



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED
A/C.1/PV.977
7 November 1958
ENGLISH

Thirteenth Session
FIRST COMMITTEE
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVENTH MEETING
Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 7 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.977. 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): The Committee will continue with the examination of the Korean question in general debate. The first speaker on the list for today is the representative for Liberia, on whom I now call.

Mr. COOPER (Liberia): My country is far removed from Korea, and our only interest in the Korean question stems from our belief and feeling that all peoples and all countries, despite race, creed or religion, are entitled to be free, independent, and masters of their own destiny.

I need not remind you of the tragic fate of the Koreans of their past and glorious history, and despite harsh and long rule under foreign yoke, they never ceased to cherish their longing and aspiration to be free and independent. They had great hopes of fulfilling these aspirations after the conclusion of the Second World War, due to the definite promises of the United States and the Soviet Union, who solemnly pledged the restoration of independence of Korea. It is indeed unfortunate that, as in the past, in the struggle for power among the great Powers, the smaller nations generally become the victims. Our hearts and our sympathy go out to all Koreans, whether in the North or South. I believe their only interest is to be free and independent, and left to manage their own affairs without outside interference. I think this would have been possible had not, after the Second World War, those who were comrades in arms ceased to be friends, entertaining against each other suspicions and doubts as to their honesty and integrity. It was hoped that, with the creation of the United Nations, such problems as Korea and Germany, which, for military purposes, were divided among the occupying forces of the United States and the Soviet Union, a speedy resolution would be found in order to unite such territories under the supervision of the United Nations.

(Mr. Cooper, Liberia)

The history of the Korean question has been outlined in the statement of the United States and other delegations. We are all aware that a Commission was sent to Korea from the United Nations to hold elections. We also know that the work of the Commission was thwarted by North Korea which refused to let the United Nations Commission enter the North, claiming that they, the Northern portion, had established a Government which they considered was the Government of Korea. We have no doubt that had this Commission been able to function, we would not have had a Korean problem now. Despite the aggression from the North which was condemned by the United Nations and in which sixteen countries of this Organization took up arms in keeping with resolutions of the United Nations for the defense of the South, the majority of the Koreans still entertained the hope for the re-unification of Korea by free elections under the United Nations. We failed to see how the Peking Government and the Government of North Korea, if they really desired to see the unification of Korea, as they contend, could object to such a solution.

In reading the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/3865), page 2, paragraphs 8 and 9, we find the conditions set up by North Korea for the unification of Korea as a whole. In paragraph 9, they propose the following:

"(i) That 'the U.S. army and all other foreign troops including the Chinese People's Volunteers should be simultaneously withdrawn from North and South Korea';

"(ii) That 'within a definite period after the complete withdrawal of all the foreign troops from North and South Korea, all-Korea free elections should be held. These elections may be conducted under the observation of a neutral nations organ';

"(iii) That 'for the discussion of questions pertaining to economic and cultural exchange between the North and South and to the all-Korea elections, negotiations between the North and South based on equality should be realized at an early date' and that free communication, travel and economic and cultural contacts between the North and South should be facilitated;"

This would appear quite impressive and sincere if one did not know the background of the Korean question.

(Mr. Cooper, Liberia)

When the question is raised as to elections under neutral nations, in a world divided between East and West, and those countries who profess to maintain their neutrality are looked upon either by the East or West with some degree of skepticism, one wonders where the neutral nations are to be found. At least in the United Nations we might be able to have a **commission** on elections that would comprise countries of both East and West. The United Nations has had some success in such undertaking in other parts of the world where the conflict between East and West was lacking.

The South Koreans, in view of their past experience, would be more than naive to request the United States Army and other troops to withdraw from their soil upon a unilateral declaration by the North Korean Government that all foreign troops in North Korea had been withdrawn from their country. Whilst we appreciate this statement on the part of the North Korean and Chinese Governments, the French delegation left us in no doubt as to what would be likely to happen. It is the belief of my delegation that if the Peking Government and North Korean Government were sincere in their proposal for unification of Korea, they would agree to a United Nations Commission such as UNCURK, which would supervise or at least watch the evacuation of all foreign troops from Korea which is indispensable to any free election in that country.

This idea was voiced in the statement of the South Korean representative who spoke before this Committee. That commission should either undertake the supervision of free elections in Korea, which is necessary for the unification of that country, or recommend to the United Nations the setting up of such a commission for that purpose.

It is also the belief of my delegation that both North and South Korea would welcome economic and cultural exchange, but that this is impossible as long as one or the other is branded as the puppet of either of the great Powers, and where suspicion and fear dominates the relations between the two parties. The Korean delegation has not failed to inform this Committee of the arrest of 9,000 North Koreans charged with espionage in this regard.

(Mr. Cooper, Liberia)

Listening to the speeches of the USSR representative and other like-minded representatives, one realizes that after five years of negotiations, the situation in Korea remains the same. One can therefore have great doubts and suspicions when one reads the following statement by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea:

"When a serious threat to peace in Korea and the Far East was created by the armed attack by United States imperialists, the Chinese People's volunteers, in order to resist United States aggression and help the Korean people, took part in the latter's just fight." (A/C.1/810, page 2)

When one reads this statement, which is the exact opposite of what happened in Korea, one wonders whether the intentions of the Government of North Korea are still not the same, that is, control of all of Korea by force and against the wishes of the Korean people.

The United States, like all other countries, has its faults, but history has shown that these people who fought for their freedom have never entertained designs on the territory of others. If this were so, the United States, after the First World War, could have added large areas in Africa and Asia to its possessions. After the Second World War, it could have added the whole or at least the greater part of North Africa and perhaps regions in the Middle East.

Yet despite the great sacrifice they made in both of these wars of their wealth and their blood, their only craving was to be able to return to their native soil. This they could have done and left a ravaged and poverty stricken world to itself; they nevertheless brought aid and succour to the hungry and the poor, not only among the people of their own race but also to countries and people far removed. It is hard for my delegation to construe such generosity as shown by these great people as imperialistic. If in communistic jargon, to defend the weak against the strong, to aid and succour the sick and feeble, to feed the starving and clothe the naked and to exploit, sabotage and create hatred and fear is democracy, then small countries like mine should be grateful to American imperialism.

In the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, under section 56, it is stated, as has been quoted by the representative of the USSR, that southern Korea spends half of its general budget on defence. Can anyone be surprised or shocked at this, when it is known that the whole of South Korea, with the exception of the base of Pusan, was laid waste and ravaged by armies of the North, supported and abetted by Communist aid -- direct or indirect. It is better, in my belief, to have to live on half a loaf of bread and yet be alive and free than to have a whole loaf and suffer slavery and oppression.

My delegation wishes to record its thanks and congratulations on the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. It is gratifying and encouraging to read of this revamp and of the progress made by the South Korean Government in agriculture, industry, health and sanitation. This has been stated in detail by the Korean delegation.

We regret the fact that there are factors inhibiting further economic growth of this Republic due to the unnecessary burden of maintaining a large army and a lack of private capital. However, it is to be noted according to the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, that:

"Because of the greater financial stability achieved this past year, enterprises essential for sustaining development, though still bringing smaller yields than speculative and largely non-productive financial operations, are beginning to look more attractive to the private investor." (A/3865, para. 57)

(Mr. Cooper, Liberia)

Many delegations have contended that no useful purpose is being served by having the question of Korea debated in this Committee and a resolution passed without the participation of both parties. In our view the same would apply if both parties were present and the position of the North Korean Government were to remain as adamant as evidenced in document A/C.1/810. We have had similar experiences in many other debates in the United Nations, especially those debates on disarmament, at which times all parties to the dispute were present but, owing to their intransigent positions, nothing has been achieved in the way of real progress. At least our discussions on Korea have a moral if not a practical effect and serve as a reminder to the Government we have set up under the United Nations -- the Government of South Korea -- despite the many drawbacks experienced in attempting to find a solution for the unification and rehabilitation of that country, the United Nations still interests itself in the problem of Korea and cherishes the hope that a peaceful solution will be found to the benefit of all Koreans.

It is five years since the Armistice was signed between the opposing forces in Korea. I think everyone has come to realize that no solution can be found which would please all or find acceptance in the sight of the Chinese Communist Government and the North Korean Government or the South Korean Government and the Western Powers as long as these Powers entertain doubts as to the aims and intentions of each other. Only when we have been able to bury the suspicions and distrust now prevailing among the great Powers will the Korean people attain their goal of unification and complete independence.

My delegation, in the circumstances, will support the resolution tabled by the United States and fourteen other Powers as the minimum which can be achieved at this time towards the unification of Korea.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): Once again we have before us the question of Korea; once again we have received a report from the United Nations Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

This report, it is pleasing to note, shows that economic progress in the Republic of Korea has been maintained and that the democratic system of government in South Korea has been strengthened.

Once again, however, we have to recognize that there has been no substantial progress towards the reunification of Korea, despite the fact that unity is the wish of the whole Korean people.

There can be no doubt that had all the people of Korea been permitted to express their wishes without external interference, unity would long since have been achieved in Korea. Unhappily, it is only in part of Korea that such free expression is possible in the conditions of today.

At the outset, let us have firmly in mind what the United Nations has repeatedly declared itself to be aiming at in Korea. As the report of the United Nations Commission reminds us the General Assembly, in resolution 1180 (XII) last year reaffirmed the two-fold objectives of the United Nations in Korea, namely:

"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." (A/3865, para. 6)

(Mr. Forsyth, Australia)

As is well known, the problem of the division of Korea arose out of the military circumstances of the Second World War. The division was accepted as a temporary military expedient, and it was clearly understood that the nation was to be reunited on the conclusion of hostilities with Japan. The Soviet Union refused, however, to relax its hold on the northern area of the country which its forces occupied in 1945.

United Nations interest and responsibility in relation to Korea was established from a very early date. The question of the independence and unity of the whole of Korea was brought before the second session of the General Assembly in 1947. In its resolution 112 (II) the Assembly called upon Member States to refrain from interfering in the affairs of the Korean people and from all acts derogatory to the independence and sovereignty of Korea. The Assembly also recommended that elections be held on the basis of adult suffrage and by secret ballot. In addition, the Assembly resolved that a United Nations Temporary Commission in Korea should be established in order to see that those elected were not merely the appointees of military authorities.

No progress towards the holding of free elections for the whole of Korea followed, however. The Temporary Commission, therefore, consulted the Interim Committee of the General Assembly which recommended that the General Assembly's programme should be carried out "in such parts of Korea as are accessible to the Commission". This was done and the National Assembly in South Korea was elected in free elections supervised by the Commission, and the Government of the Republic of Korea was duly constituted. In the same year, by resolution 195 (III) the General Assembly of the United Nations recognized the elected Government of the Republic of Korea as the only legally constituted Government in that country and reaffirmed the objectives of unity and independence.

The principles established by the General Assembly and its recommendations were treated with contempt by the Communist regime which had been set up in North Korea. Not only did this regime reject any approach to free elections as a means to unification, but it prepared -- and in 1950, suddenly launched -- a determined effort to solve the problem by an entirely different means, by the use of military force, by war and compulsion rather than by peaceful means and free expression on the part of the people.

(Mr. Forsyth, Australia)

This is history; it is set down in the records of the United Nations. Those records show how the present division of the Korean people originated, how a determined aggression was made with the object of unifying the peninsula by force, and in subjugation, in defiance of the United Nations, how long and bitter and costly that war was and how impossible it has since proved -- so far -- to make any advance towards solution without abandoning the principles which the United Nations has consistently upheld. These principles, let it be emphasized, are not an artificial and theoretical figment -- they were worked out in thorough discussion and in direct and concrete knowledge of the needs of Korea. They state the lines along which the unification and independence of Korea in freedom and in safety can be assured. To abandon them would result either in the permanent division of the Korean people or in the eventual success of the aggression started in 1950.

We Australians -- who participated in it along with the other countries which answered the call of the United Nations -- do not forget the long and grievous war in Korea; but more important, we remember what we of the United Nations forces were fighting for.

General Assembly resolution 376 (V) of 1950 clearly shows the Assembly's intention that the United Nations force sent to Korea to repel this aggression should remain there until elections had been held, under the auspices of the United Nations, for the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government.

When at length in July 1953 the Armistice Agreement was concluded in Korea, the country had been laid waste, countless civilians had lost their lives or their property and over 400,000 casualties had been suffered by the Unified Command fighting on behalf of the United Nations.

The Armistice opened the way to another attempt to secure the unity and freedom of Korea by peaceful means. The Korean Political Conference was held at Geneva in April 1954 in an effort to solve the political problems of unifying Korea; but the Communist side refused to accept the principles that, in order to achieve the unification of Korea, there should be genuinely free elections throughout the country and that the United Nations should supervise these elections. The Geneva Conference was thus abortive.

(Mr. Forsyth, Australia)

The "solution" which has persistently been offered by the Communists is simple and it would perhaps resolve the problem of unification: it boils down to a demand that all foreign forces be withdrawn from Korea.

This is the essential element of the Communist "solution". As I said, it might solve the question of territorial unification, though nothing else, for who could doubt that the Republic of Korea would be subjected to every kind of pressure and subversion backed by a vast and immediately neighbouring Power, with the hope that in some crisis a coup in South Korea would become possible. Then at last Korea might be territorially unified again -- but under what conditions. Then at last the fruits of the aggression of 1950 would have been harvested. And then, at last the United Nations principles of a free choice, of unification in democratic freedom, of independence from external control and in conditions of security in the area, could be torn up and forgotten.

The Communist refusal to accept principles which would ensure free elections in Korea, has so far been rigidly maintained. The events of the past year show as yet no advance in this respect, notwithstanding the carefully-timed and well-advertised withdrawals of Chinese forces from North Korea.

Members of the Committee will recall that on 5 February 1958, the authorities in North Korea issued a statement proposing that all foreign troops should be withdrawn from Korea and that thereafter elections should be held in the country and that these might be conducted under the observation of a "neutral nations" organ. These proposals were, of course, endorsed by the Communist Chinese authorities, and communicated to the Governments contributing to the United Nations forces in Korea. Shortly afterwards the Chinese Communists and North Korean authorities announced that the so-called Chinese People's volunteers had decided to withdraw from Korea by stages to be completed before the end of this year. Recently we were told that this evacuation had been completed.

The Governments which contributed forces to the United Nations side in Korea studied very carefully and fairly the proposals made in February by the Communist authorities, and on 9 April a note of reply was delivered on their behalf to those authorities, welcoming the announcement that Communist Chinese forces were to be withdrawn from North Korea.

Representatives will remember, however, that as long ago as 1951 the Assembly had called upon Communist Chinese forces to withdraw from Korea. It has thus taken seven years for the Peking regime to heed the Assembly, and then it did so only after ensuring a substantial increase in the military power of the North Korean Communist administration, and long after the greater part of forces of the United Nations had been withdrawn.

In their reply, the fifteen Governments also welcomed the support expressed in the Communist proposals for the principle of free elections. In order, however, to be quite clear whether in fact some basis could be found for progress with the Korean problem in a manner consistent with the declared principles of the United Nations, they asked whether the Communist proposal meant that there should be supervision not only of the preliminaries to the elections but also of the elections themselves, and that the elections should be held under United Nations auspices.

I shall elaborate a little upon this presently. For the moment it suffices to note that to this request for clarification the Communist authorities have so far made no reply.

(Mr. Forsyth, Australia)

A further communication from them on 6 May did little more than repeat the Communist view that the withdrawal of forces from Korea was a necessary preliminary to a settlement of the Korean problem.

This proposition, of course, contradicts the United Nations position that its force will be withdrawn when conditions of unity in independence, freedom and security are genuinely established in the whole of Korea.

The reply from the United Nations countries concerned to this second Communist communication expressed regret that clarification of the Communist proposals on elections had not been given. It reaffirmed once more the principle that further withdrawals of United Nations forces from Korea cannot take place in the absence of provision for a settlement of the Korean question in accordance with United Nations principles. It should be remarked, in addition, that the fifteen countries also expressed their willingness at all times to further the consideration of the reunification of Korea on the basis set out in the various relevant resolutions of the General Assembly.

The consequence of accepting the Communist proposals made in the various communications I have described would have been the withdrawal of United Nations forces from Korea, without any guarantee of any kind that the reunification of Korea by democratic methods would be achieved.

Some speakers in this debate have laid much emphasis on the withdrawal of Chinese Communist forces from North Korea. For our part we have welcomed and we welcome this withdrawal as a small step towards the conditions which would permit the reunification of Korea; but the Assembly cannot -- unless it would abandon Korea and deny its own principles -- accept the argument that withdrawal of Communist Chinese troops removes the reasons and the need for a United Nations force in Korea.

In passing I must say that we, of course, do not accept the implication that the status of the Communist Chinese forces in Korea is the same as that of the United Nations forces. The United Nations forces in Korea have a status absolutely different from that of the Communist Chinese forces, and nothing should be permitted to obscure this fact.

(Mr. Forsyth, Australia)

The Communist Chinese forces came to Korea in support of an aggression and have been solemnly declared aggressors by this Assembly. Their departure from Korea has been repeatedly requested by the Assembly.

The United Nations forces which remain in Korea are there to ensure that aggression does not recur and to serve as an earnest that United Nations intentions for the reunification of Korea by democratic means will be carried out.

Now let us return for a moment to the political aspect. It is true that in their statement of 5 February the Communist authorities made certain suggestions for political action to follow the withdrawal of troops from Korea. In particular, they stated that elections might be conducted under the observation of a "neutral nations organ". As I have mentioned, the fifteen nations gave serious attention to this and in their note of 9 April asked for a clarification of the suggestion. No reply whatsoever on this point has been forthcoming. Communist public statements on this idea of observation by a neutral nations organ left doubt whether they envisaged arrangements which could ensure that elections would be genuinely free. The fifteen nations pointed out in their communication of 9 April that North Korean representatives had made a variety of statements: for example, to the effect that the neutral nations organization supervising the elections should not "intervene" in the elections. The lack of any response to the fifteen nations' request for clarification gives rise to a justifiable doubt as to whether the proposals from the Communist side for supervision of elections have any meaning at all. In the absence of evidence that the Communist authorities are prepared to accept, or even to discuss, the principles advanced by the United Nations for a political settlement in Korea, the withdrawal of Chinese Communist forces from North Korea does not in itself demonstrate that the Communist authorities are ready to approach a peaceful settlement of the Korean problem on any terms but their own.

Once again, very recently, the North Korean representatives on the Military Armistice Commission have pressed for the withdrawal of United Nations forces from Korea. The United Nations representative on that Commission has

(Mr. Forsyth, Australia)

pointed out in reply that the conditions in which the remaining United Nations forces could withdraw can be settled only by a political conference and that if the Communist side were sincerely interested in a solution to the Korean problem it had only to indicate its willingness to discuss the problem on the basis of the objectives laid down by the Assembly. The Communist authorities have taken the matter no further.

Representatives will have read the statement made by the North Korean authorities on 28 October which has been circulated with document A/C.1/810. It contains not one single phrase likely to contribute towards a solution of the problem of Korea along the lines laid down by the Assembly. It makes several allegations, two of which I will comment upon.

First, it states that a serious threat to peace in Korea and the Far East was created by the aggression of the United States and that the Korean people were helped by the so-called Chinese People's Volunteers to resist this aggression and to fight for liberation. This is a precise reversal of the truth. The Assembly in its resolution 498 (V) recorded its views on these matters. Either the Communist authorities think that the memories of representatives here are incredibly short, or their document is not really addressed to us at all but follows their well-known technique of using the facilities of international organizations -- in this case the United Nations -- to promote their ceaseless, world-wide propaganda.

The second allegation made in the North Korean statement of 28 October is that, in view of the withdrawal of Chinese Communist troops, United States forces are also obliged to withdraw from Korea before conditions can be established in which Korea can be unified by peaceful means. It seems incredible that anyone should seriously think that we, the United Nations, could be deceived by this manoeuvre and induced to abandon the means of giving effect eventually to the long-established United Nations policies in relation to Korea.

(Mr. Forsyth, Australia)

If, however, having taken, at long last, one step enjoined by the General Assembly -- to wit, withdrawal of Chinese forces from Korea -- the Communists were prepared to take other steps recommended by the Assembly, they would not find the United Nations unresponsive. They are not, however, entitled thereby to demand in return for their retraction from a guilty trespass, that we, the United Nations, abandon, diminish or change the positive principles we have established for the solution of the Korean question.

The heart of the problem of Korean reunification is to secure conditions in which all the Korean people -- not only those in the South as at present -- can freely express their wishes. The techniques are known. The United Nations has all the necessary means. There is only one real difficulty about securing the conditions: the consent of those who control North Korea is withheld. The presence or absence of Chinese troops within North Korea makes no difference whatever to this central fact. Korea and the Korean people are denied their national unity and their territorial integrity, and it is clear by whom they are denied.

(Mr. Forsyth, Australia)

Withdrawal of the forces of the United Nations from South Korea, on the other hand, would be of vital importance, for it would remove the principal guarantee that somehow, sometime, if perseverance and dedication and right principles can ever prevail, the unity, freedom and independence of the whole Korean people will be secure. There is no decent alternative to the United Nations principles for Korea. There can be no thought of evading the responsibility of the United Nations in this question.

Precise means need not be prejudged but the policies and principles which were hewed out of concrete situations and well-weighed and long-considered judgements must be upheld, and indeed, departure from them would be an abandonment, an abdication, not a solution, and the problem would be merely submerged beneath other problems.

The Australian delegation is convinced that the only right course is to remain firm, while always ready to respond to any convincing sign of readiness to approach a solution on the basis of the United Nations principles.

It is in this spirit that we have co-sponsored a draft resolution on Korea submitted to this Committee. The draft resolution (A/C.1/L.217) reaffirms in its preamble the more important of the Assembly's resolutions in which the United Nations objectives in Korea have been set out in the past.

In the third and fourth paragraphs of the preamble the draft resolution refers to the exchange of correspondence during 1958 between the Communist authorities and the fifteen nations contributing forces to the United Nations Force in Korea. The withdrawal of Communist Chinese forces from North Korea after four-fifths of United Nations forces have been withdrawn is welcomed, because we believe that the Assembly will wish to welcome Communist Chinese withdrawals as showing some measure of willingness to observe, although **tardily**, the opinion of the great majority of nations expressed in the Assembly's request.

The operative paragraphs of the draft resolution comprise a statement of objectives in present circumstances. The Communist authorities are once more informed of the Assembly's determination to bring about by peaceful means the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea with a representative form of government and the full restoration of peace and security in the area. An appeal is once more made to the Communist authorities to accept the United Nations objectives in Korea, in particular to take part in the holding of free elections in accordance with the Assembly's past resolutions.

(Mr. Forsyth, Australia)

In the penultimate paragraph of the draft resolution the Assembly would ask UNCURK to continue its task in Korea. The value of the Commission's work has again been proved by its report on developments in South Korea. My delegation believes that the Assembly will wish UNCURK to continue in Korea as a proof of the maintenance of active United Nations interest in the problems of the Korean people and as a source of information to Member States on developments in Korea.

My delegation considers that in the circumstances still prevailing in Korea the United Nations has a duty to reaffirm its objectives there in the way proposed in the draft resolution. In essence, Communist representatives in this Committee have advised the United Nations to abandon these objectives and its principles. If the Assembly were to bend to Communist pressure and were to fail to reaffirm its objectives, the Korean people would be left without hope that they would one day be able to achieve unity in independence, and enjoy the whole of their country in freedom from foreign domination. Failure now to reaffirm our objectives would be an admission that the United Nations is not prepared to stand firm on matters of principle in the face of difficulties. The damaging effect of such an admission would not be confined to the Korean people.

Mr. ZARATE MORENO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): Colombia is one of the countries co-sponsoring the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/L.217 which this Committee is now considering. My delegation would be extremely pleased to find this draft resolution adopted by the Committee.

At no time has my country considered itself alien to the question of Korea. We did not consider ourselves outside the matter when this country was dragged into an absurd and cruel war; therefore, fulfilling our obligations under the Charter, we contributed considerable contingents to the United Nations Forces. We still consider ourselves involved in this matter. That is why Colombia is one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution before the Committee at the moment.

Naturally, the Colombian delegation would like to comment on the substance of the matter. This comment is to stress the fact that my country is not in favour of the Korean question becoming for the United Nations

(Mr. Zarate Moreno, Colombia)

one of the frozen subjects which every year are brought out, presented to the Assembly, sent off to a committee and made the subject of periodic, bureaucratic reports or resolutions of noble words that become dead letters.. The blood that was shed in Korea, and the dignity of the United Nations, cannot permit this matter to become one of those secondary items, the routinary repetition of which does so much damage to the prestige of the world Organization. Colombia would want the Korean question to have not only a just solution but a rapid and secure solution. It is well known that the benefits of the Armistice Agreement have already gone as far as they possibly could. By its very nature armistice is closer to war than to peace. Therefore, what follows now must be a new and vigorous policy that would overcome the present state of affairs and, in as strict a democratic equality as possible, return to Korea the reins of its own fate.

The United Nations cannot save the country from war if that country is then to be allowed to succumb to peace in such a way as the situation that at present obtains in Korea. The case of Korea must show that as far as the United Nations is concerned it is as important to fight against any manifestations of war as it is to avoid certain types of peace that can be as damaging and destructive.

It is for this reason and with this idea in mind that my delegation co-sponsors the draft resolution before the Committee, and that we will support anything that will effectively -- and I repeat, effectively -- lead to the reunification and rehabilitation of Korea.

Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa): We have been concerned about the question of Korea for about ten years. Fortunately we are far removed from the days when active fighting was going on in that unhappy land, but unfortunately the objective of the United Nations to achieve a reunited free and independent Korea is not yet in sight. We know only too well that in matters of this kind infinite patience is required, and we are equally convinced that the great majority of nations represented in this Committee will lend their support to ways and means that promise to achieve the United Nations objective of a Korea reunited in peace and security. We are fully persuaded that the people of Korea ardently desire this.

(Mr. Jordaan, Union of South Africa)

Our own security interests -- and by that I mean the interests of the Union of South Africa -- lie closer at home than the shores of Korea. Still, dedicated as we are to the collective-security provisions of the Charter, South Africa was one of the handful of those States that responded to the Security Council's appeal for assistance in repelling the aggression against South Korea, and the support we gave in conjunction with other United Nations forces during those unhappy years entailed no inconsiderable sacrifice on our part in human lives and material.

The Union of South Africa could with justification have demanded a voice in the final settlement of the Korean question. It had earned it. But instead it announced that it was willing to abide by any agreements reached between the Powers which had direct and vital interests and responsibilities in the Korea area. It was in these circumstances that, although the Union of South Africa was entitled to participate in the political conference which followed the armistice in Korea, it renounced its seat in those discussions.

This did not mean that we had lost interest in the cause for which our forces fought under the United Nations flag. In fact, we have followed the debates in the United Nations on the Korean question with keen interest. While we had never entertained extravagant hopes as to the immediate outcome of efforts to achieve a pacific settlement of the dispute, we believed that the desire for peace was universal and that this would make a satisfactory settlement eventually possible. In spite of the very slow progress that has been made, my delegation is not prepared to accept failure as a foregone conclusion. It is abundantly apparent that as far as the United Nations is concerned the door to negotiation remains open.

The history of all the abortive attempts to find a solution is set forth in the records of this Organization, and I do not propose to dwell any further on that aspect.

But we are of course concerned about the position as it is today. According to the report of UNCURK the North Korean authorities made proposals concerning "measures that should be taken without delay for the peaceful unification of Korea under the present situation". These would, inter alia, entail free elections under observation of a neutral nations organization, and withdrawal of foreign troops from Korea.

It has all along been accepted by the United Nations that a prerequisite to the establishment of a free and independent Korea is the holding of free elections

(Mr. Jordaan, Union of South Africa)

under United Nations supervision. We were therefore interested to note that the other side also favours free elections. But it is essential to know what is meant by the other side by a neutral nations organization to supervise the elections. The other important point is to know on what basis the new assembly will be elected. It would be in our opinion indefensible if, numerically speaking, equal representation were to be given to the North and to the South; such representation must necessarily be on a proportionate basis in accordance with populations.

Clarifications on these issues were sought by the Chargé d'Affaires of the United Kingdom in Peking on behalf of the Sixteen, but these clarifications were not forthcoming, and one is left to wonder whether the North Korean proposals were seriously intended.

As regards the question of troop withdrawal, we have in document A/C.1/810 of 3 November 1958 a communication from the North Korean authorities to the effect that all "Chinese People's Volunteers" had been withdrawn from North Korea. My delegation heartily welcomes this statement. But in the communication a demand is made in extravagant language for the withdrawal of United Nations troops. It speaks, for instance, of "the immediate withdrawal from South Korea of the aggressive forces of the United States imperialists". The Soviet Union associates itself with this demand and with the terms in which it is made.

All of us know the history of the Korean crisis and I need not go into that. It is necessary merely to point out that the so-called Chinese People's Volunteers participated in a war of aggression against South Korea, while the United States and other forces were sent there at the behest of the United Nations to repel aggression.

Such forces as still remain, greatly reduced as they are, are there under the authority of this world-wide Organization for the purpose of keeping the peace until the twofold objectives of the United Nations in Korea are achieved, namely, "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".

(Mr. Jordaan, Union of South Africa)

Difficult as this task may be, the delegation of the Union of South Africa must continue to hope that the United Nations objectives will eventually be attained. If at the present time we can do no more than to urge the authorities concerned to strive towards the attainment of these objectives we should not desist from doing so. It is for this reason that my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution introduced by Australia and twelve other countries which is contained in document A/C.1/L.217.

Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania) (interpretation from French): It can be stated dispassionately that the United Nations debates on the Korean problem are characterized by the fact that the delegation of the United States and some other delegations persist in the strange attitude of dealing with the problem while ignoring, or appearing to ignore, what are its fundamental data. Even at the risk of displeasing the representative of the Union of South Africa, I am obliged to remind the Committee of what are the true facts of the Korean problem, in the hope that sooner or later the Committee and the Assembly will understand that any attempt to solve this problem without taking into account its fundamental data can only be doomed to failure. The essential aspect of the problem with which we are dealing is that on Korean territory two distinct states exist at the present time. If matters were not so there would be no problem of the unification of Korea. Surely the representatives of the United States and other members of this Committee who have echoed the American position are at liberty to recognize only one of the two Governments in Korea, that of South Korea. They may go around saying that this is the only real Government, that the Government of South Korea is the only legal one; and without too much trouble they can get one or more resolutions adopted to confirm their point of view. However, this will not prevent Korea from being divided; this will not cancel out the fact that there exist two states which exercise sovereignty over two distinct portions of the territory of Korea.

What ought finally to be understood is that the consideration of the Korean problem by the United Nations General Assembly is not designed to ascertain or determine what is the legitimate or legal Government of Korea, or of any other country for that matter, nor to say what is the regime best suited to the Korean people or to any other people. By its Charter the United Nations is precluded from

(Mr. Mezincescu, Romania)

pronouncing itself on the legality of States Members or non-Members of the United Nations. This question is one which is beyond the competence of the United Nations precisely because the United Nations is an Organization of sovereign States and that States which are outside the United Nations are not impaired in their sovereignty by their non-membership in this Organization.

I should like now to make a few brief comments on the speech yesterday of the representative of the United Kingdom. I carefully studied that speech and I noted that he did not answer after all, even at this stage of the debate, an important question asked by members of this Committee.

(Mr. Mezincescu, Romania)

He did not tell the Committee why he found that the non-admission of representatives of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea to our discussions on the Korean problem was in any way helpful and in what way it was thus helpful. And I understand the reasons for his reticence on this point: there is in fact, and can be, no reason, no grounds which will make the procedure adopted by the majority of the Committee helpful in the solution of the Korean problem. I am not going to emphasize this point further; the matter was raised by another delegation and it might perhaps be lacking in modesty for me to press it. In such circumstances Romanians like to say that where there is nothing, even God cannot ask for anything. But since the representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic have been excluded from this debate, the First Committee has automatically ruled out any possibility of making any headway towards a solution of the question, at least at the present session; and that is that. This fact can only be construed as evidence that the United States and the countries which support the United States are far from seeking settlement of the question in the spirit of the Charter and of international agreements that are relevant to the matter. The way in which representatives of these States push this question continually in attempts to impose solutions on one party that would be suitable to the interests of the other and irrelevant to the interests of the Korean people only proves that that is the pass to which things have come.

The speech of the representative of the United States, as well as certain other speeches by other delegations which are wont to follow the United States position on the Korean problem, is evidence of the fact that the ruling circles of these States continue to be opposed to a fair solution of this question -- and this, despite the fact that there was a surge of hope this year that tangible progress could be achieved in the direction of a peaceful solution of the Korean problem towards a peaceful and democratic unification of Korea. This hope was encouraged by the initiatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Government of the People's Republic of China, initiatives which opened new possibilities for the diminution of tension in that area and the settlement of the Korean problem in conformity with the interests of the Korean people and of all other peace-loving peoples. I refer particularly to the important

(Mr. Mezincescu, Romania)

initiative concerning the withdrawal from Korea of the Chinese People's Volunteers, an initiative taken in February 1958 by the Chinese-Korean side on its own motion, so as to facilitate the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea as a fundamental step towards the peaceful unification of the country.

As is well known, the Chinese People's Volunteers, after that initiative, decided to withdraw from Korea; and that decision, in fact, had been fully implemented by the time these debates began here.

One might well have expected that such a measure -- whose importance no one surely will question -- would have induced the United States and other countries maintaining troops in South Korea to follow up the proposals contained in the 19 February 1958 statement of the People's Democratic Republic and the Chinese People's Republic and to withdraw their armed forces. This would have been a logical response on the part of those Governments if they had been as sincere in their desire to help in a peaceful solution of the problem as they would like to have us believe.

What happened, however? Not only was the Chinese-Korean initiative not followed up by the United States or applied by it as an honourable opening for withdrawal of its armed forces, but, on the contrary, it was taken as a green light for intensifying its own military preparations in South Korea. It is common knowledge that the United States side, which had unilaterally taken the decision to disregard paragraph 13 of the Armistice Agreement, forbidding the introduction of military equipment into Korea, thereafter accelerated the pace of the introduction into Korea of Honest-John rockets and atomic cannons of various calibres, transforming that part of Korea into an atomic base. One may ask what end this concentration of forces is designed to achieve. What is the concept which guides the logic of political thinking of those who, at the time of the withdrawal of the Chinese People's Volunteers from the Territory of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, respond by intensification of military deliveries for the inflated armed forces of South Korea and strengthening their own forces stationed in that country by atomic and rocket weapons? There is only one kind of logic which can direct this policy and such actions. It is evident that the grave situation which has arisen in the Taiwan Strait, owing to the aggressive actions of the Chiang Kai-shek refugees, supported by the

(Mr. Mezincescu, Romania)

United States fleet, and the strengthening of the United States atomic base in South Korea, is a part of a premeditated total pattern.

Intensification of armed forces in Korea is supposed to be a link in the chain of United States actions designed to achieve United States colonial domination of the peoples of the Far East. The representative of the United States has confirmed to this Committee the fact that United States occupation troops in Korea have been equipped with nuclear weapons. He endeavoured to play down the danger to international peace and security implicit in the presence in Korea of United States armed forces equipped with nuclear weapons and insisted that their effectiveness was small. But it is an elementary fact of military science that one does not have to have large armed forces in order to handle weapons of mass destruction. Moreover, the role of furnishing cannon fodder, atomic or otherwise, is reserved for the Government of South Korea.

The representative of the United States told the Committee quite blandly that, in spite of the withdrawal of the Chinese People's Volunteers, the occupation troops of the United States would continue to remain in Korea, and I quote his words: "... for one purpose only, the achievement of United Nations objectives". (A/C.1/PV.973, p. 63)

Would the representative of the United States be kind enough to suggest to the Committee what the objectives of the United Nations are in Korea which the United States proposes to attain by means of rockets and nuclear weapons? I would scarcely think that the representative of the United States would be able to supply an answer to this question in terms compatible with the Charter. The true purpose in the continued occupation of South Korea by United States nuclear troops is indicated in another passage of the same speech which was given two days ago. He said:

"... 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 ..." (Ibid.)

What does this mean? In ordinary terms, this means a United States dictat in Korea; atomic blackmail in order to secure the capitulation of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, utilizing all the time the discussions here in the absence of representatives of the People's Democratic Republic of

(Mr. Mezincescu, Romania)

Korea as a smokescreen, even though these discussions, carried on in this manner, can lead to nothing. At the same time, military preparations are being intensified in South Korea.

Is there any need to emphasize how dangerous this game is for the Korean people, for the United States itself, and for international peace and security in general? The Romanian delegation feels that, despite the grave situation created by the aggressive policy of United States ruling circles, the Korean problem can and must be solved by peaceful means. The Korean people, divorced for **many years** by an artificial wall, should be able to undertake a peaceful and constructive life within the framework of an independent and democratic Korea. What means exist for attaining this end? The means were set out in the statement by the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea: first of all, elimination of foreign intervention into the internal affairs of Korea with, of course, withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korean territory; next, free elections in the entire country in order to create a single State power organism.

(Mr. Mezincescu, Romania)

There can be no question of free elections under conditions of the military occupation of South Korea by American troops, regardless of the sponsorship of the presence of those troops.

A number of delegations have argued that it would be a proper procedure to confer upon the American troops the role of party and judge at the same time in Korea during the elections, which would enable the Americans by subterfuge to secure what they were unable to secure by force of arms. What was not acknowledged was that, if the presence of rockets and atomic cannon is capable of contributing to the atmosphere required for free elections, it would also be necessary for the delegations that support the American thesis of elections in the presence of occupation troops to acknowledge that the United Nations has lent its flag to the aggressors who have inflicted untold sufferings upon the Korean people in its struggle to secure independence for the country. The delegation of the People's Republic of Romania considers that the proposals to be found in the statements of the Fifth Assembly of this year of the Korean People's Democratic Republic Government represent an effective programme of measures designed to achieve a peaceful solution of the Korean problem. These proposals should be examined carefully and earnestly. The Romanian delegation feels that if ultimate results are to be achieved on this question, it is necessary, first and foremost, for the United States and the other countries that support the American position to take into account the experience acquired so far and, finally, to tackle the problem in a manner compatible with the principles espoused by the United Nations Charter, in harmony with the present situation of fact, and in harmony with the present state of international relations.

Mr. VEGA GOMEZ (El Salvador) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of El Salvador has listened with great attention to the Ambassador of Korea, who yesterday gave us an impressive description of the situation obtaining in his country, and of the progress achieved in the last few years by the Republic of Korea. Despite the painful division of the peninsula, which deprives the Republic of the help of the Koreans of the North and of the natural resources of that part of the peninsula, the enforced division of a peace-loving people which,

(Mr. Vega Gomez, El Salvador)

for reasons outside of its control, sees itself in as ghastly a fate as that of the people of Korea, must have some effect on world public opinion. We must be left to hope that this situation will be remedied as soon as possible, so that the people will be able to enjoy tranquillity, peace, freedom and justice, to which it has a right to aspire.

It might be said that on this question much has already been said. It can be said that the arguments have all been exhausted. That is true. It may be said: but how could we remain silent in the face of the persistence and existence of such a lamentable situation. If the United Nations is to achieve a peaceful, democratic, unified Korea, with a representative form of government and the full re-establishment of peace and security in the region, it must be the echo of that world public opinion to which I just referred, both in our declarations as well as in our action. Unfortunately, however, although we did achieve an Armistice Agreement, although we were able to hush the roar of the cannon and stop the wasteful shedding of blood, we have, nevertheless, done practically nothing insofar as the true tasks before the United Nations are concerned; that is, to return to the people of Korea their unity, and to prepare it for the full enjoyment of its legitimate international rights. El Salvador has always expressed its deep sympathy toward any constructive efforts that will bring about the democratic unification of Korea, and that is why we are ready to co-operate as far as is possible for us to do so in such a programme.

With regard to the question before us now, might I cite the words of the Foreign Minister of El Salvador, who, in the statement he made in the plenary of the General Assembly on 30 September 1958, said as follows:

"Now, during this present period, when certain currents are drawing together countries that have been separated for many years, it is paradoxical that going against the will of considerable groups of people, such countries are artificially divided as Germany, Korea and Viet-Nam. It is also said that because of the opposition of foreign Powers some of these countries have not been allowed to become members of our Organization.

"My Government which has the best diplomatic, cultural and trade relations with the Federal Republic of Germany, and which also has diplomatic relations with the Republic of Korea, and Viet-Nam, would be extremely pleased

(Mr. Vega Gomez, El Salvador)

to see their efforts for unification crowned with success, and that the United Nations open its doors to these countries whose contribution to the cause of peace and prosperity of the Organization would certainly be important." (A/PV.764, pp 8-10)

The delegation of El Salvador wishes to reaffirm its hope that, in the near future, the Republic of Korea, reunified for the good of its people and of world peace, will be able to occupy the place that is open for it in our Organization.

My delegation has carefully considered the Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, and finds the work carried out by the Commission in the last year most praiseworthy. Therefore, we believe that this Report should be approved by the Assembly. It is extremely interesting, when reading this Report, to see how gradually the ribbon of progress of the nation is being hurried up in all respects, but we can also see the grave danger inherent in the abnormal situation that exists. For example regarding the economy of the country, the Report says:

"The year under review has seen substantial improvement in the economy of the Republic of Korea. ..." (A/3865, para. 42)

And then adds later:

"While economic growth in the Republic, especially in the field of industry, has been encouraging over the past year, certain obstacles continue to retard progress." (Ibid., para. 54)

And then the Report refers to the division of the country, the defence expenditure, and the lack of private capital.

In this document we can also see how democratic ideas are taking root in Korea. To this reference was also made by the representative of Korea in his statement. This is something that must, of course, fill us with pleasure, But if, with the sword of Damocles hanging over Korea, it is still able to march toward progress, how much faster would it march if this sword were to be taken away from above it.

Regarding the draft resolution submitted by Australia, Belgium, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Greece and other delegations in document A/C.1/L.217, I must say that my delegation finds it extremely appropriate and timely, and will vote in its favour.

Mr. MATSUDAIRA (Japan): The long history of the Far East testifies to the fact that a politically stable and economically prosperous Korea is an essential condition for the security and peace of the Far East. It is a matter of vital importance to Japan as well.

We take note with pleasure, for this reason, of the conclusion of the Report of UNKRA to the effect that:

"... the continuous efforts and energies of the Korean people themselves and their Government enabled the Korean economy during the past year to achieve the greatest measure of stability that it has enjoyed since the outbreak of the Korean war. More still must be done ... before the Republic of Korea can reach its ultimate objective of a truly viable economy. Nevertheless, great progress has already been realized toward the attainment of that goal."

(A/3907, para. 172)

However, we will have to take note also of the Report of UNCURK:

"While economic growth in the Republic ... has been encouraging over the past year, certain **obstacles** continue to retard progress." (A/3865, para. 54)

One of the most important obstacles is the division of the country. This division makes the economy of the country precarious. With a precarious economy there can be no political stability in Korea. With its fine rice fields in the south, and with its rich power and mineral resources in the north, south and north are economically complementary, and each one sustains the other. Politically, and economically, Korea is one entity. As long as this division is imposed on Korea against the law of nature, there can be no economic stability in Korea. There can be no political stability in Korea either.

We welcome, therefore, that the Report of UNCURK contains this year a somewhat lengthy statement on the new developments concerning the question of the unification of Korea. We learn that on 5 February 1958, the North Korean authorities made a proposal on the "measures that should be taken without delay for the peaceful unification of Korea and the present situation." (A/3865, para. 9) Our attention is particularly drawn to two points of the proposal:

(Mr. Matsudaira, Japan)

"(1) That the 'U.S. army and all other foreign troops including the Chinese People's Volunteers should be simultaneously withdrawn from North and South Korea';

"(2) That 'within a definite period after the complete withdrawal of all the foreign troops from North and South Korea, all-Korea free elections should be held. These elections may be conducted under the observation of a neutral nations organ';" (Ibid.)

In the view of my delegation, these two points seem to be in contradiction with many resolutions adopted in the past by the General Assembly and also with the fundamental principles embodied in the report to the United Nations on the Korean political conference at Geneva. We cannot see how the first point could be reconciled with General Assembly resolution 498 (V) of 1 February 1951, for example, which:

"Calls upon the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to cause its forces and nationals in Korea to cease hostilities against the United Nations forces and to withdraw from Korea;"

Equally, as regards the second point, we cannot see how this could be compatible with General Assembly resolution 376 (V) of 7 October 1950, which recommends that:

"United Nations forces should not remain in any part of Korea otherwise than so far as necessary for achieving the objectives specified in sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) ..."

Sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of resolution 376 (V) read as follows:

"(a) All appropriate steps be taken to ensure conditions of stability throughout Korea;

"(b) All constituent acts be taken, including the holding of elections, under the auspices of the United Nations, for the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government in the sovereign State of Korea;"

It is also difficult to understand these points of the proposal in terms of the Geneva principles which say that there should be free elections, 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. We fail to understand, therefore, how this proposal could be the basis for further discussions.

As to the question of troop withdrawals, my delegation welcomes the announced withdrawal of the forces of the People's Republic of China from North Korea in the light of the said resolution of 1 February 1951 of the General Assembly, and also in view of the fact that it will contribute to the easing of tension in the area. However, my delegation feels that the United Nations forces could not be withdrawn from Korea until the conditions for a lasting settlement laid down by the General Assembly have been fulfilled.

The objective of the United Nations remains the achievement by peaceful means of a unified, independent and democratic Korea, a representative form of government, and full restoration of international peace and security in the area. The fundamental principles of unification are set forth in the Assembly's many resolutions and in the Geneva report of 1954. We believe, however, that the modalities through which these principles are to be embodied, can be flexible if certain conditions are accepted, conditions which we feel are indispensable in order to guarantee the free expression of the will of the Korean people concerning the political future of Korea.

The implementation of these principles is flexible in the sense that the General Assembly is and will always be competent to modify past resolutions and adopt new ones. We concur fully with what the representative of Canada said yesterday on this point.

As to the means for achieving this objective, the basic rule is that the settlement must be brought about by peaceful means. We think that it does not exclude any particular form of peaceful means, including good offices and negotiations.

I think that I have sufficiently clarified our position on this issue.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The remaining speakers on the list are as follows: Turkey, Thailand, India, Ukrainian SSR, Bulgaria, Dominican Republic, Uruguay, Byelorussian SSR, Venezuela, Hungary, China, Ceylon, Poland, Costa Rica, Albania, Ethiopia, Laos, Guatemala, Sweden, Philippines, Nepal, Soviet Union.

There are twenty-two speakers still on the list. We have not divided this list into sections whereby representatives may be scheduled for a morning or afternoon period. The list will be a continuous one. I shall call on the speakers in the order in which I have read out their names and I shall expect them to take the floor when called upon. If anyone is not ready to speak when he is called on, I am afraid that we will have to pass over his name and he will be given an opportunity to speak at a later date.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.