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AGENDA ITEMS 64, 70 and 72

1. QUESTION OF DISARMAMENT (continued)
2. THE DISCONTINUANCE OF ATOMIC AND HYDROGEN WEAPONS TESTS (continued)

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): You will recall that at the end of yesterday afternoon's meeting we were hearing explanations of votes on the draft resolution of Mexico, the revised version of which was distributed as document A/C.1/L.208/Rev.1. We will continue with that same subject, and I call first on the representative of Mexico.

Mr. de la COLINA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): In the statement made by the president of my delegation, Dr. Padilla Nervo, at the plenary meeting on 6 October 1958, he said the following:

"It seemed, therefore, that one of the points to which we should give priority in our conversations was the exploring of methods which would make it possible to renew these interrupted negotiations within the framework of the United Nations. Since it is obvious that this cannot be achieved by means of a majority vote, but can be achieved only with the consent of the great Powers, my delegation considers that the Assembly could make a useful contribution to that end by recommending to the representatives of the great Powers that they should meet to consider the concrete point to which I have just referred.

If this idea is favourably received by the delegations, my delegation would be prepared to submit it at the proper place, that is, to put it before the First Committee in the form of a draft resolution in which that Committee would recommend to the representatives of the United States, France, United Kingdom and the Soviet Union that they, with the assistance of the Secretary-General, jointly consider the way to review the disarmament negotiations." (A/PV.771, page 37)

This is the origin of the Mexican draft resolution which, as I have said a number of times, was intended only to bring about a rapprochement among the
representatives of the great Powers upon whose shoulders rests the main burden of the maintenance of international peace and security because of, and solely because of, their tremendous economic and military power.

I have also stressed that we wanted to reaffirm the responsibility of the fully representative organ of the United Nations, that is, the General Assembly, so that under the aegis of the General Assembly formal conversations could be undertaken to explore the most appropriate measures for the resumption of negotiations among the great Powers, because ultimately it is the great Powers who are the only ones that can draft effective and practical agreements on disarmament, and it is only they who can guarantee implementation and observance of such agreements.
We were very sorry to hear yesterday the negative views of the representative of the Soviet Union but, on the other hand, we were happy to note Mr. Zorin's remark that he did not oppose negotiations on the question of disarmament with any other Members of the United Nations, including the Western Powers, to whom the invitation of the Mexican proposal was also directed.

In the course of the general debate we were encouraged by the statements of a number of delegations, to which I wish to express my gratitude. They encouraged us to continue to try to bring about an understanding by means of the draft resolution in A/C.1/L.208. The fact that twenty-three of those delegations, in their statements, supported the Mexican idea is eloquent proof of the welcome which this proposal received and of the interest which our draft resolution has awakened. We believe that, in its essence, it has achieved the purposes which we have in mind, which is to create a favourable atmosphere for a possible agreement -- although it may be temporary and precarious. Therefore, I do not think that it is hasty or wrong to say that, in concentrating the attention of the Members of the First Committee on the need for a resumption of negotiations, the Mexican draft resolution is of undeniable usefulness and has acted in the guise of a catalyst that may lead to a solution of the initial phase of the problem before us.

In view of these remarks, my delegation feels that it is unnecessary to vote on the draft resolution which we have submitted because, as the representative of Ireland said, this draft resolution has already achieved its purpose. This position is also consistent with the spirit of co-operation that has always been at the basis of the Mexican draft resolution.

May I repeat the hope of my delegation that the great nuclear Powers will stint no effort, both within and without the United Nations, to draw up as soon as possible mutually acceptable agreements which will free humanity from the fear and anguish in which it is at present living.

Mr. ABDOLI (Iran) (interpretation from French): I should like to express the gratitude of the Iranian delegation to the delegation of Mexico for having been kind enough not to press its draft resolution to the vote. The representative of Mexico has thus displayed a spirit of conciliation and understanding.

As the representative of Ireland stated yesterday, it seems to me that the aim sought by the Mexican draft resolution was attained in part by the adoption of the
Indian-Yugoslav draft resolution, and in part by the statement made in this
Committee by the representative of the Soviet Union to the effect that he would not
oppose unofficial negotiations taking place so as to foster progress in the field
of disarmament.

Lastly, I should like to join with the representative of Mexico in expressing
the wish that unofficial negotiations should in fact take place, especially amongst
the atomic Powers, so that some headway can be made towards disarmament.

Mr. Vega Gomez (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): We have
heard the statement of the representative of Mexico regarding the decision taken
by his delegation, and my delegation fully appreciates the reasons that led the
Mexican delegation to take that stand after the approval by this Committee of the
Indian-Yugoslav draft resolution on the composition of the Disarmament Commission,
and, furthermore, after the statements made by some representatives on the Mexican
proposal.

As my delegation stated a few days ago, we felt that the Mexican draft
resolution was most appropriate. Mr. Brannon made that point clear. We had
intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution when the time came, but we wish
to express our appreciation to the delegation of Mexico for the noble efforts which
it has made to do away with the stalemate that exists on the question of disarmament.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In view of what the
dlegation of Mexico has just stated, there will be no need to continue
discussing the Mexican revised draft resolution, nor, of course, any need to
put it to the vote. Before going on, the delegation of China has asked for
the floor to give an explanation of vote on the India-Yugoslav draft resolution
that was voted on yesterday afternoon. If there is no objection from members
of the Committee, I shall call on the representative of China, but, apparently,
the representative of the Soviet Union has asked for the floor. Perhaps he
may wish to refer to the declaration made by the representative of Mexico. If
that be the case, I shall call on the representative of the Soviet Union first.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from
Russian): I listened to the speech of the representative of Mexico with great
satisfaction, and I am grateful to him for having understood the position of
the Soviet delegation accurately and for having understood correctly the
statement made by the Soviet delegation yesterday.

As the representative of Mexico and the representative of Iran have pointed
out, the purpose of the Mexican draft resolution has, in part, been attained.
The Soviet delegation stated that it was prepared to enter into unofficial
negotiations with all States, including those mentioned in the Mexican draft
resolution, this with a view to achieving progress in the matter of disarmament.
I say that the purpose of the Mexican draft resolution has, in part, been
attained, and I say that because, while the delegation of the Soviet Union
clearly stated its readiness to enter into such unofficial negotiations, we
in this Committee did not hear any corresponding statements from the delegations
of the United States, the United Kingdom and France. This, of course, is the
business of these delegations themselves, but I take it that the burden of the
Mexican proposal was to stimulate all the Powers which have primary responsibility
for the maintenance of international peace and security to move toward practical
matters of disarmament. The Soviet Union has expressed its readiness to move
in this direction. Unfortunately the delegations of the United States, the
United Kingdom and France have not stated their intention to do so.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Israel has asked for the floor. I would appreciate it if he would tell me whether he is going to refer to the statement made by the representative of Mexico. If so, then I shall call on him.

Mr. HARARI (Israel): Yes, I do intend to do so. The delegation of Israel would have voted in favour of the Mexican draft resolution. We are, nevertheless, grateful to the representative of Mexico for having withdrawn his proposal. The opinion of my delegation has always been, and continues to be, that anything and everything that can be done to get the great atomic Powers to an agreement should and must be done. We thought that adopting the Mexican draft resolution might have brought the possibilities of agreement closer, but since we see that this might not have been achieved, we still feel that everything possible to compose the great Powers should be done. We noted that the representative of the Soviet Union told us that, even if that resolution were not adopted, there would, nevertheless, be conversations on an informal basis between the great Powers; and we wish to express the heartfelt hope that such conversations would bring agreement between the great Powers closer and we again wish to thank the representative of Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As I told you before, the representative of China has asked for the floor to explain his vote on the draft resolution which we adopted yesterday, submitted by India and Yugoslavia.

Mr. WEI (China): My delegation deeply appreciates the worthy spirit behind the Mexican draft resolution. Had it been put to a vote, my delegation would have voted for it. Since the Mexican draft resolution has been withdrawn, I wish to explain, briefly, the vote of my delegation on the draft resolution submitted by India and Yugoslavia on the composition of the Disarmament Commission. Disarmament is one of the primary objectives of the United Nations. All Member States have the responsibility for its realization. In order to carry out this Charter responsibility, various forums have been established and numerous resolutions adopted since the founding of our worthy Organization.
In spite of repeated frustrations, we must continue our efforts for the realization of genuine disarmament. My delegation has always maintained that the realization of disarmament lies with the willingness of the Soviet Union to accept international obligations for peace and security but not with the composition or size of the negotiating body. It was in the spirit of co-operation that my delegation voted last year for the expansion of the Disarmament Commission. We all know what has happened. The Soviet Union boycott is unreasonable, and deserves the condemnation so aptly expressed by many representatives in the General Assembly as well as in this Committee. Such protests and condemnations have the endorsement of my delegation.

It is in the same spirit of co-operation that I have voted for the revised draft of the Indian-Yugoslav draft resolution. The absolute rigidity of the Soviet position on disarmament and its open opposition against the working groups leave little ground for optimism. We welcome the day when the Soviet Union will change its policy, so that there may be real disarmament and increased security for all nations.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of France has asked for the floor.

Mr. GEORGES-PICOT (France)(interpretation from French): I was rather surprised to hear Mr. Zorin say that France had not indicated its readiness to participate in conversations such as had been suggested by the representative of Mexico, because, as I look up Mr. Jules Koch’s speeches here I find that when Mr. Padilla Nervo’s proposal was submitted, Mr. Jules Koch said:

"The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico was kind enough to recall the rapid but useful work achieved by a committee of four members, Mr. Jessup, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, Mr. Vyshinsky and myself, which met in Paris under his chairmanship at the end of 1951. We, Mr. Padilla Nervo and I, are the only members of that group who are present among you today. I am happy to confirm the impression he has retained of those meetings and I say to him that, if the Assembly accepts his suggestion of reviving a temporary body of that sort,
I am prepared to work immediately with it in the name of France and to bring it all my devotion and my love for peace." (A/C.1/PV.955, page 26)

Speaking a little later on the Mexican draft resolution, Mr. Jules Moch said:

"I have already responded to the appeal of Mr. Padilla Nervo. As the first, and perhaps the only representative, so far, of the Powers directly concerned, I said that, in the hour that followed the adoption of the Mexican draft resolution by the General Assembly, France would participate in that meeting proposed by Mexico. This means, of course, that we will vote in favour of the Mexican draft resolution." (A/C.1/PV.964, page 22)

Whoever can do more surely can do less. Since we are prepared to participate in unofficial conversations in the framework proposed by Mexico, we, obviously, are prepared to participate in unofficial conversations on an even more flexible basis.
Mr. KHALIDI (Jordan): My delegation was unable to be present at the time the voting took place on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.210, as amended, and we therefore crave the Committee's indulgence. We take the opportunity to intervene this morning in order to place on record the fact that our vote would have been in favour of the resolution as amended.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As no one wishes to speak at this time, I take it that we have concluded our work on this item. The Committee has therefore now concluded its discussion of items 4, 7 and 8 of the agenda.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Inasmuch as at the beginning of its work the Committee took no decision regarding the order in which we would consider the other five items on the agenda, I would draw the Committee's attention to document A/C.1/806, which deals with the allocation of agenda items to the First Committee. I think that the Committee will have to take a decision regarding the order of priority to be given the items still pending.

In accordance with rule 100 of the rules of procedure, the Committee will have to bear in mind the deadline set by the General Assembly for the conclusion of the present session. May I remind the Committee that we have only five weeks left before the session ends. In view of what I have said and in order to assure the speedy conclusion of our work, I believe that it would be advisable for us to decide, once and for all, on the order in which we will take up the next two items. If we do this, then I think the delegations will have sufficient time to prepare themselves to discuss the next items.

I wish to refer, first of all, to item 1 in document A/C.1/806, namely, "The Korean question: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea", and secondly, to item 2 which pertains to the "Question of the peaceful use of outer space". The Chairman would suggest that the Committee should continue its work by examining the Korean question and when that is completed we should take up the question of the peaceful use of outer space. The question of priority with respect to the other three items would then be left to a future date.
If any representative wishes to make known his views on this matter, I shall be happy to call on him. I trust that we will be able to take a decision as soon as possible so that we may proceed with our work.

**Mr. ABDOL (Iran) (interpretation from French):** I propose that the Committee should deal first with the Korean question and then with the question of the peaceful use of outer space. As for the order of the remaining items, I think that can be decided upon when we have disposed of the former two.

**The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish):** The representative of Iran is reflecting the suggestion made by the Chairman, that we decide immediately to consider the Korean question and that when this subject has been dealt with, to consider the question of the peaceful use of outer space. This is exactly what I have suggested and which the representative of Iran has presented in his statement.

If there are no objections to the suggestion made by the Chairman and seconded by the representative of Iran, I will take it that there is general consent with regard to the order of priority.

It was so decided.

**AGENDA ITEM 24**

**THE KOREAN QUESTION: REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE UNIFICATION AND REHABILITATION OF KOREA**

**Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian):** In view of the fact that we have unanimously decided to proceed to the consideration of the Korean question, I should like to recall that on 1 November, in document A/C.1/L.214, the delegation of the Soviet Union proposed the consideration of the question of inviting the representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Republic of Korea to participate in the consideration of this question. In the letter which I sent to the Chairman, and which has been distributed to all members of the Committee, the Soviet delegation set out the main reasons why it found it imperative to submit such a proposal.
We wish to draw the attention of the Political Committee to the letter of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, contained in document A/C.1/807. In that document the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea presses for the participation of its representatives in the consideration of the Korean question in the United Nations.

There is scarcely any need to emphasize the fact that the Koreans themselves are interested, in the first instance, in the peaceful solution of the Korean question, and that is true regardless of whether they live in the north or the south of the country. It follows that the consideration by the United Nations of the problem of the unification of Korea must take place with the participation of the representatives of both parts of Korea, north and south alike. We should not close our eyes to manifest facts. We are bound to find that there are two States on the Korean peninsula, the Korean People's Democratic Republic in the north, and the Republic of Korea in the south.

The circumstance that these States have differing economic and political structures cannot serve as a pretext for keeping one of the sides away from the consideration of the Korean question in the United Nations.
The interest of the Korean People's Democratic Republic in the solution of the Korean question has been recognized by many States. Even the United States and countries which support it have engaged in correspondence through diplomatic channels with the Korean People's Democratic Republic Government concerning the solution of the Korean question. Therefore attempts to keep the representatives of that Government away from the United Nations while this question is considered are absurd. Representatives of Northern and Southern Korea alike participated in the negotiations which led to the signature of the armistice in Korea and which led to the Geneva political conference in 1954.

In the letter of the Foreign Minister of the Korean People's Democratic Republic it is stated that the Government of that Republic will continue to regard as void and will refuse to implement decisions illegally adopted in disregard of the will of the Korean people and without the participation of the representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic. Consequently an attempt at a one-sided and biased consideration of the Korean question, without the participation of the representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, so far from helping in the unification of the country, will actually erect new obstacles in the way of a solution of this problem.

Participation of the representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic in the consideration of the Korean unification problem at the present session of the General Assembly would be all the more appropriate as the Government of the Korean People's Democratic Republic has put forward a number of new proposals which may well serve as a basis for finding a way out of the Korean impasse.

In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, inviting the representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic would contribute to the creation of conditions under which the Korean people could achieve their country's unification on the basis of independence, peace and democracy.

The Soviet Union considers that it is high time to call a halt to the policy of discrimination against the Korean People's Democratic Republic and to invite to our sittings representatives of North and South Korea alike. Keeping one of the parties away from participation in the consideration of the Korean problem is not only tantamount to disregarding some of the purposes and principles of the Charter but it also means choosing the way once again of fruitless talk
about Korea. That is why my delegation has moved the proposal that representatives of both parts of Korea be invited here.

The members of the Committee will surely have before them the draft resolution in which it is proposed that the Committee,

"Recognizing that, in the absence of representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the Republic of Korea, discussion of the Korean question cannot be productive,

"Resolves to invite representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the Republic of Korea to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the Korean question." (A/C.1/L.214)

At the same time the Soviet delegation wishes to express the hope that every delegation in this Committee will treat this question with due seriousness and care since a proper solution will create proper conditions for the solution of the Korean problem itself and for the reduction of tension in the Far East in general.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Since we have taken up the question of Korea, I want to remind the Committee that two documents have been distributed, one, A/C.1/809, which contains a letter dated 1 November 1958 to the Chairman of this Committee from the head of the delegation of the Soviet Union and which refers to the question of Korea and the second is the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union which appears in document A/C.1/L.214. This first point referred to by the representative of the Soviet Union is before the Committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (United States of America): The United States opposes the proposal as set forth in document A/C.1/L.214. In accordance with the practice consistently followed here, I should like to propose on behalf of the United States that the First Committee decide to invite a representative of the Republic of Korea to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the Korean question.

The United States hopes that the Committee will adopt this resolution promptly. We have always found such participation a helpful and useful addition to our discussions.
(Mr. Hickenlooper, United States)

I must also comment on the resolution submitted by the USSR. The United States opposes that resolution; it would place on an equal footing the representatives of the only lawful government of Korea -- that of the Republic of Korea, so recognized by the United Nations -- with the representatives of the Northern Korean puppet regime. That regime was installed by the Soviet Union in defiance of the United Nations; the Soviet Union wilfully obstructed every effort of this Organization to bring about free elections in North Korea. The North Korean regime remains a convicted aggressor and it has constantly refused to co-operate in any way with the designated representative of the United Nations in Korea -- the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

As I have already said, the United States will vote against the Soviet resolution. We hope that the Committee will promptly adopt the proposal I have just submitted.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Does anyone wish to speak on this question? I do not know whether the silence of the Committee is intended to imply that there is no need to debate this matter and that the Committee is ready to vote on the Soviet resolution and the verbal motion of the delegation of the United States.

Mr. MOORE (United Kingdom): It occurs to me that as the Committee has only this morning accepted the suggestion of the Chairman that we should debate this item as the next item on the agenda, it might be more convenient if the Committee -- especially in view of the fact that there is a plenary on disarmament this afternoon -- could adjourn now and resume our consideration of this question when the Committee next meets.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of the United Kingdom has therefore suggested that this meeting be adjourned and that the matter be decided upon at our next meeting.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to the fact that the question of inviting representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Republic of South Korea should be decided upon as early as possible so as to enable these representatives to arrive here for the meetings of this Committee in due time. If this adjournment is a protracted one, then of course we would be unable to support it. Since there is a plenary meeting scheduled for this afternoon, I thought we might be well advised to decide this question today, without deferring this particular matter to the next meeting, and this in order to facilitate the timely arrival of the appropriate delegations.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The question of the invitation to representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Republic of Korea is now before the meeting.

Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa): I interpret the statement by the representative of the Soviet Union as speaking against the motion for adjournment because I think that motion has been made. I, for my part, will gladly support the motion for adjournment of the meeting because I do not think that we ought to rush our fences as fast as all this. I, for my part, am not in a position to make a decision today and to vote. I should like to consult my delegation about the proposal that has been made. Thus I support the motion for the adjournment of the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to explain to the representative of the Union of South Africa that there is no motion on this point. The representative of the United Kingdom expressed a view. The Chairman asked whether that should be taken as a formal motion but no reply was forthcoming. So I stated to the Committee that this matter was before the Committee for a decision.
Mr. BELAUNDE (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): Every year when the question of Korea comes up, the question is raised as to the invitation of the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, that is, a representative of the Government set up under the influence of the Soviet Union and China. I do not think that this time we need to go through again the bitter debate of previous years. I think that we should try to see things from the pragmatic point of view. The arguments would be repeated ad infinitum. We know full well that the People's Democratic Republic of North Korea was condemned as an aggressor by the United Nations, that the United Nations has not recognized the international standing of North Korea. However, leaving aside this discussion which I believe is already exhausted, because delegations must have made up their minds already on this point, there is a pragmatic point of view. What could be gained today by inviting the representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic to the debate? It would merely be introducing an element that would perturb and embitter our debates in the Committee. All the information that we need to adopt a resolution on the problem can be obtained either from the reports that have already been distributed or from the debate itself, the debate in which the interests of the Republic that the United Nations recognizes, the original Republic of Korea, is taken up, the Republic that was attacked by Communist China and by the dependent Government of North Korea -- side which can have its point of view presented in the debate by the representatives of the Soviet Union or friendly countries of this international entity which has not been recognized.

Therefore, pragmatically speaking, I believe that we might agree with the representative of the Soviet Union on this point. Why should we needlessly prolong the debate when arguments have already been thoroughly explored? In other words, all the arguments presented are known to all of us. A proposal has been made by the United States to invite the representatives of the Republic of Korea. There can be no discussion on the international standing of the Republic of Korea, the original Republic of Korea that should never have been divided, the Republic of Korea with which we have maintained diplomatic relations, the Republic whose independence was defended by the United Nations. We have to do this because we must bear in mind the fact that when North Korea attacked South Korea the resolutions of the General Assembly immediately following this event, and immediately after
the decision that the troops should be withdrawn and the status quo re-established, were not accepted by North Korea. Then, in accordance with the principles of international law, the label of aggressor was given to North Korea. This being the case, we can immediately go on and discuss the United States proposal to invite the Republic of Korea, as we have done in previous years, and reject the draft resolution presented by the Soviet Union, and then make a complete study of the problem which interests us all.

Although my point of view may be somewhat different from that of the Soviet Union, I think that in order to avoid a useless debate by the Committee we might take advantage of the time available by deciding on the question of the invitations this morning.

Mr. CHIANG (China): It has always been the practice of the United Nations to invite the representatives of the Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of the Korean question, and I see no reason why we should depart from that established practice.

The Republic of Korea was formed by the United Nations and is recognized as the legal Government of Korea. The so-called People's Republic of Korea is a different matter altogether. It is puppet creation imposed on the Korean people by the Soviet Union. Therefore, my delegation will vote for the United States proposal and vote against the Soviet draft resolution.

Mr. KORE (United Kingdom): I would not wish to dissent from the view of the representative of Peru, but the arguments on this point are quite clear and well known to all sides. But I still think that most of the members of this Committee were not prepared to discuss this item this morning since we have only decided to take it up a few minutes ago, at the conclusion of the debate on disarmament. I therefore continue to think that it would be for the convenience of most of the members of the Committee if we did adjourn the debate. I would make a formal motion to that effect.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of the United Kingdom has formally moved the adjournment of the meeting. In accordance with the rules of procedure, I shall put this motion to the vote immediately. The motion was adopted by 55 votes to 9, with 11 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The next meeting of the Committee will be tomorrow at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.