

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**
FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE 444th
MEETING**

Thursday, 17 May 1951, at 3 p.m.

Lake Success, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
Intervention of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea (<i>continued</i>)	635

Chairman: Mr. Roberto URDANETA ARBELÁEZ (Colombia).

**Intervention of the Central People's Government
of the People's Republic of China in Korea
(continued)**

[Item 76]*

**REPORT OF THE ADDITIONAL MEASURES COMMITTEE
(A/1799) (concluded)**

At the invitation of the Chairman, the representative of the Republic of Korea took his seat at the Committee table.

1. Mr. BALLARD (Australia) stated that the Committee was concerned at the present stage with the need to ensure that no assistance, even indirect, was given to those engaged in aggression in Korea, rather than with the positive part played by Members of the United Nations, including Australia, in giving support in the field to the United Nations cause, in accordance with the Security Council's resolution of 25 June 1950.¹ Pursuant to that resolution Australia had taken all possible steps to prevent goods of possible military value from reaching North Korean aggressors from Australia. In accordance with the General Assembly resolution 498 (V) of 1 February 1951, those steps had been extended to cover the area controlled by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

2. The Australian Minister for External Affairs had stated on 14 May 1951 that the export to the Chinese mainland of the items referred to in the resolution of the Additional Measures Committee had been prohibited for some time. Mr. Casey had explained that the restrictions did not apply to other items of normal peacetime trade and had pointed out that the resolution before the Committee did not seek the imposition of a complete economic embargo against the Peking régime. Adoption of the resolution and the amendment

would thus involve no change in the policy of the Australian Government.

3. Mr. Ballard stressed the fact that adoption of the resolution and of the amendment would not only be a good thing in itself but also an effective demonstration of United Nations determination to make use of the means available under the Charter to bring the aggression in Korea to an end. There could not be two views as to the principle involved: no Member could object to a resolution requesting it not to give aid to the enemies of the Organization. Support for the resolution was a logical reaffirmation of the stand taken by fifty-two Members in support of the Security Council's decisions on Korea. It would be difficult to understand how any of those countries could feel unable to agree to withhold from the enemies of the United Nations the material they need to continue their aggression.

4. Adoption of the resolution would also give formal recognition to a policy already applied individually by Member Governments and would provide for United Nations machinery through which all Governments could work together to make the restrictions more effective. His Government was certain that those results would be deemed highly desirable by all Members, particularly since it rested with the Governments themselves to determine which commodities exported from their territory might fall within the embargo.

5. The Australian Government attached particular importance to another aspect of the problem, namely the general desire of many Members to achieve a peaceful settlement of the Korean question by negotiation. Paying tribute to the endeavours in that respect of the President of the General Assembly and the Good Offices Committee, Mr. Ballard emphasized that such a settlement remained the primary objective of the United Nations. The Chinese communist Government had been given ample opportunity to make its wishes known, had it had any inclination to negotiate. The opportunities for a peaceful settlement were still clearly

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.
¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year*, No. 15.

available to that Government under the resolution before the Committee. In the opinion of the Australian Government, the basic principle that the United Nations should and would remain prepared to negotiate on a just and honourable basis was valid, whether the Good Offices Committee or another channel was used to bring about a settlement.

6. The Australian Government had never altered its attitude towards the aggression in Korea, and based its approach to the problem on the following principles: (1) resistance to the aggression in Korea by military means and by the withholding of military supplies from the aggressors must be resolutely supported and continued; (2) a peaceful settlement of the Korean conflict offered the best prospect of a satisfactory solution and the way to such a settlement must be kept open; (3) every endeavour must be made to confine the area of hostilities; (4) the position of the United Nations towards the intervention in Korea by the Central People's Government was established under the General Assembly resolution of 1 February; (5) Members of the Organization must maintain the greatest possible unity in the face of the grave dangers confronting it. If the United Nations maintained its solidarity and based its policies firmly on the principles of the Charter, a solution of the Korean conflict would be achieved.

7. Mr. Ballard declared that his Government's policy towards any future work which the Additional Measures Committee might be called upon to undertake would be determined in the light of those principles.

8. Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa) supported the draft resolution submitted by the Additional Measures Committee and the amendment to it. His delegation believed in the wisdom of imposing such a selective embargo as was proposed, and considered that the imposition of a general trade embargo would have been unwise at the present stage. In that connexion he noted that his country had little trade with communist China, its exports in 1950 having been nil. While the overtures of the Good Offices Committee had met with no success so far, his Government supported the idea of its continuation in the hope that the conflict in Korea might yet be settled on peaceful lines.

9. Mr. EBAN (Israel) stated that his Government had hoped, when the Chinese communist Government had become involved in hostilities against the United Nations forces, that the conflict would be brought to an end with the aid of the Good Offices Committee. The People's Government of China, however, had not agreed to negotiate with the United Nations organs on the restoration of peace. While hostilities continued, it seemed to his delegation that the United Nations should persevere in its efforts to secure a negotiated settlement, and that the General Assembly had a clear obligation to support the United Nations forces. That duty would not be fulfilled if materials enabling the Chinese forces more effectively to attack the forces of the United Nations continued to reach Peking. He would therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution as amended.

10. Mr. HOLMES (Canada) stated that his delegation supported the draft resolution and the joint amend-

ment. The Canadian Government, which had been determined from the outset to join in resisting the aggression in Korea by all possible means, had sent forces to Korea and had cut off strategic materials from the North Koreans and from the Chinese as soon as it had become clear that the latter were aiding aggression. Though most countries had long since taken measures to cut off strategic exports to China, there were advantages in action by the United Nations to generalize restrictions and require some equality of sacrifice.

11. Mr. Holmes understood the proposed embargo to be a selective one directed specifically towards assisting the military enterprise in Korea. The Additional Measures Committee could recommend adjustments in the embargo should further action be required.

12. The draft resolution was perfectly consistent with the aim of securing a peaceful settlement in Korea. All that was necessary was some indication from Peking of willingness to agree to a just settlement.

13. Mr. VON BALLUSECK (Netherlands) supported the draft resolution before the Committee as well as the joint amendment to it. Citing the contribution of the Netherlands to the United Nations forces in Korea, he stated that it was obvious that his Government did not want to supply those opposing the action of the United Nations with the means of destroying the collective efforts being made in the interests of Korean freedom and of peace in the Far East. His Government, which had kept a close watch on the already limited trade of the Netherlands in certain parts of the world, would fully co-operate with the aims of the present resolution. In view of the difficulties involved, his delegation fully agreed that primary responsibility for taking preventive measures must rest with the countries in which the embargoed goods originated. He noted with approval the part of the draft resolution before the Committee which reaffirmed the policy of achieving United Nations objectives in Korea by peaceful means.

14. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines) stated that his country had for some time applied an embargo even more inclusive than that proposed on shipments of strategic materials to communist China. The proposal before the Committee represented the irreducible minimum of additional action which the Member States must take in support of the continuing sacrifices of the United Nations troops in Korea. Since most of the countries directly affected were already applying an embargo of some kind, such support from the United Nations as a whole would have greater moral than material value at the present stage. Member States not so directly affected should be encouraged to share in the moral force which the collective embargo represented.

15. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (Uruguay) stated that the draft resolution before the Committee was the logical consequence of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly regarding the aggression in Korea and of the attitude taken by the Powers engaged in that aggression. In accordance with the clear position taken by his delegation in the past, he would support the proposal and the amendment to it.

16. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) endorsed the reservation made by the delegation of Iraq with respect to paragraph 1 (d) of the operative part of the draft resolution, to the effect that there was one State in the Middle East with which his Government could not co-operate.

17. Mr. KYROU (Greece) supported the draft resolution before the Committee and the joint amendment to it, which represented no more than a step taken in self-defence. He requested a roll-call vote.

18. Mr. QUEVEDO (Ecuador) explained that he would have to abstain from the vote as he had not as yet received definite instructions from his Government. He expected, however, to have instructions in time to take part in the discussion in the plenary meeting. He was certain that his Government would co-operate in the present matter in line with its previous support of collective efforts of the United Nations to stop aggression.

19. Mr. BEBLER (Yugoslavia) recalled that his delegation had abstained from voting on the resolution in the General Assembly which had contained the finding that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China had engaged in aggression in Korea. It had done so because of misgivings lest the resolution should create obstacles to a peaceful settlement of the problem. For the same reason, his Government had not considered it advisable to participate in the work of the Additional Measures Committee. While more than ever convinced of the need to avoid an extension of the conflict and to bring about the solution of the Korean problem by peaceful means, his Government could not disregard the fact that the Central People's Government had persisted in its support of aggression and ignored the various attempts to approach it with regard to reaching a peaceful solution. His Government therefore considered it advisable that the General Assembly should recommend the measures proposed. He would abstain from voting on the preamble of the draft resolution but would vote in favour of the operative part and of the proposal as a whole. Mr. Bebler emphasized that new efforts should be made to give effect to the paragraph reaffirming the policy of the United Nations with regard to a cessation of hostilities and the achievement of United Nations objectives in Korea by peaceful means.

20. Faris EL-KHOURI Bey (Syria) said that, in view of the attitude which his delegation had taken relative to the General Assembly resolution of 1 February 1951, he would abstain from voting on the draft resolution under discussion. This abstention, however, should by no means be interpreted as signifying that his Government would not comply with the provisions of the resolution, if adopted by the General Assembly. Indeed, his Government had always been loyal to its obligations as a Member State and would always comply with any resolution adopted by the General Assembly, regardless of the vote cast by his delegation.

21. Mr. GRAFSTRÖM (Sweden) said that, in view of the statement made by his delegation in the Committee on 31 January 1951, and in accordance with his instructions, he would abstain from voting on the draft resolution. He wished to declare, however, on behalf of his

Government that no export of implements of war or other commodities of strategic importance had taken place from Sweden to the Chinese People's Republic or to territories controlled by the North Korean authorities, and that none was envisaged under the present circumstances.

22. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the preamble of the draft resolution contained in document A/1799.

The preamble of the draft resolution was approved by 43 votes to none, with 11 abstentions.

23. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the revised amendment submitted jointly by the delegations of Australia, France, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Venezuela (A/C.1/662/Rev.1), which was to replace paragraph 1 (a) of the draft resolution by the following text:

“(a) Apply an embargo on the shipment to areas under the control of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and of the North Korean authorities of arms, ammunition and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items useful in the production of arms, ammunition and implements of war”.

The amendment was approved by 45 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

24. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole.

At the request of the representative of Greece, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Czechoslovakia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, voted first.

In favour: Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Ecuador, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Sweden, Syria, Afghanistan, Burma.

Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic did not participate in the voting.

The draft resolution was approved by 45 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

25. Mr. GROSS (United States of America) said that he understood the USSR representative's argument to be that under the Charter, the Security Council was the only body authorized to deal with discussion of collective measures. Such a thesis was a misinterpretation of the Charter. It was true that Article 24 conferred on the Security Council primary responsibility

for the maintenance of international peace and security. But it was equally true that the Charter conferred upon the General Assembly the authority to discuss and make recommendations on any measure within the scope of the Charter, unless the Council was exercising in respect to any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it in the Charter. If the Council failed to exercise its functions or ceased to deal with matters arising under the Charter, the General Assembly had the power to make recommendations to deal with them. In its resolution 377 (V) entitled "Uniting for peace" the General Assembly had declared such a course of action to be correct. Indeed, in the very case under discussion the General Assembly had dealt squarely with the question, after the Security Council had been prevented by the USSR veto from carrying out its responsibility to deal with the aggression in Korea. In conclusion, he stated that there could be no question in the view of his delegation that the General Assembly was fully authorized by the Charter to recommend the action which the Committee had just approved.

26. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the argument of the United States representative was an attempt to justify the actions of the United States delegation, the United States Government and the aggressive core of the United Nations. Actually, the arguments which he had adduced proved nothing except the illegality of the consideration and adoption of the decision and of the fact that such actions were contrary to the Charter. Indeed, Article 41 of the Charter stated that only the Security Council could decide the measures to be taken, including economic measures. Moreover, Article 11, paragraph 2 also stated that recommendations with regard to any such question on which action was necessary should be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly, either before or after discussion. The reference of the United States representative to the "Uniting for peace" resolution, which was imposed on the General Assembly by the United States delegation and the aggressive core of the United Nations, did not in any way justify the action just taken by the Committee, since the matter was entirely and exclusively within the competence of the Security Council. The action of the Committee therefore constituted an act of illegality and a flagrant violation of the Charter.

27. As regards the substance of the draft resolution under discussion, which was imposed on the First Committee, he wished to say that it was a shameful resolution entirely in line with the aggressive designs of the ruling circles of the United States; it was not designed to find a peaceful solution to the Korean

conflict but, on the contrary, to continue and extend the scope of the war.

28. Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland) said that the statement of the United States representative was an expression of the discomfort felt due to the breach of the Charter which had been committed by the majority of the Committee under the pressure of the United States. Mr. Gross had quoted Article 11, paragraph 2 in an attempt to justify the action taken by the Committee. But he had purposely forgotten to mention the latter part of that article which provided that "any such question on which action is necessary shall be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion". Mr. Gross had also recalled the "Uniting for peace" resolution. But the United States did not even adhere to their illegal resolution, since that very resolution would have called upon the General Assembly to act in the absence of unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council; no one could claim that the question of sanctions had ever been discussed by the Security Council.

29. The aim of the approved resolution was not to promote peace in the Far East; it was an aggressive resolution. The United States Government was anxious to apply sanctions in order to suppress the national liberation movement in Asia and to start a war against the Chinese People's Republic because of a dislike of the change in Government and of the victory of the Chinese people. In conclusion, Mr. Katz-Suchy stated that the resolution was an additional link in the chain of resolutions which were aimed at transforming the Organization into an obedient tool of the aggressive purposes of the United States Government.

30. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that the resolution proposed by the United States and approved by the majority of the Committee revealed once more the ways of American imperialism, through which American monopolists tried to conceal their selfish and greedy aims under the United Nations flag. It was another attempt to use the United Nations as a cloak to hide the desire for world conquest by the American monopolists; it was contrary to all principles and provisions of the Charter.

31. FAWZI Bey (Egypt) noted that the position taken by his delegation concerning the resolution just approved by the Committee was in conformity with its position regarding the General Assembly resolution of 1 February 1951. Moreover, he declared that Egypt did not export any of the articles mentioned in the resolution.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.