

further aggression both in Korea and against China.

In the First Committee there had been definite opposition to the aggressive course of the ruling circles of the United States; that fact, they maintained, could not be ignored. The attempt of the twelve Powers to find a possibility of a peaceful settlement by negotiations had been unsuccessful because of the crude and open pressure, blackmail and threats against those who intended to support the twelve-Power proposal. Many countries economically or otherwise dependent on the United States had thus been compelled to fall in line, they stated; adoption of the draft resolution would defeat the fundamental principles of the Charter and violate the sovereignty of many nations which had been forced to support it.

The representative of the United Kingdom stated that his Government supported the proposal because it attached primary importance to the work of the good offices committee. It was the United Kingdom's hope that the group would first study the various communications from the Peking Government in order to see what light they shed on the possibilities of peaceful negotiation and what further clarification was required.

The programme outlined by the representative of Canada, he said, also contained many valuable ideas which might form the basis of an eventual settlement. The emphasis, he suggested, should be on peaceful settlement rather than on potential sanctions, which might be dangerous, double-edged or merely useless.

The representative of Syria stated that the means of achieving a peaceful settlement had not been exhausted and that there was still a strong possibility of establishing a cease-fire, even at the first meeting of the seven-nations conference suggested by the twelve Asian Powers. Adoption of the United States proposal, he said, would not end the war, but would be more likely to extend it. Were the war to be extended, the United Nations would have to fight against a population of about 800 millions. He would, he said, abstain in the vote on the draft resolution, but his abstention did not signify approval of the behaviour of the People's Republic of China or opposition to the draft resolution. It only meant that the twelve-Power draft resolution should have been adopted first so as to exhaust the possibilities of peaceful discussion.

The representative of India stated that he would vote against the proposal because it would prolong hostilities in Korea indefinitely and might

expand the conflict into a global war. By combining condemnation and negotiation in one proposal, that proposal lost its moral force and negotiations their best chances of success. So many mistakes had been made against the People's Republic of China in the last twelve months that the resolution did not seem to be quite fair in its condemnation.

The representative of Egypt explained that, although he agreed that it was the duty of the United Nations to set up and maintain, and even to put in action, the system of collective security envisaged by the Charter, he saw no reason to overlook the essential concept of the Charter that peaceful means of resolving questions must first be exhausted. The peaceful means, he considered, had not been exhausted in the present case.

At the request of the representative of Israel, the sixth paragraph of the operative part of the draft resolution of the First Committee was put to the vote separately and was adopted by 43 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions. The remainder of the draft resolution was adopted by 44 votes to 7, with 8 abstentions. The draft resolution as a whole was then voted upon by a roll-call and adopted by 44 votes to 7, with 9 abstentions, as follows:

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

Against: Burma, Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, India, Poland, Ukrainian SSR and the USSR.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Egypt, Indonesia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Syria, Yemen and Yugoslavia.

On a statement by the representative of Saudi Arabia that he was not participating in the vote, the President ruled that if a delegation did not participate in the vote, it thereby abstained. However, he said that the Saudi Arabian representative's statement that he did not participate in the vote would be recorded.

The resolution (498(V)) adopted by the Assembly at its 327th plenary meeting on 1 February 1951 read:

"The General Assembly,

"Noting that the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, has failed to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in regard to Chinese Communist intervention in Korea,