

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**
 ELEVENTH SESSION
 Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 820th
 MEETING**

**Tuesday, 8 January 1957,
 at 3 p.m.**

New York

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 21:

The Korean question (*concluded*):

- (a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea;
- (b) Problem of ex-prisoners of the Korean war: report of the Government of India..... 37

Chairman: Mr. Víctor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

AGENDA ITEM 21

The Korean question (A/3172, A/3203, A/C.1/L.158, A/C.1/L.159/Rev.1) (*concluded*):

- (a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea;**
- (b) Problem of ex-prisoners of the Korean war: report of the Government of India**

1. Mr. JARRING (Sweden) said that, in view of the statements which had been made regarding the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission (NNSC), he wished to state the position of his Government. He recalled that at the ninth session of the General Assembly, the Swedish representative on the First Committee had stated that his Government was not entirely satisfied with its participation in the NNSC, among other reasons because it did not seem appropriate to maintain a large staff in Korea while the NNSC could not effectively accomplish the task expected of it (738th meeting, para. 7). That position was confirmed at the General Assembly's tenth session (792nd meeting, para. 26).

2. Following a partial reduction of the Commission's personnel in September 1955, his Government had proposed in March 1956 the temporary withdrawal of the inspection teams stationed at the designated ports of entry, with the proviso that the NNSC should retain its right to dispatch its teams to the said ports of entry should the need arise. The proposal had been accepted by the parties, and the inspection teams had been withdrawn. That had led to a very considerable reduction in the personnel of the Commission. However the position of his Government remained as before, namely that it was not satisfied that the Commission was in a position to accomplish the task entrusted to it.

3. Mr. Krishna MENON (India) welcomed the revised draft resolution submitted by Ecuador, El Salvador and Venezuela (A/C.1/L.159/Rev.1) concerning the ex-prisoners of the Korean war and expressed the hope of his Government that the resettlement of the ex-prisoners who were still in India would be carried out soon with the co-operation of Member States.

4. He regretted the statements that had cast a reflection on the handling of the ex-prisoners in India by the Indian Government. He was confident, however, that,

perhaps with one exception, the Members of the United Nations were satisfied with the integrity and objectivity shown by his Government in that connexion. He was convinced that the action the Indian Government had taken in ascertaining the desires of the ex-prisoners and in sending them where they wanted to go would bear examination.

5. After recalling the statement of his delegation at the 818th meeting on the United States draft resolution (A/C.1/L.158), he said that, although his delegation had not succeeded in obtaining certain modifications by private consultations, it felt, however, that it would not be in the interest of the United Nations objectives in Korea to seek an amendment of the draft resolution. Such a procedure might accentuate the differences which might arise.

6. His delegation had already stated that there could be more than one way of supervising elections throughout Korea. If the objective was to unify Korea on the basis of free elections, then there should be no insurmountable difficulty in finding methods in which such elements as the secret ballot, freedom of campaigning, time for organization and international supervision could be incorporated. It was, therefore, possible to find a method which would maintain the prestige and concern of the United Nations, incorporate all the essential features of international supervision, and secure the agreement of both sides. International supervision of elections with the agreement of the United Nations would meet all points of view in that respect. His delegation therefore believed that, in the circumstances, it was not practicable to hold to the position that supervision must be United Nations supervision: a view that had also been expressed at the tenth session by the representative of Sweden, that had been implied to a certain extent in the statement of the representative of Canada at the 816th meeting, and had been taken into account by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of France at Geneva.

7. A second difficulty concerned an all-Korean conference in which one side could veto the proposals of the other. He recognized the problems involved, but believed that both sides should negotiate, without outside assistance, on the composition of the body to be elected. It was clear that the elections would not be for a South Korean Parliament nor for a North Korean Assembly, but for a body on which both sides could agree. With regard to the question of the representation of each side in that body, when a country was being united into a single State the only basis for deciding the question should be population taking into account also, as a weighted factor, the size of the respective areas. The two sides should find it possible by negotiation to agree on the number of seats that would go to each of them. The United Nations and those who were in a position to influence the parties must encourage them to enter into formal discussions with a view to agreeing on some form of constituent assembly which could create its own constitution. Secondly, there should be some arrange-

ment whereby North Korea might be induced to agree that the fact that its population was smaller must be taken into account, while at the same time South Korea should accept the view that some consideration must also be given to the size of the respective areas. That approach, India believed, should yield positive results.

8. If the United Nations agreed such supervision must guarantee what was desired, namely, that the elections would be straight forward, that they would be properly and honestly conducted, that there would be freedom of campaigning, and that there would be no pressure applied either in the North or in the South. For that purpose, the machinery need not necessarily be—in fact, it could not be—the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK). It would have to be some *ad hoc* body.

9. Those were the Indian proposals made at the 818th meeting, though they had not been presented as formal amendments to the United States draft resolution. His delegation wished to avoid division on the United States proposal and would thus abstain in the vote. However, if the draft resolution were to be voted upon in parts, his delegation would vote for the preamble, which noted that the Armistice Agreement remained in effect and for paragraph 1, which reaffirmed the objectives of the United Nations in Korea.

10. Mr. BERNARDNES (Brazil) expressed the gratitude of his delegation to the representatives who had paid tribute to his Government for its efforts to resettle some of the ex-prisoners of the Korean war. He also thanked the representatives of Ecuador, El Salvador and Venezuela for their draft resolution (A/C.1/L.159/Rev.1) and said he would vote for it since it expressed gratitude to the Governments of India and Argentina for their co-operation.

11. Mr. KIZYA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that a final peaceful solution of the Korean question should be achieved by the Korean people itself. To that end, he considered very important the establishment of economic, cultural and political links between the two parts of Korea. The continuation of the activities of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and of the policy aimed at imposing on one part of Korea the social and political order of the other part could not lead to a settlement of the question. The United Nations draft resolution aimed at imposing on North Korea a solution from outside. It proposed the continuation and expansion of the functions of UNCURK. In the opinion of his delegation that Commission had been created for the purpose of extending the South Korean régime to the whole of Korea. Experience had shown that such one-sided and oversimplified approaches to a solution of the Korean problem could not bring any positive results. It was clear that UNCURK should have been dissolved long ago. His delegation would vote against the United States draft resolution.

12. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the United States draft resolution (A/C.1/L.158).

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Yemen, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Iraq, Ire-

land, Israel, Italy, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Egypt, Finland, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria.

The draft resolution was adopted by 57 votes to 8, with 13 abstentions.

13. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by Ecuador, El Salvador and Venezuela (A/C.1/L.159/Rev.1).

The draft resolution was adopted by 69 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

14. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) stated that his delegation had voted in favour of the United States draft resolution (A/C.1/L.158) since that draft offered the only way in which to confront successfully the difficult and complex problem of Korea. The question was not one of the unification of the peoples of North and South Korea; the question concerned the people of South Korea and a foreign Power that was now governing the people of North Korea. As long as that Power did not agree to unification, a favourable solution would not be achieved. It was, therefore, necessary for the United Nations to maintain a watch over the situation and to keep the question on its agenda. The delegation of Ecuador had voted in favour of the United States draft resolution because, under the present circumstances, it presented the only effective way to keep before the conscience of the world the serious situation existing in Korea.

15. Referring to the draft resolution submitted by El Salvador, Venezuela and Ecuador (A/C.1/L.159/Rev.1) he observed that the draft had been introduced since the problem of the ex-prisoners of the Korean war had not been fully covered by the United States draft.

16. Mr. ALVAREZ AYBAR (Dominican Republic) declared that the discussion in the Committee had led his delegation to a stronger conviction as to the need to maintain unassailable the principles of the United Nations, upon which the objectives of the unification and reconstruction of Korea were based. The question of Korea was a symbol of international morality, which explained why it was not for the United Nations to address itself to the authorities of North Korea, but for the latter to assume sufficient moral quality to be recognized as a proper party. In spite of wide divergencies between the activities carried out in South Korea and in North Korea—democracy and peace in the South, and communism and the desire for domination in the North—there was significant importance in unification on the basis of a free democratic action as advocated in the resolution which had just been adopted.

17. The delegation of the Dominican Republic expressed hope that the Republic of Korea would soon enter the United Nations and that its territory would be completely restored to it.

18. The delegation of the Dominican Republic also wished to congratulate the three sponsors of the draft

resolution on the ex-prisoners of war in Korea for their happy initiative in the matter.

19. U PE KIN (Burma) explained that his delegation's abstention in the vote on the United States draft resolution (A/C.1/L.158) in no way implied indifference or lack of concern about the Korean question. His Government continued to believe, as it had when it had supported the Security Council action of 27 June 1950 (S/1511), that collective measures for peace and efforts to bar aggression or interference in the affairs of any nation deserved full support. He recalled that his Government had also recorded its affirmative vote on previous General Assembly resolutions affecting Korea. However, if certain measures had been tried in the past and had been found wanting, new measures should be sought. Would it not be unwise to return to the annual sessions of the General Assembly with unchanging adherence to previously fixed positions?

20. The delegation of Burma had abstained in the vote on the United States draft resolution because it felt that no beginning had yet been made to apply in the Korean question the wisdom that had been applied in other instances. The Government of Burma supported the reaffirmation made in paragraph 1 of the resolution; it believed most firmly that the objectives of the United Nations were to bring about by peaceful means the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of government and the full restoration of international peace and security in the area. It believed also that it was time to seek a new approach, which might produce more positive results than UNCURK had.

21. The Burmese delegation had voted in favour of the three-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.159/Rev.1) in appreciation of the most delicate and complex task well discharged by the Government of India and of the generous way that the Governments of Argentina and Brazil had co-operated in the solution of the problem of ex-prisoners of the Korean war.

22. Mr. WINKLER (Czechoslovakia) pointed out that his delegation's abstention in the vote on the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.159/Rev.1) did not mean that it failed to appreciate the role played by India and other countries in connexion with the problem of the ex-prisoners of the Korean war. On the contrary, it fully appreciated that role, the more so because Czechoslovakia, as a member of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission, had witnessed most closely and had shared the difficulties that India was facing in carrying out its task in Korea. His delegation had abstained for reasons of principle. Its position on the question of the ex-prisoners of the Korean war, in particular on their illegal transfer to the United Nations Command, had been made sufficiently clear previously. It had not been able to vote for the draft resolution because it felt that such a vote might imply recognition of the *fait accompli* carried out in respect of the status of the prisoners formally held in the custody of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission.

23. His delegation had voted against the United States draft resolution for the reasons sufficiently obvious from his previous statement (817th meeting).

Mr. Yang, representative of the Republic of Korea, withdrew.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.