

The main debate centred on two draft resolutions: an eight-power resolution sponsored by Australia, Brazil, Cuba, the Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines and the United Kingdom, and the second, a five-power resolution, sponsored by Byelo-Russia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the Ukraine and the U.S.S.R.

The eight-power resolution, presented by the United Kingdom, made the following recommendations:

- (1) that "all appropriate steps should be taken to ensure conditions of stability" throughout Korea;
- (2) that "all constituent acts be taken, including the holding of elections under the auspices of the United Nations for the establishment of a unified and democratic government";
- (3) That United Nations forces should only remain in any part of Korea so long as necessary for achieving these objectives;
- (4) that all necessary measures be taken to accomplish economic rehabilitation.

The resolution went on, in its operative part, to call for the establishment of a Commission to be known as the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK).

The Cominform bloc opposed the eight-power resolution on the grounds that it sanctioned United States "intervention" in the internal affairs of the Korean people, and tacitly permitted the military occupation of Korea "by imperialist powers". Their counter-resolution consequently recommended that the "belligerents" immediately cease hostilities and that the United States and other foreign troops in Korea be immediately withdrawn, and that a "parity" commission, elected at a joint meeting of the Assemblies of North and South Korea, organize and conduct elections for a national assembly of all Korea.

These resolutions reflected two irreconcilable approaches to the Korean issue. A somewhat different position was taken by the Indian Representative. While agreeing fundamentally with the objectives and assumption of the eight-power resolution, he nevertheless questioned the wisdom of adopting, at that stage, those provisions which gave a tacit authority for the continuation of United Nations military operations north of the 38th parallel, and pointed out that these paragraphs of the resolution might serve merely to increase the tension already existing in that part of the world. However, he did not submit any specific resolution embodying his views. Instead, with the strong support of Israel and Yugoslavia, he proposed the appointment of a sub-committee to formulate a compromise resolution which might command the largest measure of agreement. Many delegations, while sympathetic to the intention behind the Indian proposal, nevertheless came reluctantly to the conclusion that it was unlikely to produce concrete results. As Mr. Pearson pointed out, the Soviet Delegate had already stated that he saw no possible compromise. Moreover, the need for further United Nations guidance was a matter of urgency and a sub-committee might well result in prolonged delay. When brought to a vote the Indian proposal was defeated by 32 to 24, with 3 abstentions. The Assembly was thus faced with a choice between the only substantive resolutions which had been proposed, and there was no doubt where the will of the majority lay. In the final vote on October 7 the General Assembly adopted the eight-power resolution by 47 to 5, with 7 abstentions, including India.