

UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED  
A/C.1/PV.973  
5 November 1958  
ENGLISH

---

Thirteenth Session  
FIRST COMMITTEE  
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 5 November 1958, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. URQUIA

(El Salvador)

The Korean question [24] (continued)

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.973. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

## AGENDA ITEM 24

THE KOREAN QUESTION: REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE UNIFICATION AND REHABILITATION OF KOREA (continued)

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): At the end of yesterday's meeting the Committee was considering two draft resolutions: one by the delegation of the Soviet Union (A/C.1/L.214) according to which the Committee would resolve 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; and the other by the delegation of the United States (A/C.1/L.216) according to which the Committee would invite a representative of the Republic of Korea to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the Korean question. Therefore, the Committee will continue its discussion of this point before proceeding to the substance of the matter.

I call on the representative of India on a point of order.

Mr. LALL (India): My point of order is this. You have just said, Mr. Chairman, that we shall first discuss this issue of seating the representatives of the two parts of Korea in this Committee. Very respectfully, I entirely agree with that view and I trust that the speeches which we are now going to hear will be confined to that matter. I should be grateful if you would make that clear because, if the other speeches are not going to be confined to that point, then the delegation of India would appreciate being called upon first because we propose to move an amendment to the United States draft resolution and it may be of advantage to the Committee to know of that amendment, which we have handed in to the Secretariat, and to have it explained at a very early stage in our consideration of this first primary issue.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As I said earlier, the Committee will consider the question raised previously by the delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States regarding the seating of representatives of the two parts of Korea. As far as the statement by the representative of India is concerned, it might help us if he would explain the amendment which he is going to submit, if he so desires.

Mr. LALL (India): I am grateful for this opportunity to explain the amendment which we are introducing now to the United States draft resolution (A/C.1/L.216).

We are introducing an amendment to this draft because we anticipate that it may be the desire of the United States delegation to ask for priority for this draft resolution over the draft resolution presented by the Soviet Union. Our amendment is, in the first place, to introduce the word "each" between the words "representative" and "of the Republic of Korea". The second amendment is to add words, after "the Republic of Korea" to cover the other Government of Korea; ~~that~~ is to say, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. So that, the draft resolution as amended would read:

"The First Committee,

"Decides to invite a representative each of the Republic of Korea and of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the Korean question."

I would be grateful for a moment to explain this amendment.

We are concerned here primarily with a report on the unification and rehabilitation of Korea. Korea is an entity essentially. It is an entity with a long history. If this Committee, as it must do, wishes seriously to attend to this problem and is not going to attend to it purely in terms of the crystallization of positions, which have achieved nothing and which can achieve nothing, then it is common sense, it is reasonable, it is rational that we should ask the representatives of both Governments or regimes -- whatever we wish to call them -- in Korea to come to this table and to participate in the debate.

Surely it is not the intention of this Committee to look upon this item as purely a propaganda item, as purely a theoretical debate, as purely something divorced from the realities of the situation. We are interested in the reality of Korea; we are interested in the rehabilitation of the whole of Korea; we are interested in the unification of Korea. Now, our steps in this Committee must be directly logically and consistently towards these purposes.

(Mr. Lall, India)

It follows, therefore, that if we are going to have a debate on the whole of Korea, we must have here at our table the representatives of both regimes in Korea or Governments. I put it that way because I do not want to take a stand for other countries as to these people, as to whether these are governments or regimes. That is not the issue. The issue is the integrity of Korea. And we would beg this Committee not to look at this issue and say: we did this in 1949; we did that in 1950; we did that in 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1957: Therefore, we must continue it. I do not have to tell important delegates, sophisticated delegates, that if the whole world is to run on the basis that we will continue to do today what we did in 1914 or 1814 or 1948, we would get nowhere. We wish to tackle this problem seriously with the delegates around the table. We do not ask the delegates to take sides for one Government or one regime or the other, but we beg them to remember that we are talking about Korea. Korea is a geographical entity; and we are going to get absolutely nowhere if we are not going to take that into account. Now if we are going to get nowhere in this discussion, then let us adopt the American draft resolution. But if we intend to be practical, if we intend to be moral, if we intend to take into account the affairs and the lives of the Korean people, then let us adopt the amendment that the delegation of India proposes.

The CHAIRMAN: (interpretation from Spanish): The members of the Committee have heard the gist of the amendment proposed by the delegation of India. If anyone wishes to speak to that amendment as well as the draft resolutions of the United States and the Soviet Union, we will have before us one issue. I call now on the representative of Czechoslovakia.

Mr. BUSNIKA (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from French): In view of the forthcoming consideration of the Korean question, we must again decide whether to invite the representatives of the two sides directly concerned in this matter, that is, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of Southern Korea, to participate in these talks. The peaceful solution of the Korean question implies and presupposes the unification of Korea into a united democratic state. This is a problem which affects the interests of the whole Korean people, and it is a matter for the Koreans themselves. It is, therefore, imperative that

(Mr. Busnika, Czechoslovakia)

representatives of both parts of the hitherto divided country should take part in the consideration of this question.

The Czechoslovak delegation welcomes and wholeheartedly supports the proposal of the USSR delegation (A/C.1/L.214) to invite representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate, without the right to vote, and to enter into the discussion of the whole question.

The history of the Korean question in past years has demonstrated that no amount of intervention from outside will solve this question, nor will the unilateral imposition of the will of sixteen countries which, headed by the United States, took part in the aggressive warfare against the Korean People's Democratic Republic, do so. If we do not want this year's discussion of the Korean question to wind up in failure, it is essential for representatives of both parties in the Korean conflict to take part in this debate, that is, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the delegation of Southern Korea. This is in line with the requirements of equity, and the norms and standards of international law, as well as the principles of the United Nations. Repeated attempts to deny to the KPDR access to the consideration of the question of Korea in the United Nations, implicit in the United States proposal (A/C.1/L.216), constitutes additional evidence of the intention of the United States delegation again to frustrate any sort of progress or possibility of progress in the solution of this question. The United States wants to perpetuate the division of Korea as long as possible, to maintain tension in that area, and to keep Korea in the future as an aggressive base on the Asian continent.

In the opinion of the Czechoslovak delegation, the presence of representatives of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea at the present session of the United Nations General Assembly is all the more essential, as the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea could eventually submit explanations and details as to the new proposals of the KPDR Governments submitted in February of this year concerning measures for the peaceful unification of Korea.

In view of all the above, the Czechoslovak delegation considers that the proposal of the USSR delegation that the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Southern Korea should be invited to participate in the

(Mr. Busnika, Czechoslovakia)

discussion of the Korean question is a well-advised and just one, useful for the work of our Committee. We will, therefore, vote in favour of it.

The Czechoslovak delegation likewise declares that it will vote against the one-sided proposal of the United States delegation in A/C.1/L.216, which would have us invite representatives of Southern Korea alone.

Mr. Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom delegation will vote in favour of the proposal of the representative of the United States contained in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.216 to invite the representative of the Republic of Korea to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion by this Committee of the Korean question. This is the Committee's established practice when considering this item, and the Committee has found this practice helpful. This proposal, moreover, is responsive to the fact that, so far as the United Nations is concerned, the Government of the Republic of Korea is the legitimate Government of that country. This point has relevance also to the Soviet Union draft resolution now before us. To invite representatives of the North Korean authorities to take part in our discussions would be to accord to those authorities a status that they do not possess. The United Kingdom delegation will, therefore, vote against the Soviet draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.214.

It follows from what I have said that my delegation will be unable to support the amendments just read out by the delegate of India, which would equate the North Korean authorities with the Government of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): Once again the Korean question comes before the United Nations, and at this time, again, as we gather from the United States position, we see that there is an effort being made, on the one hand, to stop the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from taking part in the discussion of a subject which is vital to the life of his country, and, on the other hand, to try to hamper the United Nations in its taking of the necessary decisions to bring out a solution to the Korean question. The Bulgarian delegation reserves its right to refer to the substance of the question later. But today I shall limit myself to expressing my opinion regarding the efforts being made to stop the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from taking part in the debate. What subject

NB/rs

A/C.1/FV.973

9-10

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

are we going to discuss? We are going to discuss the Korean question. How can we find out what decision to take unless we hear the representatives of both sides? The decision which was taken during the twelfth session, under pressure of the United States, made it impossible for the United Nations to do this.

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

The main task is to make of Korea, by peaceful means, one unified independent and democratic country, to re-establish peace and security in that region of the world and to have this country recognized by all the world. Therefore, what we have to do is to try peacefully to unify Korea. But in order to unify two independent countries -- which is a division based on a recent historical event and wherein there are different social and political structures -- we not only must ask for their opinion, which is an elementary question in any matter of unification, but we must at the same time make every effort to have the parties come to an agreement; that is, of course, if we wish to unify the country peacefully.

The proposal which the delegation of the United States of America made to invite only one of the parties to participate in our discussion creates serious doubts as to the intentions of the United States in bringing about the unification of Korea by peaceful means, and, what is worse, it creates suspicion and fear in the minds of the members of the Committee and as regards world public opinion.

Why does not the United States want to see the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea come before this Committee? The reason is -- and we gather this from the statement of the representative of the United States yesterday -- that it would be the representative of a puppet government. This is what he said. It is a most peculiar argument that the delegation of the United States is trying to interject here. According to the standards adopted by that country, it would appear that any government which refuses to take orders from the United States or refuses to allow the United States Army and Navy to invade its country and territorial waters, or has sufficient strength to oppose the threats levelled against its country, is thereby termed a puppet government.

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

Therefore, any President or Government which might allow the Army and Navy of the United States to go into its land and set themselves up there, and then have that country obtain subsidies in order to exist, these, I suppose, are not puppet governments and they therefore can receive the benediction of the United States and would be allowed to send representatives to the United Nations. This is a most bizarre practice which the United Nations cannot and must not countenance. To prevent an invitation being addressed to one of the parties concerned in a debate, in order to have them participate in a debate which would deal with the unification of their country, is a way of acting that must create doubts as regards the good intentions of the United States in bringing about the unification of Korea by peaceful means.

In fact, how can our Organization do its duty and work towards the unification of Korea if we are going to block any efforts at reaching a solution? If we admit the representative of South Korea and do not admit the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, is it not then obvious that this must hamper the possibility of having any solutions adopted here? Any solution, in order to be viable and acceptable, must be adopted with the presence and participation of both parties concerned.

In his statement of yesterday, the representative of the United States said that the participation of the representative of Syngman Rhee in the discussion will be "extremely useful". Therefore, we must gather from this that the representation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will not be useful and would be annoying. Another representative, adding to the statement of the representative of the United States, said that the representation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would introduce an element of perturbation and worry into the debate. They too would apparently be annoying to this other representative who spoke. But this would be giving us more information.

However, since the United States wishes to turn South Korea into a military base and spearhead against the Asian continent, since it is setting up bases and launching pads for rockets, and since the United States is accumulating atomic weapons there and wishes to turn South Korea into an atomic weapons base, then any person who would make such facts known would obviously introduce an element of perturbation and worry here, and therefore the United States would be very careful not to allow such information to come to the attention of the United Nations or to world public opinion.

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

But I think it would only be right to recall here that the role of the United Nations in this matter is to give its assistance in the solution of the Korean question, to help set up peace and not merely to bow to the intemperate wishes of the United States. The delegation of Bulgaria feels that the presence of the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will greatly facilitate the tasks of the United Nations. It is for this reason that the Bulgarian delegation will vote in favour of the Soviet draft resolution (A/C.1/L.214) to invite representatives both of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of the Korean question. We will also support the amendment submitted today by the delegation of India to the United States draft resolution (A/C.1/L.216).

Mr. BUDO (Albania) (interpretation from French): The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania considers, as it has already stated at previous sessions, that the efforts of the United Nations in seeking a positive solution of the Korean question must be guided first and foremost by the fundamental principle governing the matter, that the Korean question is first of all the affair of the Korean people. There are two distinct States with different political and social systems to be found on the territory of Korea now.

If we are truly guided by the sincere desire to do fruitful and dispassionate work here in order to achieve success, it is indispensable that the representatives of the two Korean States should have a chance to participate in our deliberations. These two States are the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea. Surely we cannot persevere in the erroneous path chosen hitherto where only one of the parties concerned has been invited to participate in our debates. Surely we cannot persist in denying to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea the right to be heard. This procedure has yielded no fruit and the Korean problem remains in a deadlock. Past experience should teach us some lessons.

(Mr. Budo, Albania)

This, after all, is a question which affects both parts of Korea and it is only logical that representatives of both of these States should be given a chance to be heard. It should likewise be recalled that in the letter of 24 September 1958 the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea made it clear that his Government regarded any decision adopted by the United Nations, without the participation of the Korean Democratic People's Republic representatives in the United Nations debates on this question to be null and void. Expediency, equity and the interests of an affirmative solution on the Korean question are at one in requiring us to invite representatives of both parts of Korea to take part in our deliberations on this matter.

For all these reasons the delegation of the People's Republic of Albania considers the United States draft resolution in Document A/C.1/L.216 unacceptable; we support the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.214, sponsored by the USSR and we will vote in favour of the Soviet draft resolution.

Mr. BRATUS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic)(interpretation from Russian): The Ukrainian delegation finds it natural that the problem of the unification of Korea which affects the vital interests of the whole Korean people living in both parts of the country should be discussed and can only be solved with the active participation of representatives of both parts of Korea. The consideration of this question in the absence of one of the parties concerned, that is to say, in the absence of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, has always been and will continue to be utterly fruitless. Many years' experience of consideration of the Korean question at sessions of the United Nations General Assembly has abundantly proved this point.

The unilateral and biased solution of the Korean question perennially imposed on the General Assembly by the United States and certain other countries has been the result of a violation by those States of the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. This in turn constitutes a deliberate placing in jeopardy of the national rights and interests of the Korean people.

Some of the representatives who have spoken in the debate on the Soviet draft resolution to invite to participate in the discussion of the Korean question representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the Korean Republic have once again referred to an established practice which as hitherto

(Mr. Bratus, Ukraine)

taken the form of inviting only the representatives of the Republic of Korea to the Committee and some delegations have rejected the Soviet draft resolution on those grounds. We cannot agree with this argument; we are in fact convinced that the absence of the representative of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the discussion of the vitally important question of the unification of Korea will once again make it impossible this year to adopt any sort of objective decision. Under these circumstances the Committee will simply be unable to cope with this task. We are all aware of the statement of the Korean People's Democratic Republic in document A/C.1/807 wherein it is stated that the Government of the Korean People's Democratic Republic would continue to regard as null and void and will reject any decisions taken in disregard of the will and interests of the Korean people in the absence of representatives of the Government of the Korean People's Democratic Republic.

Whether some delegations want it or not, there simply are two States on Korean soil at the present time. Their economic, political and social systems are different; which of these systems is the most suitable for the aspirations and interests of the Korean people is a matter for the Korean people themselves to decide. The United Nations Organization must see to it that representatives of both sides in Korea should be able to enter into communications, freely exchange views, etc. both here and at home. If we want to take a dispassionate position, if we are eager to have this unification of Korea problem solved in a fair manner, then surely we will have to have the representatives of both sides in Korea invited to the Committee, we will have to hear from them their views and thus get a notion of the wishes of the entire Korean people. In this manner alone can the views of the Korean people properly influence the decisions of the Committee and of the Assembly on the Korean question.

This being so the Ukrainian delegation will vote in favour of the resolution moved by the USSR which is most in keeping with the paramount interest of the unification of Korea. We are likewise in agreement with the Indian amendment to the United States draft resolution.

Mr. BARUSHKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The Byelorussian delegation has repeatedly taken a stand in the United Nations in favour of inviting representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the Republic of Korea to participate in discussions on the Korean question. Our delegation continues to share the views that representatives of both parts of Korea--- north and south -- should be invited. This would be in line with the principles of justice and is most likely to foster the peaceful unification of Korea.

At past sessions of the General Assembly representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic were denied access to the General Assembly. Such decisions by the Assembly, so far from fostering the peaceful solution of the unification of Korea, actually play into the hands of those forces who want no kind of peaceful unification of Korea but who want to perpetuate in fact the military occupation of South Korea.

The Korean question is a question which is up to the Korean people themselves to decide; in fact it cannot be decided in the absence of representatives of the Government of the Korean People's Democratic Republic which represents the will and the interests of the Korean people. No serious consideration or comprehensive understanding of the problems of a country divided into two States can take place if representatives from one side only, namely South Korea, are heard in this Committee while the other side is not heard. The Korean People's Democratic Republic is not merely an interested party in this Korean question which we are now discussing. It has in fact made a record for itself by its consistent efforts toward the establishment of a united Korean democratic State. This is made evident by the statement of the Korean People's Democratic Republic of 24 February 1958 in which new, constructive proposals of that Government for the peaceful unification of the country are set out. These proposals would yield a real possibility for a swift and successful solution of the problem of unification in Korea.

The experience of past sessions of the General Assembly has convincingly shown that the absence of representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic has had a serious and unfavourable impact on our efforts to solve the

JB/ihl

A/C.1/PV.973  
19-20

(Mr. Barushko, Byelorussian SSR)

**question.** The Foreign Minister of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has sent a letter to the President of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly and the Secretary-General in which he says that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will continue to regard as null and void and will not accept any decisions illegally adopted in defiance of the will and interests of the Korean people in the absence of representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic.

(Mr. Barushko, Byelorussian SSR)

The consideration of the Korean question at this session of the General Assembly with the participation of representatives of both parties concerned would be in keeping with the principles of the United Nations Charter. The Byelorussian delegation supports the proposal of the delegation of the USSR that representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic and of the Republic of Korea should be invited to participate in the discussion of the Korean question at the current session of the General Assembly. My delegation will vote against the draft resolution of the United States which would have us invite only representatives of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. LEWANDOWSKI (Poland): It seems that we are about to follow a very disappointing pattern in dealing with the items on our agenda. Before the opening of the discussion on the merits of this item, we are always faced with some opposition to any motion that would facilitate this discussion or which would help to bring the opposing views closer together. This happened when the priority of the disarmament issues were argued, and I am afraid that it might happen now.

We are to consider the Korean question. It cannot be denied that although the international atmosphere would benefit by the just solution of this question, such a solution rests mainly in the hands of the Korean people themselves and is in their interests and concerns, first of all, the two Governments now existing in Korea. Some delegations may not like one of those Governments and other delegations may have the same feeling about the other one, but this should have nothing to do with an objective and realistic approach to the problem. To decide, as some delegations now propose, that we should grant the right to present its case to the representatives of the South Korean State only and deny this same right to the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would be unjust, in our opinion, and would prejudge the issue before discussing it. Moreover, if only the representatives of the South were invited here, we would deprive ourselves of an opportunity to get a more comprehensive and true picture of the situation and of the policies pursued in the whole of Korea from all quarters responsible for carrying them out.

(Mr. Lewandowski, Poland)

This is exactly what has happened in previous years when we discussed the Korean question. May I ask: Did the discussions conducted with such limitations bring us any nearer to the solution of the problem? Certainly not. Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to say that although we are considering not only whom to invite, the result of this particular discussion will give an answer to the far more important question, and that question is: Are we able to deal with problems of such importance and complexity as the Korean problem in a judicious and realistic manner and with the necessary political wisdom or shall we let passions and feelings, no matter how just, prevail?

If the latter comes to pass, will it not then be interpreted by some people outside of the United Nations as supporting the opinion that one should not negotiate or discuss or recognize the existence of the Government that one does not like? Or even worse, that one should deal with it only on the battlefield.

Five years have elapsed since the hostilities have ceased in Korea. During that period the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has made great progress in rebuilding its country from the devastation of war. The people who live there, together with its Government, want to further this development for the good of all the Korean people. The only thing they need is a peaceful and just solution of what we call here the Korean problem.

If we desire a serious and unbiased political discussion to that end, we should listen to the views of the representatives of all Korea, both North and South.

That is why, in the belief that this desire exists among us, the Polish delegation strongly urges that the resolution inviting these representatives be approved and that the Committee give its support to this resolution and to the Indian amendment, and thus give its support to the wise maxim audiatur et altera pars.

Mr. PAZHAK (Afghanistan): There are two very clear draft resolutions before us, and there is also one amendment which was presented this morning by the representative of India on the issue before the Committee.

Many statements have already been made on this question. We do not want to repeat the arguments of either of the two sides, but I think that since at some stage some impartial views are needed and it is our policy to be impartial on all issues, and basing ourselves on this attitude, our approach to the question cannot be otherwise.

The point which we wish to bring to the attention of the Committee concerns two statements which were made this morning in the Committee, the first statement made by the representative of India and the second made by the representative of the United Kingdom. In presenting his draft resolution, the representative of India criticized what has been called in the Committee a practice followed in the past, and what was referred to by the representative of the United Kingdom as an established practice.

This is a point of interest to our delegation. In his criticism of the practice followed in the past, the representative of India gave us certain reasons, but the statement of the United Kingdom representative was merely that this was an established practice which, he added, has been helpful. When I asked to speak, I just wanted to ask a question of the representative of the United Kingdom whose views we always respect and consider of importance. Could he tell us a little more clearly the reasons which led him to say that this practice of the past has been helpful, how it has been helpful in the past and how he thinks this practice, if followed now, will be helpful in the future because our interest in the question is the solution of the problem of Korea, which would lead to the unification of Korea? We want to be very clear in our minds to follow the correct practice in this Committee so that we vote on the different issues with a very clear mind.

I have put this question to the representative of the United Kingdom but I want to make it clear that if he does not wish to answer it, I will not insist upon it at all. But if he would do so, I will be extremely grateful to him.

Mr. SUBASINGHE (Ceylon): When the United Nations decides to discuss a question, my delegation expects that it does so in order to achieve some fruitful results. We expect that this is also the purpose in discussing the Korean question.

We are confronted with a given problem in Korea. We are all concerned with the unification, peaceful and democratic development of Korea. The division of Korea and the subsequent developments were caused by a number of historical reasons, and I shall not attempt an evaluation of them now. However, the very idea of unification presupposes that there are two parties. Korea is today divided into two parts with two governments.

Now we in this Committee cannot impose unification on the Koreans. We can only help in bringing it about. In order to do that, I think, we have to bring the two parties together. In our opinion, the representatives of the two Governments must be present here to join in our discussions.

Therefore, my delegation will support the draft resolution submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union. If that draft resolution does not come up for a vote, we shall support the amendment submitted by the representative of India.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to point out that the French text of the Indian amendment (A/C.1/L.218), which is now being distributed, contains an omission and will therefore have to be revised and redistributed later.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): My delegation is opposed to the proposal to invite representatives of the so-called Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea to be seated in this Committee of the General Assembly. I should like to indicate very briefly the principal reasons for our position in this matter.

Let me first say, however, that of course we are concerned with the unification of Korea in conditions of democracy and security. We shall be discussing the problem of arriving at that objective and we shall see how difficult that problem is and shall, I think, recognize once again where the difficulties arise and at whose door must be laid the responsibility for the

(Mr. Forsyth , Australia)

prolonged division of the Korean people. We shall make every effort to find a way of surmounting those difficulties. But we do not believe that our discussions would profit from the presence here of representatives of the North Korean regime.

First, that regime does not, in our opinion, represent the people of Korea.

Secondly, the General Assembly itself has identified the Government of the Republic of Korea, which at present controls South Korea, as the legitimate government of Korea.

Thirdly, the task of the General Assembly is to arrange, when it is possible to do so, for means by which the Korean people may be unified, and those means have already been established in principle by the General Assembly. But it has not been possible to put these principles into operation because of the unyielding, indeed defiant, refusal of the North Korean regime and its rejection of the General Assembly's principles in relation to Korea. There is not the slightest reason to believe that an invitation to join in this debate would affect their position in any respect.

Fourthly, the General Assembly, we feel, should not give recognition to a regime set up by external force, the existence of which and the actions of which run exactly contrary to the objectives and principles which the United Nations itself has established.

The General Assembly cannot recognize two States in Korea at the same time as it is working for the unification of that country.

As for the pretension that this Committee should, so to speak, hear both sides, it is obviously unnecessary to invite representatives of the North Korean regime here for that purpose. I do not think the Committee will be left in ignorance of any imaginable argument and any fact which the North Korean regime would want it to hear. This has already been demonstrated by several speakers this morning.

My delegation favours the presence here of representatives of the legitimate Government of Korea, the Republic of Korea, and will vote for the draft resolution presented by the United States delegation. We must, of course, oppose the amendment proposed by the delegation of India and the Soviet draft resolution.

Mr. FETER (Hungary): The question before us is: what does the Committee want to do regarding this issue? Do we really wish to deal with it in an objective way. If we want to deal with it objectively -- and there could be no other justifiable intention -- then the Committee must hear the representatives of both sides. Whatever the opinion of any delegation in this Committee may be regarding the status of the regimes or governments of the two parts of Korea, both sides should be heard. My delegation has its own view regarding the political and constitutional validity of the regime of South Korea, but this opinion could not prevent me from supporting the idea that a delegation from the South should be invited.

On the other hand, for example, Mr. Belaunde or the representative of Australia may have their own views regarding the political and constitutional validity of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, but that opinion should not prevent them from supporting the idea that a delegation from North Korea should be invited. If they do otherwise they make it clear that they favour an unbalanced debate and a one-sided resolution. That is to say, any delegation which favours hearing only one side represents a prejudicial attitude, and such an attitude reveals a type of fear of confronting reality.

Since the draft resolution presented by the Soviet delegation and the amendment presented by the Indian delegation to the United States draft resolution correspond to the idea of objectivity, my delegation is ready to vote in favour of both these proposals.

Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): The representative of Afghanistan invited me to amplify one point in my brief statement this morning. For me to do so would lead me, I fear, too far into substance for the convenience of the Committee in what is essentially at the moment a procedural debate. I am, however, proposing to deal at greater length with the point to which the representative of Afghanistan drew attention in the context of a speech which I hope to have the opportunity of delivering later in the debate on this item.

I was grateful to the representative of Afghanistan for his courtesy in not pressing me at this stage on the point which he raised and he will, I am sure, understand that I prefer at this stage to rest on the balanced statement which I made and which should, of course, be read as a whole.

Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): Before taking up, for the seventh or eighth time, the discussion of the Korean question, the First Committee must make a decision on the proposal to invite representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of the Korean question. This proposal is contained in the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.1/L.214), which is supported by the delegations of India, Ceylon, Poland, Czechoslovakia and other countries.

From the very beginning of the discussion of this question we have noted that the very reasonable and understandable idea of inviting the representatives of the two parties to participate in the discussion of this matter has been confronted with the obstinate opposition of many countries, headed by the United States. If a majority of the Committee once again supports, by its vote, the suggestion of the United States, the debate that will follow will be as sterile as those in past years. My delegation feels that the experience of previous debates and previous decisions that have had no positive influence whatever on the evolution of the Korean question should be taken into account by the Committee when we are called upon to decide on this matter.

I believe that the representative of Afghanistan might perhaps want to comment himself on the reply given by the representative of the United Kingdom to the question that he posed. As far as I am concerned, I should merely like to mention that the representative of the United Kingdom, at this point in the debate when our Committee is discussing the proposal to invite representatives of the two parties concerned in this question, did not consider it useful or necessary to give the Committee the reasons why he feels that the practice so far followed has been a useful one.

Since the twelfth session of the General Assembly, important events have taken place which the United Nations should consider, for these might have a positive influence on the evolution of the Korean question. The members of this Committee know full well that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has presented new and very constructive proposals which once again bear witness to its intention to bring about a unification of Korea by peaceful and democratic means. The members of this Committee know also that the Government of the People's Republic of China immediately moved to put into practice the parts of the resolution applying to it and decided to withdraw

(Mr. Mezincescu, Romania)

the Chinese volunteers from Korea. On 28 October last the last contingent of Chinese volunteers left Korea. Therefore, the United Nations is confronted with an entirely new situation. There are no more foreign troops in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. However, the armed forces of the United States still occupy the territory of the Republic of Korea, and the Government of Syngman Rhee still carries out its tirades and its aggressive policies against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The situation that has existed after the peaceful moves by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shows more clearly than ever the reason for the difficulties that exist in Korea and the necessity for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to be allowed the opportunity to come here and state its views. If this debate in the United Nations is intended to help the Korean peoples to reunite by peaceful and democratic means, the First Committee has the obligation to take all possible measures to help the people of Korea to make known their views and to arrive at a reunification. If our object is the unification of Korea, as stated in item 27 of the agenda, there can be no argument against the invitation of the representatives of both parties.

On the specific point we are discussing, it is not only a question of the exclusion of one of the parties; it is a question of excluding the party whose policy is the unification of Korea by peaceful and democratic means -- and the new proposals and the behaviour of this party are proof of this. We are being told that we should invite the representatives of that party that has proclaimed its aggressive intentions. Therefore, logically, the United Nations -- or at least those Governments supporting the United States position -- not only will be acting deliberately against the peaceful and democratic unification of the Korean people but will also be giving further sanction to the aggressive policies of the Syngman Rhee clique and to the colonialist policy of the United States.

My delegation considers that there is no need to go into the background of this question to show that this policy is inevitably leading towards another stalemate. I must draw the attention of the Committee to the illegality of this stand from the viewpoint of the Charter and international law. I must also draw the attention of the Committee to the dangers to peace and international security in the continuation of the aggressive policy of the United States as regards the Korean people, under the banner of the United Nations.

(Mr. Mezincescu, Romania)

It is not only a question of deciding whether the First Committee should once again engage in a sterile debate on the question of Korea but rather of admitting that a decision to exclude representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from this debate can be interpreted only as encouragement being given to the Syngman Rhee clique and the American colonialists who are fomenting further aggression against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The pretexts invoked by the delegation of the United States in support of the draft resolution it has submitted can change neither the essence of the problem nor the real significance of a unilateral decision taken by the Committee.

We have once again heard here the previously exploded argument that, in the view of the United States, supported by certain members of the Committee, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was declared an aggressor in the war carried out by the United States in Korea under the banner of the United Nations. However, the debate here is not limited to that point; it is rather the question of the unification and rehabilitation of Korea. To exclude representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from this debate would merely confirm the fact that the United States and the delegations supporting its policies want to bring about the unification of Korea not by peaceful and democratic means but rather by the use of force, because it is very obvious that the unification of Korea cannot be carried out without the active co-operation of the people and the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Where would this policy lead us? Merely to accept the initial premise. If the United States places itself in the position of wanting to use force to reunify Korea, it is perfectly obvious that the very idea of aggression on the part of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has no basis; there has never been any basis for accusing that Republic of aggression.

(Mr. Mezincescu, Romania)

Now, as far as the affirmation that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is under some so-called domination by foreign Powers, I do not think it is even worth taking this matter up. However, we should mention here that this idea was affirmed and reaffirmed in circumstances where the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has no foreign troops in its territory, although the Republic of Korea is still occupied by American forces. May we suggest to the Committee, and especially those who have upheld this idea, that they ponder for a few minutes on what would happen to the Government of South Korea if it dared to ask the American forces occupying the country, to withdraw? It would obviously be replaced by another Government less docile to the American colonialist policy.

Therefore, my Government feels that it is not the character of the Government of South Korea that makes it imperative that they be invited, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea not be invited to speak to the Committee; it is not because the Government of Romania recognizes or does not recognize the representative character of delegates of the Republic of Korea or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, but because we believe it is in the interests of unification and the national rehabilitation of Korea, and it is for the benefit of the people of Korea that the United Nations should hear the views of both parties in this question. We believe that if the ideas of other delegations agree with their statements of sympathy for the people of Korea, then the Committee must take the equitable view of inviting the representatives of the two Governments -- the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea -- to participate in the debate in the Political Committee on the Korean question.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): It appears to the Soviet delegation that the consideration of this procedural question has in substance yielded an answer to the question implicit in the item on the agenda -- at least a preliminary answer. The discussion has made clear who favours the unification of Korea and who favours the partition of Korea, the continuation of that partition, and the deepening of that cleft.

The representative of Australia who seems to be well versed in the Korean problem and in its details has let it be known that everyone here who deals with the Korean question is interested in the unification of Korea; this is a complex problem. It requires careful study, and so on and so forth. He went on to say that we cannot recognize two regimes in Korea while we are working on the unification of Korea. Now, there was an utterly non sequitur which is striking to say the least. If you are working for the unification of Korea, presumably what are you trying to unify -- two parts, are you not? You cannot unify what is already united. So if you are working on the unification of Korea, presumably there are two parts to join into one. You, yourself, have mentioned the existence of two regimes in Korea. If you want to unify them, why do you not want to listen to the two regimes which actually exist and are extant in Korea? Why are you afraid of doing that?

Here are questions which are bound to arise in the mind of any person who will approach the substance of the question which we are discussing with the minimum of objectivity. The answer to this question was yielded by other representatives who spoke in favour of an utterly incorrect and unobjective position, that is, excluding one part of Korea from the consideration of the unification of Korea.

The representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom have invoked a practice, experienced in the consideration of the question, which they say has justified itself. But all you gentlemen know, and the whole world knows, that this practice has not moved the unification of Korea forward one step. It has in fact led to the deepening of the partition of Korea and to the perpetuation of that partition. Should that practice continue to serve as a basis for our work? It is an utterly improper and unjustified practice. Surely it should not serve as a basis for continuing along this bad way if, we want Korea to be unified, and unified peacefully rather than in a war-like manner.

Given a desire to unify Korea peacefully, we cannot ignore the existence of two regimes in Korea; and we, the Soviet Union and the other countries that have taken a stand for inviting the representatives of both regimes, rather than one,

do not want just the North Koreans to be invited, but both parts of Korea. We, therefore, take a dispassionate and objective position, whereas you have committed yourselves to an aggressive position because you want the regime of one part of Korea to extend its sway over all of Korea, and you want to dictate that to the Committee and to the General Assembly. Is this a dispassionate approach? Is this the way to the peaceful unification of Korea? No sound-thinking human being can ever accept such logic. None of the representatives who spoke here in favour of this position was able to adduce one solitary, reasonable argument.

The representative of the United Kingdom refused to answer the legitimate question of the representative of Afghanistan as to why and in what way, if any, this past practice has justified itself. He deferred an answer to his statement on the substance of the matter. But his refusal was a sufficient answer. It spoke volumes. There simply are no arguments in favour of this position because past practice has led to no solution of the question. It has not moved this question one step forward -- and everybody knows it. We shall have an opportunity to discuss the substance of this question and to demonstrate who prevents the unification of Korea, who has committed himself to an aggressive position in this question. But the course of the discussion so far has already shown how deeply mired in its own aggressive policy in the Far East the United States has found itself. And this applies to Korea.

"Aggressors" were mentioned yesterday. But the position of the United States today, and the position of other countries, has shown who harbours aggressive intentions with regards to Korea. If you had no aggressive intentions, you would not dread inviting the representatives of both sides of Korea, and discussing the question with them. But you are unwilling to do so because you harbour aggressive intentions against North Korea. We shall speak of this in greater detail when we address ourselves to the substance of the question. But your position on this matter has already revealed your aggressive intentions.

He who stands for the peaceful unification of Korea cannot possibly refuse to hearken to the representatives of both sides in Korea. The Soviet Union, for its part, does not recognize the regime in South Korea. We do not regard the Republic of Korea as a regime which expresses the desires, the will and the aspirations of the people of South Korea. But we are not afraid of listening to the representatives of South Korea. We are perfectly willing, in fact we are anxious, to have the representatives of both sides of Korea heard here because those are the regimes which are extant in reality.

We look the real facts in the eye. You refuse to do so. You wish to build your policy on the basis of a plan which you have devised in advance. This plan, however, is bursting at the seams in respect of China and in respect of Korea. It will collapse under the weight of life because it is not a realistic plan. It is based on the notion of imposing a Diktat on North Korea. This is a policy which collapsed in the course of the Korean adventure and is not now likely to yield the fruit of success to your aggressive plans.

The Soviet delegation therefore considers that the consideration of this question has already served to reveal the intentions of the United States and of the countries that support it. These intentions boil down to deepening the division in Korea, maintaining the military situation in South Korea and using South Korea as a marshalling point for aggressive intentions against North Korea. This has already been shown in the course of the procedural debate on inviting the representatives of North and South Korea to participate in our discussion without the right to vote.

The Soviet delegation will support its own draft resolution (A/C.1/L.214) and the Indian amendment (A/C.1/L.218) as well if we come to a vote on that.

Mr. SON SANN (Cambodia)(interpretation from French): The United Nations has set for itself the following fundamental aim ~~is~~ far as Korea is concerned: to create an independent, unified and democratic Government for the peninsula. The Cambodian delegation feels that, in order to achieve this aim, the United Nations should hear all sides. It should not officially prejudge the stand of the regimes concerned.

(Mr. Son Sann, Cambodia)

In order to achieve peace, you have to negotiate with the adversary. This has been done in the past; it must be done in the future. We have to hear the representatives of all the Koreans. It is for this reason and without attaching any political significance whatever to this move or prejudging the recognition of any system of government that Cambodia has not recognized any Korean Government.

The Cambodian delegation will vote in favour of the Indian amendment (A/C.1/L.218) to the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.216) submitted by the United States of America because we warmly hope for the unification and the rehabilitation of Korea. We will, for the same reason, abstain on the other draft resolutions before the Committee.

Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa): When the representatives of the Soviet Union and India presented us with arguments in favour of their proposition, my delegation, of course, listened with interest and attention. Their views are entitled to our respect. But I was not impressed when we had to listen to a debate on the part of the Soviet bloc which sounded for all the world like a full orchestra playing on one note. I was really wondering whether the Soviet Union would not consider that it might not be conducive to the smooth working of our Committee and that it might not be a reflection on the intelligence of the members of this Committee if, by organizing a claque of that sort, the same arguments were repeated and re-echoed ad nauseum.

The first speech of Mr. Zorin was an argument. His final speech was out and out propaganda. I am also wondering whether a propaganda speech of that sort carries any greater weight if it has to be repeated by every single member of the group, which we know always shows great solidarity.

For my part, I do not have to argue the issues. I will not insult the intelligence of the Committee by repeating what has already been said by previous speakers. Therefore, all I need to do is to say that I associate myself with the remarks of the representative of Australia and that my vote will be cast in accordance with the considerations he advanced.

Mr. ORTIZ-MARTIN (Costa Rica)(interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Costa Rica is against the amendment (A/C.1/L.218) proposed by the representative of India because we consider that to allow participation in the debate of a representative of a country that has been labelled an aggressor is to favour and to support rebellion against the United Nations. It would be a most dangerous precedent to set, because then all countries, following their own ideas or the ideas of others, which disobeyed United Nations orders, would be able, supported by a number of countries, later to discuss and debate on an equal footing with other Members of the United Nations without being punished for their rebellion. Countries that do not abide by the resolutions of the United Nations should at least be punished in such a way as not to allow them to sit on a par with the Members of the United Nations. That is why my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.216.

U THANT (Burma): I just want to make a very brief statement on the issue before this Committee.

In the course of the general debate, on behalf of my delegation, I made it clear that on any issue in dispute before this world Organization my delegation would press for the hearing of both sides of the dispute. This applies clearly to the legitimate case of the People's Republic of China, and it applies similarly to the present matter under discussion.

The United Nations will be failing in its duty if it comes to a decision without hearing the views of both sides to the dispute. The United Nations has consistently shut the door to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in its deliberations on the question of the unification of Korea, with obvious results: a decision on paper without leading us anywhere.

It is time that a re-examination and a reappraisal of our attitude is called for. Let me appeal to my colleagues to try a new and sensible means of breaking the deadlock.

For these reasons, my delegation will support the Indian amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.218 and for the same reasons my delegation will support the Soviet draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.214.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): It appears that we have now finished our procedural debate and that we are ready to vote.

There are two draft resolutions before the Committee: the first submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union in document A/C.1/L.214, dated 1 November; and the second submitted by the United States delegation in document A/C.1/L.216, dated 4 November. To the United States draft resolution, there is an amendment submitted by the delegation of India in document A/C.1/L.218.

According to rule 132 of the rules of procedure we will have to vote first on the draft resolution submitted first -- in this case, the draft resolution of the Soviet Union submitted in document A/C.1/L.214. No amendment has been moved to this draft resolution, and a roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

The Philippines, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq

Against: Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Peru

Abstaining: Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Venezuela, Yemen, Afghanistan, Austria, Cambodia, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Israel, Lebanon, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Norway.

The draft resolution was rejected by 42 votes to 17, with 18 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We shall now go on to vote on the draft resolution of the United States of America, (A/C.1/L.216). However, since amendments have been submitted to this draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.218, we shall vote first on the amendments.

A vote was taken by roll call.

The Federation of Malaya, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Ghana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia

Against: Federation of Malay, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia.

Abstaining: Finland, Israel, Lebanon, Libya, Mexico, Norway, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Austria, Canada, Denmark.

The amendment to the draft resolution was rejected by 42 votes to 21, with 14 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We shall now vote on the United States draft resolution (A/C.1/L.216) on which a roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Thailand, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden.

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

Abstaining: United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Finland, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Sudan.

The draft resolution was adopted by 51 votes to 10, with 16 abstentions.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Yang, representative of the Republic of Korea, took a seat at the Committee table.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (United States of America): Once again the General Assembly turns to the question of Korea. It should be cause for regret on the part of all Members that, since 1947, our annual discussion of this question has failed to achieve a solution to the fundamental problem in Korea, namely, unification.

(Mr. Hickenlooper, United States)

The Korean people desire unification of their country. They see in the Charter of the United Nations, and in the actions which the General Assembly has taken repeatedly since 1947, a promise for the fulfillment of this desire. Yet the United Nations has failed to bring about the realization of the just aspirations of the Korean people for freedom, independence and unity. Why has this been so?

It seems to me that a review of the Korean problem from the time it was first discussed in the General Assembly gives an answer to this question. It can also point the way in which, although after regrettable delay, we might achieve a fair and just solution.

Following the liberation of Korea in 1945, efforts were made, in accordance with the pledges of the Cairo and Potsdam Declarations and the Moscow Agreement of 1945, to bring about an independent and united government of Korea. As the military Power in the southern zone of Korea at that time, the United States participated in these efforts, sincerely expecting early agreement on the establishment of a united Korea. Unfortunately, the then occupying Power in North Korea, the Soviet Union, did not approach the problem in the same manner. Instead, the Soviet Union treated the 38th Parallel, which had been established only as a temporary line of division to facilitate the surrender of Japanese forces in Korea, as a permanent division. It obstructed all efforts to reach agreement on the arrangements necessary to bring about establishment of a unified government. After two years of trying vainly to reach agreement with the Soviet Union in the Joint Commission, the United States brought the problem of Korean independence before the United Nations.

In introducing the Korean question into the United Nations in 1947, the then Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, referring to the deliberations in the Joint Commission said:

"The United States representatives have insisted that any settlement of the Korean problem must in no way infringe the fundamental democratic right of freedom of opinion. That is still the position of my Government."

I can repeat that that is still the position of my Government today, in 1958. Just as in 1947, when the General Assembly first considered this problem, the democratic right of freedom of opinion -- that is, the expression of the will of the Korean people through genuinely free elections -- remains the fundamental issue in the settlement of the Korean problem today.

(Mr. Hickenlooper, United States)

In 1947, the General Assembly called for free elections throughout Korea under the observation of a United Nations body, the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea. In its report to the United Nations, the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea stated:

"The United States military authorities in the South declared themselves ready to extend facilities and assistance. On the other hand, no answer was received to that effect from the Soviet Military Commander in North Korea ...

"The Commission therefore regretfully drew the conclusion that it would not be possible, for the time being, to implement its terms of reference in that part of Korea occupied by the forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics." (General Assembly Official Records: Third Session, Supp. No. 9 (A/575) p. 41)

The Commission observed the elections held in South Korea. It concluded its report to the United Nations on those elections as follows:

"... the results of the ballot of 10 May 1948 are a valid expression of the free will of the electorate in those parts of Korea which were accessible to the Commission and in which the inhabitants constitute approximately two-thirds of the people of all Korea." (Ibid., p. 47)

The General Assembly approved the Temporary Commission's conclusions. It declared, in resolution 195 (III) of 12 December 1948:

"... there has been established a lawful government (the Government of the Republic of Korea) having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the Temporary Commission was able to observe and consult and in which the great majority of the people of all Korea reside; that this Government is based on elections which were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate of that part of Korea and which were observed by the Temporary Commission; and that this is the only such Government in Korea;" (Resolution 195 (III))

Thus, in the first efforts of the United States to bring about a free, independent and unified Korea, the fundamental democratic right of freedom of opinion of the Korean people was upheld and protected by the United Nations. Only the refusal of the Soviet Union to permit this same "freedom of opinion" to take place in the northern part of Korea, which was under Soviet occupation, prevented achievement of Korean unification. Confronted by the establishment under United Nations auspices of the Republic of Korea, the Soviet Union created the north Korean puppet regime. Leadership in this puppet regime was assumed in many important cases by Koreans who, until that time, had held Soviet citizenship and even commissions in the Red Army.

An attempt was made to hide this manufactured regime behind the facade of so-called elections. These elections were not observed by any outside impartial body. There was no "freedom of opinion" or of expression in their conduct. The thousands of Koreans who have fled from north Korea to the south show graphically the lack of popular support for the Communist regime from the day of its creation.

In the Republic of Korea they found a safe haven with opportunities for their individual wellbeing in an atmosphere of freedom. Many tens of thousands of other Koreans were less fortunate. Thousands whose only crime was their quest for freedom, were killed by the Communist dictators in north Korea. Thousands more were massacred during the initial period of communist successes in the invasion of the territory of the Republic of Korea. There were many thousands more who were forcibly taken north in death marches when the victorious forces of the United Nations compelled the communists to retreat.

Following the establishment of the independent, sovereign Government of the Republic of Korea, United States forces were withdrawn from the Republic of Korea. Soviet occupation forces were also withdrawn from north Korea, but only after they had assisted in building up a strong Communist military establishment. Communist intentions with respect to Korea were soon revealed. On 25 June, 1950, the north Koreans launched an attack against the Republic of Korea. Unable to cope with this aggression with its own limited defensive capabilities, the Republic of Korea appealed to the United Nations for assistance. The United Nations immediately responded.

(Mr. Hickenlooper, United States)

I do not feel that it is necessary to review in detail the unhappy consequences of this north Korean action or of the Chinese communist role in joining in the aggression. They are well known to the world: the deaths, human suffering and misery brought to the Korean people, the dislocation of hundreds of thousands, the economic destruction of the country. The United Nations responded with a successful collective defence effort, the first such in history.

In July 1953, after long and tortuous negotiations extending for more than two years, hostilities in Korea were terminated by the Armistice Agreement. The Agreement included a recommendation for a political conference whose purpose was to bring about unification. At this juncture, having failed to conquer Korea by force of arms, the Communist side now obstructed every effort to unify Korea through peaceful means. Although by the end of August 1953 the General Assembly had expeditiously completed arrangements for United Nations participation in the political conference, it was not until late April 1954 that the political conference recommended by the Armistice Agreement actually met.

The conference took place over a period of seven weeks at Geneva. The United Nations Members who participated in the Korean action made every effort to obtain agreement that would lead to the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea. Two fundamental principles underlay their positions: I am reading now from the principles established:

"(1) The United Nations, under its Charter, is fully and rightly empowered to take collective action to repel aggression, to restore peace and security, and to extend its good offices to seeking a peaceful settlement in Korea; and

(2) In order to establish a unified, independent and democratic Korea, genuinely free elections should be held under United Nations supervision for representatives in a National Assembly, in which representation shall be in direct proportion to the indigenous population in all parts of Korea."

At Geneva the Governments concerned maintained that genuinely free elections are the essential first step toward the unification of Korea. To ensure

(Mr. Hickenlooper, United States)

conditions of genuine freedom, they took the position that the elections must be conducted under the impartial and effective supervision of the United Nations.

The Communist participants rejected the two fundamental principles. They argued that the United Nations had lost its moral and legal authority to deal with the Korean problem. They refused to provide any guarantee that elections would be carried out in genuine freedom. They rejected the principle of representation on the basis of population. The Communist proposals would have provided the Communist side with an absolute veto over the conduct of the elections. They proposed a supervisory body where equal representation of Communist and non-Communist nations, and a provision requiring unanimity for all decisions, would have enabled them to frustrate the Commission's operations and to prevent any effective observation of the elections. The ineffectiveness of any such supervisory body has now been clearly shown in the operation of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission under the Armistice Agreement.

The Geneva Conference failed to achieve the political settlement in Korea achieved by the Armistice Agreement. The differences that developed at Geneva remain. The unification of Korea has not been achieved.

Nevertheless, the Armistice Agreement has continued as a basis for maintenance of the truce. To say the least, the performance of the Communists with regard to the provisions of the Agreement has been utterly lacking in good faith. Their violations of the Agreement and the remedial actions the United Nations Command was compelled to take as a result, have been fully reported to the General Assembly. I should like here to refer you to the two principal reports of the Unified Command in this respect (Documents A/3167 of 16 August 1956 and A/3631 of 13 August, 1957).

Let me also add one final comment with respect to the statement made by the United Nations Command in June 1957 regarding subparagraph 13(d) of the Armistice Agreement.

As the Command announced in its statement of 21 June, 1957, it took certain limited defensive measures in response to the repeated, flagrant and gross violations of the reinforcement provisions of the Armistice committed by the Communist side. These actions, for the most part, involved the strengthening of the Command's defensive position by the introduction of certain units equipped with modern weapons. I should like to repeat that these actions were purely defensive in nature. They would not have been necessary if the

HR/inl

A/C.1/PV.973  
59-60

(Mr. Hickenlooper, United States)

Commanded to be carried faithfully by the provisions of the Armistice Agreement. Last year, my predecessor in this Committee discussed this matter in detail, and I shall now discuss it further.

Now the Chinese Communists announce that they have withdrawn their forces from north Korea, and demand that United Nations Command forces must also be withdrawn from the Republic of Korea. However, the Chinese Communists continue to defy the purposes of the United Nations, and ridicule its resolutions and actions. They persistently reject every constructive proposal designed to bring about Korean unification.

(Mr. Hickenlooper, United States)

Communist violations of international conventions and the principles of humanity governing the treatment of prisoners of war are a matter of record. The fate of several hundreds of military personnel of the United Nations Command, who at one time were either in Communist hands or about whom the Communist side had some knowledge, remains unknown. Yet the provisions of the Armistice Agreement require an accounting in this matter. The atrocities and war crimes committed by the North Korean and Chinese Communists during the hostilities, were discussed in detail during the ninth session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1953. This deplorable record cannot now be forgotten.

From the outset the question of the withdrawal of foreign troops from Korea has been an important aspect of the Korean problem. I remind the members of the Committee that once before foreign forces were withdrawn from that unfortunate nation. The members here will recall what subsequently took place. The Communist authorities in North Korea immediately made ready their invasion of the Republic of Korea.

As reported by the United Nations Commission on Korea, then on the spot, the attack was launched by the North Koreans. Moreover, it is clear that they received moral and material support from others in this venture -- in fact, they have boasted publicly of that support. They believed that the Republic of Korea, weak in a military sense, would stand alone and hence would be unable to cope with this aggression. In this they were wrong. Free nations came to the Republic of Korea's assistance and reversed the initial successes gained by the North Koreans from the surprise attack. At this point, Chinese Communist forces entered Korea to join in the aggression against United Nations forces.

After the Geneva Conference the Communist delegations called for immediate withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea before the holding of elections. From time to time during the past four and a half years, they have repeated this call. Early this year the North Korean regime announced certain proposals, including a demand for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea again. The Chinese communist authorities endorsed these proposals and indicated their willingness to take the initiative by withdrawing their forces from North Korea. They now claim to have completed this withdrawal.

(Mr. Hickenlooper, United States)

Let us again not forget what occurred after the last withdrawal of foreign forces from Korea. And let us not forget why United Nations forces are in Korea today. At the call of the United Nations they came and remain for the assistance of a victim of ruthless communist aggression. They will be withdrawn when the conditions for a lasting settlement laid down by the General Assembly have been fulfilled.

The North Korean and Chinese communists have attempted to present their position on the withdrawal of foreign troops from Korea as an indication of their sincerity in seeking to achieve a settlement in Korea. They proclaim loudly and widely, and are supported in these claims by others in the Sino-Soviet bloc, that all that is needed to establish peace and security in the Korean peninsula and to achieve Korean unification is for United Nations forces to withdraw from the Republic of Korea. Again, I remind the members of this Committee that we need only recall the events in 1949 and 1950 to recognize what the consequences of a withdrawal of United Nations forces from the Republic of Korea might be, should such a withdrawal take place before unification in accordance with the long-standing objectives of the United Nations is accomplished.

Recent statements by communist leaders and other developments in the Far East give equal cause for concern. Speaking of the Chinese communist withdrawal only a short time ago, Chou En-lai himself stated it does not mean that the Chinese people "have forsaken their international duty to the Korean people". One may ask what is meant by "international duty to the Korean people". Does Mr. Chou En-lai mean that the so-called volunteers have not renounced their aggressive ambitions in Korea?

The communist side has attempted to equate the Chinese aggressors with the forces of the United Nations which were sent to Korea in accordance with United Nations resolutions to repel aggression. The withdrawal of these aggressor forces was demanded by the General Assembly more than seven years ago. If it is indeed true that the Chinese communists have withdrawn from North Korea as they claim, then one can only say that it is about time that they have complied with this demand, a demand which was repeated in the resolution adopted by the General Assembly at its twelfth session.

(Mr. Hickenlooper, United States)

Sixteen Member nations contributed forces to the United Nations Command in Korea in response to the appeal of the United Nations. Many other members and some non-members, contributed hospital units, other services, and supplies. Soon after the conclusion of the Armistice Agreement, a substantial part of the United Nations forces were withdrawn from the Republic of Korea. Today the forces of the United Nations Command, excluding those of the Republic of Korea, are small. They consist primarily of two United States divisions, a Turkish brigade, a Thai company and liaison groups from the other nations. These facts show how ridiculous the communist propaganda claims are that these forces are "in occupation" of South Korea or that they are "imperialist" forces.

One United Nations Command remains in Korea for one purpose only, the achievement of United Nations objectives. As the Governments concerned have repeatedly stated, they are prepared to withdraw from Korea when their mission is accomplished. There is an easy way for the communist authorities to make possible the early withdrawal of United Nations forces. That is by accepting the proposals of the United Nations for a settlement in Korea which will mean the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea.

I referred previously to statements issued at Pyongyang and Peiping earlier this year. The statement of the Peiping regime was communicated to the Governments participating in the United Nations Command in Korea. These Governments replied to that statement in the hope of eliciting from the communist side some indication as to its true intentions with respect to a settlement in Korea. The Peiping regime made it abundantly clear that the communist position had not changed since the Geneva Conference. The Chinese communists, who also claimed to be speaking for the North Korean regime, refused the requested clarification of their position on the question of free elections, and the question of the principles on which elections should be held was brushed aside.

It is these principles that lie at the heart of any settlement of the Korean question. The refusal of the communist authorities concerned to accept conditions which would guarantee the free expression of the will of the Korean people -- the "freedom of opinion", which Secretary Marshall spoke of eleven years ago in the General Assembly -- remains, as in the days of the Joint Commission, and thereafter in the United Nations, at the Geneva Conference in 1954, and today in 1958, the only real obstacle to a permanent settlement in Korea.

(Mr. Hickenlooper, United States)

If the communist authorities concerned really desire a settlement in Korea, they need only give evidence of their sincerity on the question of free elections. So far, regrettably, they have failed to do so. Why, it might be asked, are these communist authorities opposed to free elections? Without doubt they fear the results of a free expression of opinion by the Korean people, just as they fear freedom of opinion anywhere in the world. The prospect entailed by free elections and free expression obviously frightens the communists because they recognize that they would be overwhelmingly repudiated. This is the real reason behind the refusal of the communist authorities to agree to conditions which would ensure such elections.

Undoubtedly they take note that, in the Republic of Korea, despite many adversities in the ten years since its establishment, the Korean people have learned to exercise these fundamental democratic rights.

The United Nations Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea has repeatedly testified to the continuing growth and development of democratic institutions in the Republic of Korea. As a matter of normal practice the Republic of Korea invites the Commission to observe elections held in the Republic and co-operates in facilitating the activities of this United Nations agency. Foreign correspondents roam freely about South Korea, observing and reporting without interference. Frequently they find things to criticize, and they do. And so does the Korean press and the Korean political opposition.

(Mr. Hickenlooper, United States)

One thing even the most severe critic of the Republic of Korea must admit -- in the Republic of Korea there is "freedom of opinion". Tragically, we cannot say the same for the area under the control of the North Korean regime. There the iron hand of Communist dictatorship suppresses any manifestation of free society.

The Republic of Korea has also proved its right to full and equal status as a sovereign nation in many other important respects. It has become increasingly active in its international relationships. The Republic of Korea participates in several specialized agencies of the United Nations, as well as in other international organizations. It has repeatedly been found qualified for membership in the United Nations. Its admission to the United Nations has been blocked only because of the consistent use of the veto by the Soviet Union in the Security Council. The United States hopes that the Republic of Korea can soon assume its rightful place here in the United Nations. We will continue to work for its admission in every practical way.

In conclusion may I again emphasize the solemn obligation of the United Nations to bring about the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea through peaceful means. This Assembly can now contribute to the peaceful unification of Korea by reaffirming the fair and just principles it has advanced in the past as a basis for a settlement in Korea. This is the purpose of the resolution which the United States, together with the representatives of Australia, Belgium, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, the Philippines, Thailand, Turkey and the United Kingdom have submitted.

Once again we must bring to bear upon those authorities who have so far prohibited a settlement through a free expression of opinion of the people of Korea, the force of the will of the overwhelming majority in the United Nations. The Communist forces cannot forever reject the demands of the gallant Korean people and of world opinion for a just settlement in Korea.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I have two speakers on the list for this afternoon and in view of the fact that we really must go ahead with our work I would like to ask the delegates to make an effort to see if other speeches can be made thereafter.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.