III was adopted by 45 votes to 6, with 5 abstentions.

Draft resolution III as a whole was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 51 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

223. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Polish delegation has requested a separate vote on the first paragraph of the preamble of draft resolution V. I shall put that draft resolution to the vote.

The first paragraph of the preamble of draft resolution V was adopted by 51 votes to 3.

Draft resolution V as a whole was adopted by 50 votes to none, with 5 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.