



CONTENTS

	Page
Invitation aspects of the consideration of item 98: Question of Korea (continued)	1

Chairman: Mr. Andrés AGUILAR M. (Venezuela).

Invitation aspects of the consideration of item 98: Question of Korea (continued) (A/8026, A/8044 and Add.1-3, A/8045 and Add.1-3, A/8046, A/C.1/999, 1000, 1002, 1007-1009, A/C.1/L.520 and 521)

1. Mr. SOLANO LOPEZ (Paraguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In the consideration of the purely procedural aspects of the items placed under the general heading of "Question of Korea" my delegation, whose position is very well known, might well have refrained from speaking and have limited itself to indicating its views by its vote, but the tenor of some interventions and particularly the interpretation of the scope and meaning of any possible invitation to be extended to a representative of the Republic of Korea and one from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate without the right to vote in an examination of this subject has made it necessary for us to reiterate the reasons for our views on this subject. I shall do so as briefly as possible.

2. We share the view that the presence and participation of the representatives of the two parts into which the Korean nation finds itself unfortunately divided would contribute to making our deliberations more effective and efficient. Of course, superficially, such a principle would appear to be unexceptionable, but I say "superficially" because in this case we must also bear in mind both the framework in which the debate is taking place—the United Nations—and also the historical and legal background of the question. On the basis of such an examination we believe that the participation of these representatives in this study would require certain conditions.

3. It is not just a matter of the presence of these representatives in the First Committee, nor of the contributions they might and particularly their willingness to co-operate. There is one prior and indispensable condition. This is the explicit and unequivocal recognition and acceptance by both Koreas—North and South—of the competence and authority of the United Nations itself to deal with this question and to take decisions.

4. This argument is based upon the very origin of the situation existing in Korea whence arises not only the right but the duty of the General Assembly to adopt the measures necessary to discharge the duties it has assumed.

The facts are too well known for me to go through them again, but it would be wrong for me not to remind you that at the unhappy time when the Korean Republic was attacked, invaded and devastated by an act of naked aggression on the part of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea—or North Korea—and was about to succumb and be conquered, it was the United Nations, pursuant to the pertinent provisions of the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, that assumed the responsibility, by its collective efforts, of thwarting the imperialist designs of North Korea. It cost much blood and many sacrifices to repel the North Korean aggression and to restore to the people of the Korean Republic their right to decide their own destiny. This collective action to defend the rights of a people who were the victims of aggression does honour to the tradition of the United Nations.

5. The armed conflict ended many years ago, but the years since then have not been a time of peace which would have allowed the noble purposes of our Organization to be fulfilled. The absence of an open conflagration has meant that the Republic of Korea has had to maintain a constant vigilant and costly defence to prevent further aggression, and in that self-defence she has always counted on the support and guarantees of the United Nations.

6. Therefore our Organization is in duty bound to insist that in order to participate in the debate the two parties must explicitly and unequivocally recognize the competence and authority of the Organization. We believe this to be an indispensable prerequisite.

7. This condition has already been definitely fulfilled by the Republic of Korea. That country, therefore, has placed itself within the framework which will allow it fully to participate in the consideration of this question. The position of North Korea, however, is entirely the opposite. Therefore it is North Korea itself and not the General Assembly, through its First Committee, which is debarring itself from participation in the debate.

8. It is in the light of these views that we have weighed the two draft resolutions submitted to our Committee for decision and, for the reasons I have adduced, we entirely support the draft resolution submitted by Australia and 15 other countries in document A/C.1/L.521, and we shall vote in favour of it.

9. For the same reasons we have decided to vote against the draft resolution submitted by Algeria and 24 other countries, contained in document A/C.1/L.520, because the invitation referred to in it is "unconditional" and were that draft resolution to be adopted it would mean that the United Nations would be disavowing its own noble conduct in the tragic hour when the Republic of Korea was attacked

by its neighbour from the North. This would be a situation which my delegation, in all good faith, could not and should not accept.

10. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): During the commemorative session of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations every opportunity was seized to stress the peace-keeping role of our Organization. All together we adopted a Declaration of Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [*resolution 2625 (XXV)*] and other provisions relating, *inter alia*, to the rights of peoples to self-determination and the right freely to choose their political régime without any foreign interference [*resolution 2621 (XXV)*]. The delegation of Mali is constantly mindful of this solemn commitment of the Organization, in keeping with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

11. Regrettable circumstances have led this Organization to intervene in Korea through the creation of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and the despatch of troops to South Korea.

12. For 20 years the United Nations has been embroiled in the Korean problem. For over 15 years, at every session, it asks itself whether both parties to the Korean question should be heard here. It has been said that this is only a procedural matter. We think that the question is thus not correctly posed, unless we want to become prisoners of our own words.

13. If we really wish to seek for peace in Korea, reason and objectivity would lead us to wonder why, after over 15 years of hearing only the pleas of the South Koreans, we are still undecided as to whether we should approve such hearings; or are we so engrossed in our own routine that we are forgetful of our main task? I repeat that this mission must be in keeping with the Charter, which recognizes for all peoples—among others the Korean people—the right to settle their own affairs.

14. It is in this spirit, and only in this spirit—that is to say, without prejudging the substance of the matter—that the delegation of Mali would like to tackle this question.

15. We were not able to agree with the arguments put forward by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.521, requesting that, in view of the idea that they have of the authority and competence of the United Nations, only South Korea be admitted to take part in our debates. We regret to be forced to say that the adoption of their draft would result only in a new debate next year on the same procedural question, just as in the previous 15 years.

16. We were told that parties to a dispute should agree in advance to accept the conclusions of the body which they seize of their dispute. We fully agree, but in this case the United Nations has unilaterally inscribed the Korean question on its agenda and it will decide to hear the parties to the conflict. Since we were told that this invitation had nothing to do with the substantive aspects of the Korean question, we wonder whether the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.521 are not aware of this contradiction—unless they want the whole Committee to endorse the contradiction.

17. But to come back to the idea of the Seoul régime agreeing to the competence and authority of the United Nations, we were actually disturbed when we heard this described as an act of good faith which should lead us to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/L.521.

18. The commitments of the United Nations in Korea are very serious. We are quite aware of this. We ardently hope that peace will reign in this part of the world. In document A/C.1/1007 we read carefully the statement of South Korea, according to which: “The main burden of maintaining peace in Korea is the responsibility of the United Nations Forces, under relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.”

19. However, in his statement the permanent representative of Cuba reminded us of the present discussions between the Seoul Government and that of a State Member of the United Nations about reductions of the latter’s war effort in Korea [*1742nd meeting*]. If that Member State had thought it unnecessary to exercise the right provided for by Article 50 of the Charter to consult the Security Council on this matter, the Government of South Korea should have thought of the competence and authority of the United Nations. Should it not at least have advised the Secretary-General or some other Member State of this?

20. It is in the light of all this that one should approach draft resolution A/C.1/L.521.

21. On the other hand, a number of countries, including my own, presented to the Committee draft resolution A/C.1/L.520, which differs from the other only in that we put forward no condition for inviting both parties directly concerned. This is logical and is due to the fact that we want to hear both parties. It is due to the fact that peace will not be established in Korea without the participation of North Korea.

22. Some delegations alleged that if North Korea were invited it would use the First Committee debates for propaganda purposes. One might believe that those delegations know in advance what the North Korean representatives would tell us.

23. The delegation of Mali, on the other hand, is fully aware of the statement made on 29 August 1970 by the Government of North Korea [*see A/C.1/L.1000*]. We have received a copy of that statement which says, *inter alia*: “Furthermore, when such a question”—of course, the Korean question—“is discussed at the United Nations, the representative of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, the party directly concerned to the question, must naturally take part in the discussion.”

24. Thus, how can one prejudice the good faith or lack thereof of a party which asks to be heard in a question of direct interest to it?

25. In the same document the Government of North Korea also states: “The Government of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea has always respected and respects the Charter of the United Nations and its objectives.”

26. In fact, North Korea refuses to accept decisions on the Korean question without its participation.

27. By adopting draft resolution A/C.1/L.520, the Committee will afford it the invaluable opportunity of coming here to explain its position. Such a decision would be in keeping with our task and especially in keeping with the Charter.

28. Mr. FONSECA TRUQUE (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, I should like, although very briefly, to endorse the congratulations that have been addressed to you on your unanimous election to the Chair of this important Committee. I should also like to extend my endorsement to the statements made in connexion with the election of the other officers of the Committee.

29. As it takes part in the debate on the invitation aspects of the question of Korea, the Colombian delegation is not unaware of the fact that we are confronted by what may be the most intractable problem of the United Nations.

30. We all recall that from the distant days of the Korean war this subject has constantly been the subject of attention in the world Organization; year after year the same draft resolutions are submitted; the same arguments are adduced with implacable persistence; and, when all is said and done, no positive progress is achieved by the United Nations in attaining the objective it has set for itself, namely, to establish by peaceful means a united, independent, democratic Korea enjoying a form of Government which will reflect the freely expressed will of the Korean people—in one word, to re-establish international peace and security in that region.

31. Furthermore, we are all aware of the fact that this state of affairs persists despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of delegations present truly want to find an equitable solution that would take into account the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of the two Koreas.

32. The vicious circle has not been created by the resolutions that have been adopted year after year by a substantial majority of the Members. We must recognize that the petrification of this question of Korea is, on the most careful analysis, due to the fact that a minority of the delegations stubbornly uphold the extravagant theory that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea cannot accept the competence or the authority of the United Nations under the Charter to adopt measures or take decisions on the question of Korea. According to those delegations, such an acceptance would be an insult to the dignity of that country.

33. Such a strange argument forces us to ask: what reasons would North Korea have for wishing to be invited to express their views in an international organization whose authority and competence to intervene in the solution of the problem they deny? My delegation has repeatedly asked this question, but receives no answer. I repeat the question: why does the Democratic People's Republic of Korea insist that we invite them? To legitimize a discussion that they have already called illegal or to participate in the illegality itself? If it is the former, we do not believe they possess any special powers of purification. We do not agree

that the spokesmen of North Korea have the magical power to turn evil into good or to legalize those acts which, according to them, are illegal *per se*. So long as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea continues to contend that our actions are illegal we cannot invite them to discuss these matters with us, because at that very moment the United Nations would then be placed in an extremely inferior position vis-à-vis the nation making the persistent and uncalled-for accusations against it.

34. Colombia, like the majority of delegations here, sincerely wants the presence and participation of representatives of both nations to discuss the substance of the question of Korea. But what my delegation cannot accept is that after the Republic of Korea has explicitly and unequivocally agreed to and accepted the authority of the world Organization, after it has complied with the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, after it has suffered the constant aggression of North Korea, the United Nations should now invite the representatives of the aggressor Government, North Korea, without the latter even so much as accepting the competence or the authority of the United Nations to participate in the search for a solution to the conflict.

35. There can be no doubt that these sterile debates on the question of Korea will go down in the history of the United Nations as clear testimony of the lack of a spirit of co-operation and maturity that has marked relations in the international community during the last few decades.

36. Colombia's reasoning is based on the certainty that the action undertaken by the United Nations in Korea since 1950 has been not only fully in keeping with the fundamental purposes and the objectives set forth 25 years ago at San Francisco in the Charter regarding the maintenance of international peace and security but that furthermore, it is imperative for us to recognize that the measures adopted were only an effective and legitimate application of the machinery for collective security provided for in the Charter, in order to repel aggression, to restore peace and to exercise the good offices of the Organization in the search for a peaceful and equitable solution for the parties concerned. It has become obvious, however, that some delegations are eager to use the debate as an anachronistic weapon that dates back to the period of the so-called "cold war" which we have left behind. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.521, which Colombia and 18 other countries have sponsored, has been represented as a manoeuvre designed to prevent North Korea from taking part in this debate; the truth of the matter is that that draft resolution is offered generously as a friendly and civilized bridge by the Organization to that country so that, finally, it can decide to accept the competence of the United Nations and so that North Korea can place itself within the fold of international law and the Korean people at last be allowed to achieve their desired unity.

37. I believe that when a debate like this reaches a stalemate—as has always been the case—the Charter does provide an appropriate way to break the stalemate, namely, to proceed to a vote without delay. Colombia respects the majority decisions of the United Nations, for therein lies the authority of our Organization. We also respect the opinions of other delegations, even though they may not be

the same as our own. It is for those reasons that my delegation rejects the inappropriate language that some delegations—fortunately, very few—have been resorting to in our debate. Modern psychology explains certain violent reactions in man as hidden manifestations of some complex, such as the venting of some repressed feeling on some other person or institution, as the only means of relieving some pain or anxiety that one may be experiencing. However, the rules of diplomacy, like the rules of a game, recommend courtesy and calm in all circumstances.

38. Furthermore, we are all eager to preserve an atmosphere of cordial co-operation and of constructive debate in our deliberations, particularly during this anniversary year. I think we would be well advised, therefore, to shorten this fruitless oratorical duel and, as soon as possible, proceed to the final stage in this debate, namely, the vote.

39. Colombia hopes that draft resolution A/C.1/L.521 will be supported by a majority of the members and that draft resolution A/C.1/L.520 will be rejected by this Committee as an elementary act of justice.

40. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*interpretation from French*): This is the first time that the delegation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo is speaking in this Committee, and I should like to start by congratulating you, Mr. Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, Ambassador Farah, and the Rapporteur, Ambassador Cernik, on your unanimous election. With such competent personalities, the work of our Committee certainly will be crowned with success.

41. The question of the invitation which we are now considering must be placed in its true context if we want to understand its real scope. The question of the invitation to be addressed to the parties can only be discussed in its relation to the subject of the debate to which the parties will or will not be invited.

42. Some representatives say that this is related to the right and competence of the Organization to deal with the solution of the Korean question, which to them is exclusively a question for Koreans.

43. There are others who say that the only question that can be debated now is the Korean question and its solution. The competence of the Organization has already been decided by the General Assembly, and it is obligatory for all; it must, therefore, be accepted by all the parties before they can be invited to take part in the debate.

44. My delegation considers that the question of competence is not what we are now debating. If that were the case, we would be ready to assimilate the request of the North Korean representatives, who claim that the United Nations is not competent, to the right of asking for a decision by making the preliminary exception of declaring the court incompetent, but we are beyond that point. The General Assembly was quite right in recognizing its competence in this matter. This decision, unless it is changed by an appropriate procedure, must be accepted by the Member States and, *a fortiori*, by non-member States which would wish to take part in the debate of this Committee on the substance of the question.

45. However, we share the view that no positive solution can be found by the United Nations for the Korean question without the co-operation of all parties, and, therefore, without the co-operation of North Korea. But we are also in duty bound to note that this co-operation of North Korea has been denied to the United Nations from the very start, since that country refuses to recognize the competence and authority of our Organization to consider the Korean question.

46. In these circumstances, my delegation has very serious reservations about inviting the representatives of North Korea, as is proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/L.520. On the other hand, we shall support draft resolution A/C.1/L.521, which is in keeping with the views we have expressed, without prejudging our position on the substance of the Korean question.

47. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to thank the representative of Colombia and the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo for their kind words of congratulation to the officers of the Committee.

48. Mr. TOURE (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): First of all, my delegation wishes to express its opposition to and its rejection of the methods and procedures adopted whereby, year after year, for more than 20 years, we have postponed this item on our agenda dealing with the invitation aspects of the Korean question.

49. The question of an invitation to the true representatives of the valiant people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a matter of logic and justice. It is a question of logic because it is obvious to my delegation that our Organization cannot hold a valid debate on the Korean question without previously having heard all the parties directly concerned. However, due to a device that is at once illogical, arbitrary and unjust, efforts are made each year to invite unilaterally the representatives of the authorities of Seoul to discuss a matter on which they have neither full competence nor complete responsibility.

50. Such a procedure is degrading to our Organization and causes it to serve one side only, and clearly at the expense of the other.

51. As I have said, an invitation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a question of justice because our Organization, being universal in character, cannot ignore the courageous and proud people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, who have achieved considerable progress in all fields of national construction. Its people's Government has more than once given clear proof of its respect for the Charter. We believe that it is the United Nations, remotely controlled by other forces, which refuses to apply all the provisions of the Charter to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

52. If, after two decades, our Organization has continued to mark time by its mistakes and by its stubbornness, we would hope that this twenty-fifth anniversary might give us an opportunity, during this commemorative session, to redress a flagrant and growing injustice by receiving the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of

Korea, so that we might discuss with them a matter of primary concern to them.

53. It was with this conviction that my delegation, together with 25 other delegations of Asia, Africa and Latin America, as well as all the socialist countries of Europe, submitted the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.520. If we want to be consistent, the invitation to the parties concerned should not be made subject to any kind of conditions. Therefore, it is with a concern for objectivity that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.520 ask you to support their efforts.

54. On the other hand, draft resolution A/C.1/L.521 is of a discriminatory nature in its formulation. Its aims are contrary to our desire for equity and justice and the very spirit of our Charter, and my delegation will vote against that draft resolution.

55. The prior question of the presence of the two parties in no way prejudices the discussion of the substance of the question of Korea, on which, of course, my delegation reserves its right to speak in due course.

56. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): The representative of Guinea was the last speaker announced for this meeting. As members are aware, the plenary meeting of the General Assembly will begin in a few minutes.

57. Before adjourning this meeting, I should like to express my appreciation to the members of the Committee for having been good enough yesterday and today to have attended our meetings at an unusually early hour. I would again crave the co-operation of members to allow us to begin our meeting this afternoon punctually at three o'clock so that we can conclude the invitation aspect of the Korean question.

58. As members of the Committee are aware, the First Committee decided to conclude the debate on this subject this afternoon and to vote on the draft resolutions that have been submitted. There are seven speakers on the list to participate in the debate. After hearing those speakers, we shall vote on the two draft resolutions.

The meeting rose at 10.35 a.m.