



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED
A/C.1/PV.980
10 November 1958
ENGLISH

Thirteenth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND EIGHTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 10 November 1958, at 3 p.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.980. 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)

Mr. MALILE (Albania)(interpretation from French): For a number of years at every session of the General Assembly we have been called upon to examine the Korean question, and we have arrived at no practicable result. Is our Organization incapable positively of solving this problem? We do not think so. The stalemate that faces the United Nations on this question, as in the case of a number of other important international matters can be understood only if we understand the aggressive policy of the United States and of countries supporting that policy. In the examination of this question the United Nations, under pressure from the United States, is starting from erroneous premises. The methods and the principles that have so far served as a basis for our actions, the policy of Diktat, of unilaterally prepared conditions, are contrary to the spirit and the letter of the Charter, and in effect make any solution impossible. The Korean question is basically a matter for the Korean people to decide, and this principle must guide all our efforts so that a peaceful solution of the question of Korea may be achieved. If at any moment in our task we forget this principle by one iota, the result of our work will not serve the peaceful and democratic unification of Korea.

The procedure followed thus far, which is being repeated at the present session of the General Assembly as well, is to invite to our debates the representative of only one of the parties in this situation. It is unjustifiable and makes any constructive solution impossible. This way we are only serving objectives which are alien to the interests of the Korean people and to the cause of a stable peace in that part of the world. The Korean People's Democratic Republic should be present at our debates; this is an imperative matter.

(Mr. Malile, Albania)

I must repeat in this same general framework that the absence of one of the permanent members of the Security Council, the Democratic People's Republic of China, a great Asian Power which is directly concerned in the matter, makes it more difficult for us to arrive at a satisfactory solution of the problem. The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania believes that the United Nations should not allow itself to continue along this incorrect road. We must choose one of two courses. Either we are going to face this problem in the normal manner in accordance with the principles of the Charter and international law, in accordance with the most elementary principles of logic and equality, thus opening the road to a just solution, or else we are going to continue holding sterile discussions, adopting unilateral resolutions so as to impose the will of one party on the other, all of which cannot serve as a basis for a just solution of the Korean problem.

From 1945 until the present the United States has tried, in accordance with its aggressive plans for Asia, by all means at its disposal to impose on the Korean people the regime which now prevails in South Korea. However, the numerous resolutions of our Organization and the armed aggression against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which the United States imperialists have perpetuated under the banner of the United Nations, have not enabled them to achieve their objectives. The heroic Korean people, assisted by their brothers of the great Democratic People's Republic of China, have defended their independence and have justly repulsed the aggression.

The history of the events of this period has shown that nothing can be obtained by the use of force against the Korean people. The advocates of the policy of force should have learned this by now, not only as regards the Korean question but also as regards all international questions. Since the conclusion of the armistice in Korea in 1953, the United States Government has been trying either directly or through the so-called United Nations Commission and Syngman Rhee in South Korea, to raise more obstacles in the path of solving this difficult problem.

The peaceful solution of the Korean question is of great importance because it is intimately connected with the future of the Korean people and with the maintenance of peace in the Far East. Thirteen years after the liberation of Korea from the Japanese imperialists, the country is still

(Mr. Malile, Albania)

divided into two parts. The main cause of this division is the aggressive policy of the United States, which is intended to transform South Korea into a United States military base in order to carry out the aims of the United States against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of China. A very large share of the so-called United States aid to Korea is used for military purposes. We note in the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea that more than half of the 1958 budget was intended for military purposes. The United States has given South Korea nuclear weapons, thus violating the Armistice Agreement. Military manoeuvres of United States troops and troops of South Korea using atomic weapons are taking place near the frontier. Provocations are constantly taking place to threaten peace, and they have also occurred in the demilitarized zone. All these provocative acts incited by the United States have encouraged Syngman Rhee to undertake new military adventures. It is because of this that he frequently appeals for a march to the North.

There can be no doubt that such activities do not serve the interests of peace or the interests of a peaceful solution of the Korean problem. In order to solve the Korean problem, the United Nations must act in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. The existence of two Korean States with different economic and social systems is a fact which cannot be denied. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea have been recognized by Member States of the United Nations and diplomatic and commercial relations are enjoyed among them. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is supported by the population of North Korea and reflects the vital interests of the Korean people. Its Government has done everything in its power to bring about the reunification of Korea. It has undertaken constructive action to achieve this end by peaceful means.

At the Geneva Conference in April 1954, a conference which was called to examine the question of Korea, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea proposed a series of measures for the reunification of Korea by peaceful means. Subsequently, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea undertook certain important measures so as to establish direct contact between the two parts of the country. It proposed that negotiations should be held between the North and the South so as to establish economic and social relations, postal

(Mr. Malile, Albania)

services and to allow the entire population to move freely between both parts of the country. North Korea was ready to provide electric power to South Korea, which was badly in need of it. It was also ready to provide rice to 1 million families to relieve the famine which existed and to offer concrete assistance to the various phases of their economy. Its Government proposed to reduce its armed forces and to commit itself not to resort to force. It has unilaterally reduced its military effectives to 80,000 men. All these positive measures were intended to create a spirit of understanding and to establish political, economic and social relations between the two parts of the country. This would contribute to reducing international tension in this part of the world and create conditions favourable to the peaceful unification of the country. Unfortunately, however, the United States and the authorities of South Korea rejected all these just and fair proposals of the Government of North Korea. By taking this stand, the interests of peace and of the Korean people were certainly not served.

In continuing its efforts to unify Korea, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea proposed, in its declaration of 5 February 1958, the withdrawal of all foreign armed forces stationed in Korea and the organization of free elections for the whole country under the supervision of a body composed of representatives of neutral countries. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of China supported this declaration, and on its recommendation the Chinese volunteers withdrew from Korea during this year.

At the same time an appeal was addressed to the United States to follow that example and withdraw its armed forces from South Korea. The initiative with regard to the withdrawal of Chinese volunteers from North Korea was welcomed by all peace-loving peoples and appreciated as an important contribution to the reduction of international tension. The people of the world waited in vain for the United States to withdraw its armed forces from South Korea but, on the contrary, the United States Government has done nothing so far to justify the hopes which had been placed in it. The State Department of the United States has attempted to justify the maintenance of the United States troops in South Korea on the ground that they are there to protect South Korea from an alleged attack from the north. But we are convinced -- as are a number of other delegations here -- that there can be no possible justification for the stationing of United States troops in South Korea. The world is well aware - and the United States people are also aware -- of the fact that there is no danger from the north. In order to camouflage its aggressive actions, the United States is trying to hoodwink world public opinion by presenting arguments that have no basis. The keeping of United States troops in South Korea reflects the policy of positions of strength pursued by the United States, and this is proved by the fact that the same policy is being applied in other areas of the world.

The United States has occupied Taiwan. It sent a great number of ships to the Taiwan Strait under the pretext of protecting the United States and the so-called free world. It committed aggression in Lebanon and provoked a crisis in the Middle East with the same aim in mind; and, although thousands of miles separate these countries from the United States, this argument is upheld. But such a policy is doomed to a stalemate and to failure.

It is shameful that the United Nations is obliged to compromise itself in the eyes of the world in pursuance of this policy in Korea. The report of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea reverts to the well-known ideas of the United States and presents us with no constructive elements regarding the possible unification of Korea. In fact, we can expect no positive results with regard to a solution of the Korean question from a Commission whose members, in one way or another, represent the States which participated in the Korean war or are members of aggressive military blocs with the United States at the head.

In truth, the work accomplished so far by the Commission has not served the cause of the unification of Korea, but rather the continuation of the division of that country, and for that reason it would be only right that that so-called Commission should cease to function.

The report of the Commission stresses the economic situation in South Korea but, as a matter of fact, it does not give a true picture of the economic situation of the whole country; particularly does it fail to say a word about the success achieved in North Korea. The Korean People's Democratic Republic has made tremendous advances in economic, social and cultural fields. It has carried out successfully the first three-year plan and was able to raise by 2.8 the amount of total production in 1957 as compared to 1949, which was the year prior to the war. In the course of the present year industrial production increased by 34 per cent compared to the same period of the previous year. A great deal of construction work has been carried out all over the country and many efforts made in the field of culture and education. The amount devoted to culture and health in 1958 has been 2.7 times greater than in 1954. The gradual reduction in prices of foodstuffs and consumer goods by 30 per cent has been of assistance in improving the welfare of the population.

On the other hand, the economic and social situation in South Korea is quite different because of the war-like policy imposed by the United States, which results in constant need as far as the population is concerned. Unemployment figures have risen to a dangerous degree. The balance of payments showed a considerable deficit in 1957. Industrial production decreased by 14 per cent in January of this year, as compared to December 1957.

In order to cope with the considerable expenditures that are required to maintain the army, the police and the entire machinery of the State, both taxes and prices have increased. The United States is about to take over the reins of the economic life of South Korea and to give the orders there. According to information in the United States Press, American corporations such as General Electric and Standard Oil have managed to control the chief enterprises of the mining, coal and electric industries of South Korea. The so-called United States-Korea Treaty of Friendship, Trade and Navigation serves the purposes of the United States monopolies and accords to them the right to dominate and monopolize South Korea.

(Mr. Malile, Albania)

In the present state of affairs, the Chinese volunteers having been withdrawn from North Korea, there can be no reason to leave foreign troops still in occupation of South Korea. In his letter of 28 October, addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Assembly(A/C.1/810), the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Korean People's Democratic Republic stated very clearly that until the United States Armed Forces have evacuated South Korea, the unification of the country will be impossible.

The Republic of Albania and the people of Albania welcomed with satisfaction the proposals of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of China for the peaceful unification of Korea, considering them to be an invaluable contribution to the cause of peace in Asia and, therefore, in the world itself. It is most regrettable that, in the course of the present session, no solution has been reached so far because of the negative attitude adopted by the Western Powers. The draft resolution submitted by Australia and twelve other Powers contains no positive element that might lead to the unification of Korea, and for this reason the delegation of Albania will be unable to support it and will vote against it.

To arrive at a solution of the Korean question we believe that it is indispensable that the Members of our Organization be guided by a sincere desire, goodwill and objectivity, which are necessary if the problem is to be examined from the point of view of safeguarding the interests of the people of Korea and peace in the Far East.

Mr. ALEMAYEHOU (Ethiopia): I deem it appropriate to set forth the view of my delegation on agenda item 24, that is, the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, and to explain the position taken by my Government as regards the general question of Korea. Ethiopia is one of the sixteen countries which contributed military contingents to the United Nations Command in Korea. Ethiopia did not go to the Korean War for territorial, political, economic, or any other advantages whatsoever, nor has she ever in history displayed any hostile attitude toward any particular country or people in Asia and the Far East impelling her to take arms against such country or people. On the contrary, apart from normal, traditional friendship tying it to the countries in Asia and the Far East, Ethiopia has many things in common with those countries. It has experienced many injustices and sufferings in common with the countries of Asia and the Far East. It has common problems of political, economic, social and cultural import with the countries of Asia and the Far East, the solutions of which require common efforts and co-operation. Finally, Ethiopia is bound together with the countries of Asia and the Far East by lofty principles, such as those enunciated in the Declaration of Bandung. These manifold relations and common interests which Ethiopia has with these countries, and intends, not only to maintain but also to further promote are, I believe, sufficient proof that it has no intention to take any action designed to harm the interest or well being of any one of them.

As it has been very often stated by His Majesty the Emperor of Ethiopia, the foreign policy of the Ethiopian Government is based upon two main principles. The first of these is the strengthening of the collective security system of the United Nations and full co-operation with the United Nations in all matters affecting the peace and the general well being of the peoples of the world; and the second is to co-operate with all peace-loving nations of the world, in particular, with those of Africa and Asia, in all questions of common concern.

Our policy for a strong system of collective security of the United Nations stems from the profound conviction that the safety and, indeed, the very independent existence of small countries like ours, that have no sufficient means to defend themselves against external aggression, depend upon such strong system of collective security.

(Mr. Alemayehou, Ethiopia)

Others may doubt the validity of this conviction of ours. But we hold the view that the security of the small nations can never be ensured unless and until the Members of the United Nations, in particular the small nations, exert their determined efforts for an effective system of collective security, to be a reality within the United Nations. We say this from experience. We say this because we believe that, had there been such an effective system of collective security within the old League of Nations in 1934 through 1936, the safety of Ethiopia could have been guaranteed; the League itself would not have collapsed, and perhaps the Second World War might not have ensued.

The machinery for collective action by the United Nations to repel aggression and to maintain international peace and security is there in the Charter, as it was, to a certain extent, in the Covenant of the League of Nations. But, as the failure of the League to apply the machinery provided for in the Covenant of that Organization has brought -- to use the words of the Charter of the United Nations -- "untold sorrow to mankind," we believe that the failure of the United Nations to apply the machinery provided for in its Charter not only would render such Charter provision meaningless, but it would also bring to mankind much more disaster, perhaps hitherto unknown.

It is, therefore, this consideration -- the consideration of the necessity to apply the collective security system provided for in the Charter -- which motivated the Ethiopian Government to promptly respond, in accordance with Article 43 of the Charter, when the Security Council called upon all members in 1950 to contribute troops to the United Nations Command to repel aggression in Korea. We did this with other like-minded countries, in spite of our limited resources, both military and financial, because we believed that such action would strengthen the system of collective security, which alone could guarantee the peaceful existence of all nations, in particular of the small nations.

Thanks to the collective action by the United Nations, the situation in Korea today is not what it was in 1950 or in 1951. However unstable, however unreliable, there has been peace throughout Korea since the Armistice Agreement was signed in 1953. Extensive reconstruction work has been carried out in the Republic of South Korea, and the economic achievement of the Republic since the Armistice Agreement is considered to be remarkable. Similarly we have heard statements from

(Mr. Alemayehou, Ethiopia)

some delegations here that notable progress in economic and other fields has been made in North Korea. This could, naturally, not have been possible if it were not for the temporary peaceful condition existing in both parts as a result of the Armistice Agreement.

This is, of course, a good start, leading to the ultimate objective for which the United Nations Force went to Korea; that is, a stable and lasting peace; and we should, therefore, spare no effort in searching for ways and means by which this temporary peace could be transformed into such a stable and lasting one. But lasting peace does not seem possible in Korea as long as the present artificial situation persists: as long as Korea remains divided into two hostile camps. Korea must be reunified through peaceful means if normal conditions are to be restored in that country on a permanent basis, which, my delegation believes, is the fundamental objective of the United Nations.

It is encouraging to note that there is no difference of opinion on this fundamental issue here in the United Nations, nor is there any between the Republic of Korea and the North Korean authorities. The difference is not on the fundamental objective, but on the procedure to achieve that objective. It must be admitted, however, that this difference on procedure is an important difference. But I do not believe that the difficulty to reconcile the differing views are such that they cannot be overcome, provided that all possible efforts are exerted by all concerned, and that all possible ways and means of contact and exchange of views are made available for the parties directly concerned.

There is no doubt that, under normal circumstances, one of these ways and means to settle differences would be to bring the opposing parties together to listen to the arguments of both, and to make a decision or recommendation, as the case may be. In fact, this was the argument of a number of delegations in the present case, when they proposed that representatives of the North Korean authorities should be invited along with those of the Republic of Korea, to participate in the discussion of the Korean question, which argument my delegation finds it difficult to accept, for reasons which I am going to explain.

In the opinion of the Ethiopian delegation, this question has its legal as well as political aspects, and these two aspects must be considered separately, if the desired end is to be achieved without compromising the position of any party.

(Mr. Alemayehou, Ethiopia)

The United Nations has already taken a position on this question. It has declared itself that there was only one Government for Korea, and that that Government was the Government of the Republic of Korea. The same United Nations which thus declared itself cannot, therefore, invite the Government of the Republic and the authorities of North Korea to sit here on an equal basis without compromising its legal and moral position.

(Mr. Alemayehou, Ethiopia)

In our view, any decision of this august and respected Organization should not be based, in the first place, upon short-sighted political expediencies designed to serve the interest of one or the other group of Member States. It should be based instead, upon principles designed to serve the general interest of all peoples of the world and to promote peace among all nations of the world. But once the United Nations has made a decision, such decision should not be disregarded or sidestepped simply because it is not to the liking of one or the other group of Member States. The United Nations must not waver as regards decisions it has taken, if its legal and moral authority is to remain unimpaired and respected.

The position of my delegation is therefore that, legally, the United Nations has taken a definite stand on the Korean question and it must maintain that stand. But politically, the United Nations can help, in the opinion of my delegation, to facilitate solution of this difficult problem without compromising its legal position. It can direct or encourage the two parties most directly concerned to seek agreement on all outstanding questions separating them, through mediation, conciliation or other means of their choice, outside the United Nations. If such agreement can be reached, the United Nations can act later in conformity with the wishes of the parties concerned.

This method of settling differences outside the United Nations, but through the direction or encouragement of the United Nations, is provided for in the Charter, and I believe that it can be resorted to in this case. This is one way in which the United Nations can help to bring the two parties together without compromising its position. If there are other ways and means by which the two parties concerned can be brought together, all such ways and means must be explored by the United Nations, because, unless force is resorted to, the settlement of all outstanding differences between North and South Korea, as well as its peaceful reunification, can only be possible if and when the parties most directly concerned agree. Such agreement can only be possible when the parties are brought together to discuss their differences, perhaps with the assistance of mutual friends.

(Mr. Alemayehou, Ethiopia)

The United Nations has two main objectives in Korea: first, to repel aggression, and secondly, to restore normal conditions through peaceful reunification of that country. The first objective may perhaps be considered as achieved, inasmuch as the aggressor has been expelled from the territory he invaded. But whether or not the present temporary armed peace could be transformed into genuine and permanent peace depends upon the achievement of the second objective, that is, the restoration of normal conditions through the peaceful reunification of Korea.

My delegation cannot accept, therefore, the argument of some delegations that withdrawal of United Nations forces while the armies of the opposing sides are facing each other across the frontier, would make it easier for the two parties to settle their differences. On the contrary, withdrawal of United Nations forces under the present circumstances not only would make resumption of hostilities possible, but it would also perpetuate the division of Korea, which we all deplore. In our view, the presence of United Nations forces in Korea, while deterring aggression against South Korea, has never been and can never be a menace to the North. It has brought peace to Korea at least temporarily and has reduced tension considerably, thus giving the parties directly concerned full opportunity to think and reason in an atmosphere of calm, which is necessary in settling differences of this nature.

My delegation believes, therefore, that the United Nations should direct or encourage the parties directly concerned to get together along the lines that I suggested a moment ago, while United Nations forces are still in Korea, if the resumption of hostility or the perpetuation of the division of Korea is to be avoided. As to who should supervise the general election of an all-Korean National Assembly, the countries participating in the Korean war, on behalf of the United Nations, have proposed that the United Nations should supervise such elections, while the Communist authorities of North Korea preferred a neutral nations body to undertake the task.

This too is a proper subject requiring the agreement of the parties most directly concerned if only they could be brought together. In any case, there is a fundamental principle involved here to which my delegation attaches great importance. In reserving the position of the Ethiopian Government as regards this principle, my delegation, on behalf of Ethiopia, as one of the sixteen countries contributing forces to the United Nations Command in Korea, has co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.217 and will vote for it.

Mr. HERRARTE (Guatemala) (interpretation from Spanish): The sad and lamentable history of the Korean people in its painful tragedy teaches humanity a number of lessons. First of all, it proves to us the methods of cruelty utilized by one system to impose itself on the world, inasmuch as after the last war there were those of us who still believed in the coexistence of States and the fact that aggression had once and for all been wiped out from the earth.

Secondly, it has been a hard test for the United Nations to see to it that its decisions are respected and to impose peace, using collective measures to do so. Thirdly, it also teaches us what can be done by human effort, within an atmosphere of freedom, as witnessed by the rapid recuperation of the Korean Republic after the horrors of war. This question has been the subject of lengthy annual debates in the General Assembly because it has always been an important issue.

The last events are summed up adequately in the Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/3865) which was submitted to the present session. My delegation is happy to congratulate the members of the Commission for the important work which they have accomplished, despite the grave difficulties that have beset them at every step.

Notwithstanding what has been said on this thorny question, I should like briefly to make known the view of the delegation of Guatemala as regards this extremely arduous and difficult matter. It is true that the problem is old, but it is still up to date and new to us of the free nations of the world. Although the United Nations has not been able to solve the question entirely, the repeated position of the United Nations indicates condemnation for acts of aggression and also reiterates the desire of the United Nations to wind up this problem once and for all in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

The aggression against the Republic of Korea, with the determined intervention of Communist China, is something that is known and has been proved historically. Upon the appeal of the Republic of Korea, our Organization, in fulfillment of its fundamental duties and in accordance with Article 1 of the Charter -- which gives full authorization to the Organization to intervene in order to repel acts of aggression -- sent a United Nations expeditionary force to Korea, which achieved an armistice but which was not able to solve the serious problem of the reunification of Korea, a country which, by its history, by its tradition, by its customs and language, was one nation and should have remained so.

Mr. Herrarte, Guatemala)

The General Assembly has stated its purpose, 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;"
(General Assembly resolution 1180 (XII))

The only way to establish that united and democratic Korea is by means of free elections supervised by the United Nations. But this logical, practical and sincerely expressed measure was opposed and continues to be opposed with subterfuges by those Powers that wish to stimulate and encourage communist designs. The presence of United Nations troops in Korea, which went there to re-establish peace, has been criticized bitterly, and yet the aggressors are called "volunteers". We are also told that the United Nations forces should withdraw from Korea while the free elections that were supposed to be held have not as yet been held and a legally constituted government has not been elected for all Korea which truly reflects the desires of the people. The reason for this is that the aggressors wish to renew their aggression and they oppose elections supervised by the United Nations. There can be no comparison between the so-called "volunteers" of Communist China and the United Nations expeditionary forces since the latter went there to repel the aggression of the former. Furthermore, the United Nations forces have been reduced to the bare minimum.

For all these reasons my delegation enthusiastically supports the draft resolution submitted by Australia and twelve other countries (A/C.1/L.217) because we believe that the United Nations is thus repeating its intention to bring about the unification of Korea by peaceful means and for free elections. Otherwise, we would be sanctioning aggression and abandoning our position of equity and justice, a position that must guide the actions of the United Nations. We cannot shirk a responsibility which we assumed when the harmful effects of aggression, which caused that responsibility to be assumed, still exists just because a certain number of years have passed. If the so-called Chinese "volunteers" have already left Korea, as has been stated -- and this should be approved by our Organization -- then the interested parties have only to accept the idea of free elections supervised by the United Nations, and then a unified, legal government will be set up in Korea. The United Nations could then consider its task accomplished, it could withdraw its troops because its main duty, to do away with aggression and maintain peace in the Far East, had been accomplished.

Mr. DELGADO (Philippines): It was the determination of the Philippine delegation to participate in the debates during this session of the Assembly on controversial matters in a conciliatory manner and to contribute towards agreements acceptable to all. It was also our desire to assist in removing tensions and to help minimize, if not eradicate, recrimination and charges, so that goodwill may prevail in all debates.

But no sooner had the final vote been taken on the disarmament problem than the opposing camp publicized the hackneyed and unfounded charge that those who had voted for the successful resolutions had been improperly pressured, with all its disagreeable implications. It is because of this that we are constrained to participate in the present debate in a detailed manner, in an endeavour to show that as in the past our position now is based exclusively on the facts as established by the best available evidence and their analysis through logic and reason.

Emphasis has been laid on the industrial and agricultural progress made during the last few years by the North Korean Democratic People's Republic, based entirely on self-serving statements; but we still have to hear from its protectors how the officials of that Government have been elected or appointed. On the other hand, we have the several annual reports of the very Commission of the United Nations, showing not only progress on the material side but also the use of truly democratic processes in the election of the highest officials and members of the House of Representatives of the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea. We particularly call attention to Chapter III of the latest report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (Supplement No. 13 (A/3865) which shows undeniably that the President and Vice-President, as well as the members of the House of Representatives of the National Assembly, were elected in a free election which compares favourably to any free election held in the truly democratic countries of the world. The best evidence of the success there of the two-party -- or shall I say the multi-party -- system is the fact that while the President belongs to the majority party the Vice-President was of the opposition party. Not even the United States gives such extraordinary democratic proof as what has happened in the election.

(Mr. Delgado, Philippines)

As we face the problem of Korea once again, we wish it were possible to assure ourselves that it has been brought nearer to solution. The truth is that it has not. Korea remains the painful symbol of the irreconcilable divisions of our time.

We note this fact with dismay, but at the same time with a strengthened determination to explore all the avenues which will bring a just and democratic solution within the realm of the possible. There are two reasons why the Korean question is of the utmost importance: first, it is a test of whether the freely given wishes of a majority of the Assembly can be flouted indefinitely; and secondly, it is a test of whether this majority can tolerate an artificially-fostered strife to develop into a condition of permanent civil war.

The United Nations will stand in grave default if it refuses to recognize these issues. Fortunately, we do recognize them; and it is principally because of this that we choose to keep the question of Korea alive, in spite of the constant and humiliating disappointments which have attended our search for agreements.

(Mr. Delgado, Philippines)

The past year has not been altogether barren of encouraging developments. Irrespective of the motives behind the action, the withdrawal of the Communist Chinese Volunteers from North Korean soil and the recognition by the Communists of the principle of free elections under neutral supervision constitute a gain of sorts. They would seem at first sight to indicate a softening of the customary intransigence of the Communists in respect of Korea.

Unhappily, the hopes that we entertained upon receipt of these announcements proved unfounded. We now realize in the light of the subsequent exchanges of notes between the Unified Command and the Communist Chinese Government that the Communist proposals cannot become the basis for concrete agreements.

The key proposals of the Communists cover two points: first, the simultaneous withdrawal of "foreign" troops and Chinese volunteers from South and North Korea respectively; and, second, free elections under the supervision of a neutral organ following the withdrawal of troops.

The inequity of the first proposal is easily exposed when we recall that Communist China borders North Korea and that the volunteers, even if they withdrew, could remain on call at a moment's notice. On the other hand, the Unified Command would have to retire to bases beyond the immediate geographical vicinity of South Korea. Agreement on this proposal therefore would expose South Korea and the United Nations position to maximum risk while affording maximum protection to the Communist lines of defence and offence.

Moreover, in the absence of supervision and control, there would be no guarantee that the Chinese volunteers would in fact completely withdraw from North Korea. It is true that Communist China has offered to allow the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission to oversee its own initial withdrawal stages, but everyone knows that in the past the Commission had been unable to exercise its functions satisfactorily, precisely because of the roadblocks, legal and illegal, which North Korea had thrown in its path.

Regarding the second proposal, its tone of reasonableness evaporates on closer examination. First of all, it is necessary to note that the Communists have made the holding of free elections conditional upon the complete withdrawal of troops from both parts of Korea. Their subsequent refusal to make the

(Mr. Delgado, Philippines)

clarifications requested by the Unified Command serves to strengthen the suspicion that they have no intention of holding free elections in accordance with the mandate of the United Nations, and that the offer of free elections is in fact a transparent attempt to secure troop withdrawals and thereby obtain a military advantage in Korea.

The sequence of withdrawal followed by elections as proposed by the Communists is a disturbing one. It overlooks the fact that the United Nations Command is in Korea for a specific purpose. At the behest of the General Assembly, the Command is engaged in the necessary task of maintaining stability in the entire region and of promoting the conditions which would lead to the realization of the Assembly's purposes in Korea. To ask those troops to leave before those objectives are attained is to negate the wishes of the Assembly and to ensure the defeat of the principles upon which the whole United Nations action in Korea was premised.

Let us bear in mind the two points on which the Communist Chinese Government has remained conspicuously silent. Does the neutral organ envisaged by the Communists to supervise the elections mean that these elections would be under United Nations auspices? If we kept the proper perspective, it is unthinkable that they should be under auspices other than that of the United Nations; for the Korean war was not a mere conflict between nations or blocs of nations but a just action by the community of nations against a proven aggressor.

The second point is also significant. In the event of agreement on free elections, would the composition of the Korean National Assembly reflect, in proportion, the entire Korean people? Or would this Assembly, as the Communists had proposed at one time, be composed of half North Korean representatives and half South Korean? It is important to know beforehand, because the Communist alternative is no solution. It would merely perpetuate the tragic division which now exists and further aggravate the malady by leaving no hope of redress for those who desire the unification of the country through democratic means.

The other day the representative of the Soviet Union expressed the hope that the reunification of Korea would be achieved according to the wishes of the Korean people. This is an admirable attitude and it is one which on the face of it accords fully with the purposes of the United Nations. For our part, we can

(Mr. Delgado, Philippines)

only hope that in saying these words we and the Soviet Union attach the same meaning to them. For there is only one way by which we can achieve the unification of Korea on a just, equitable and democratic basis, and that is by proportionate representation in the National Assembly through the medium of free elections under United Nations auspices.

This is the main burden of the draft resolution before us. We consider it a privilege to co-sponsor it.

I wish to add that a few minutes ago I received a copy of the note communicated on 10 November 1958 -- that is, today -- by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Peking to the United Kingdom chargé d'affaires there for transmission to all the nations of the United Nations Command in Korea. If it were not so lengthy, consisting of two pages in single space, I should be glad to quote it. However, after a very minute scrutiny of the terms of this last note, I find nothing new in it. It is only a reiteration of the charges and aspersions made against the nations of the United Nations Command in Korea and it is also a reiteration of the proposals that I have just tried to show are inequitable, unjust and no solution of the problem of Korea. They insist on a withdrawal of all foreign troops prior to free elections and they insist on supervision by a neutral nations organ. May I ask, are not the members of the Commission sent by the United Nations actually made up from both sides of the controversy? Where can we find neutral nations that would not be on one side or the other in this controversy? For these reasons, I deem it unnecessary to go any further into this new note, which will be broadcast over all the radio systems concerned, I understand, sometime tonight.

Mr. SHAHA (Nepal): It is now ten years since the birth of the Republic of Korea, a country whose progress has been a source of great and continuing interest, especially to the peoples of Asia. The development of Korea and the problems it has thus far overcome have been in no small measure due to the efforts and assistance of the United Nations, and our support will continue to play a role in the further growth which is essential to a politically stable and peaceful Asia.

(Mr. Shaha, Nepal)

My delegation believes that our objectives in Korea have not changed. We must strive for an independent and unified Korea, one in which both the North and South can combine their political, economic, social and moral resources and put them to effective use for the entire country. Secondly, we must work towards the stabilization of peace and security in the area, removing the burdensome fear of foreign domination so that all efforts may be constructive efforts and not merely indications of a struggle for survival. Finally, there must be free and fair elections, enabling the entire population of Korea to determine their own government and chart their own future.

We are all aware of the progress that has been made in Korea during the ten short years of its existence. Politically, there has been a remarkable effort to set up the machinery for the growth of democracy, and this effort has met with a great measure of success. In the social field, we have seen the development of an educational system and a considerable rise in the standards of health. Industrially, the country has made rapid strides, and the general standard of living has been improved. We are pleased to note that progress is still going on, and we admire our Korean friends for their determination and strength, without which none of this would have been possible.

However, we are distressed to find that the growth of Korea is still being hampered by a basic disunity. Korea is a country which, in history and actuality, cannot be considered in two separate parts. The North and the South are inextricably bound together in every phase of national life. They must be considered together if they are to be considered at all. Together they form an entity, capable of a healthy measure of self-sufficiency, and capable of self-government. The interests of the North and the South are complementary, economically and socially, and it is for these reasons that we feel that the unification of Korea is a goal the importance of which cannot be minimized. The Koreans have shown immense courage in their fight for sustained peace and independence.

We, like several other delegations here, welcomed the news about the withdrawal of the Chinese Volunteers from North Korea which may in the long run prove to be a step forward in the solution of the Korean question.

As regards the matter of free and fair elections, we believe that in Korea, as elsewhere, only by giving the people a right to determine their own government can we hope to see them grow and take their place beside other independent nations in the international community. It had been suggested that elections take place under the supervision of the United Nations, or some subsidiary body of the United Nations. This proposal has not met with much success, however, and no facilities have been made available for a United Nations observation group. In the opinion of my delegation, there should be some means for ensuring that elections in Korea be conducted in a free atmosphere, whether it be under the auspices of the United Nations or some other impartial international agency, created especially for that purpose.

Unfortunately for the Korean people, the unification of their land is, with the passage of time, being more and more affected by the political division in our world. It is becoming more and more a part of the bigger issues in international relations which, unfortunately, are yet to be resolved. The fate and future for Korea, particularly, for the present seem to depend on the emergence of a newer and healthier outlook on international relations as a whole, with the gradual relaxation of tensions and the removal of the present atmosphere of fear and suspicion which prevails in the world between nations. Until international relations attain new health and vigour, we are afraid the Korean unification, which has become so much a part of the general peace settlement in the Far East, will not be accomplished, regardless of how much we might sympathize with the lot of the Korean people themselves.

We honestly feel that we cannot contribute to the solution of the Korean question in any way by taking a stand on the resolutions, one way or the other, because as I have tried to show, the solution of this question depends on the all-round improvement in international relations which may still take some time. For the time being, all that we can do is to hope and pray that the United Nations objectives in Korea will be fulfilled in due course, and until that happens, peace will be maintained in that land under the supervision of the United Nations.

Mr. ECUZA (Uruguay)(interpretation from Spanish): Since 1954 this Committee, and the General Assembly, have considered the so-called Korean question. The item is a hardy perennial on the agenda of our Organization. I think I should stress that at every session of the General Assembly, and by decisions adopted by important majorities, the Committee has always recommended -- and the General Assembly has decided -- to call to the attention of the Communist authorities concerned the continued determination of the United Nations 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.

The Assembly has further called upon these authorities to accept the established United Nations objectives in order to achieve a settlement in Korea based on the fundamental principles for unification as set forth by the nations participating on behalf of the United Nations in the Korean Political Conference held at Geneva in 1954 -- principles that were in due course reaffirmed by the General Assembly. The General Assembly has always urged the same authorities to agree at an early date on the holding of genuinely free elections in accordance with the principles endorsed by the General Assembly. Finally, the Assembly has requested the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea to continue its work in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly.

The fundamental principles for the unification of Korea, to which these decisions of the General Assembly refer, appeared in the report submitted to the United Nations on the Political Conference on Korea held in Geneva in 1954 by the countries participating in the action of the United Nations in Korea, and they read as follows:

"1. In accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the United Nations has a perfect right to take collective measures to repel aggression, restore peace and international security, and exercise its good offices so as to achieve a peaceful solution in Korea;

"2. In order to set up a unified, independent and democratic Korea, genuinely free elections should be held under the vigilance and aegis of the United Nations to elect representatives to a general assembly, the representation being in direct proportion to the indigenous population of the whole of Korea."

That report, with these principles, was adopted in resolution 811 (IX) of the General Assembly at a meeting held on 11 December 1954.

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

I never thought that too many dialectical efforts would have to be expended to make it obvious that the true, genuine and stable unification of Korea could only be carried out by means of genuinely free elections whereby the people of Korea could decide upon their destiny of which they are the sole arbiters. That is the only democratic way of expressing the political desire of a people and this way also accords perfectly with one of the fundamental principles of our Organization.

Where genuinely free elections are not held, where the indispensable multiplicity of public views are not listened to, when there is no freedom for expression of views on the part of the people, where the people are not allowed to enjoy the right to express their will and their desires, where the opposition is prohibited even from existing, where the Press, radio, films, theatre, arts and sciences are activities which only follow orders from above, where thoughts and ideas are not expressed, where elections are held merely to give a simple and vain appearance, where there is only one sound to be heard, where 99-9/10 per cent of the population is told how to vote, where there is no safeguard of classic individual rights and the economic and social rights of man that will permit of a dignified life to all human beings, where there is no assurance of the exercise of freedom and liberty against any unjust oppression, where there is no independence of property, where the power to exploit one's neighbour is the only power that exists, where correspondence is violable, where privacy is not respected, where people are not allowed to have their spiritual freedoms and where expression of thought is not allowed unless censored, there can be no democratic life, there can be no true democracy.

I do not think I am abusing the expression when I say that democratic means are the only means of achieving the results that we are seeking.

In order to respect these principles, the delegation of Uruguay warmly supports and will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.217 and submitted by Australia, Belgium, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States of America, which reiterates the decisions of the General Assembly to which I referred when I began my statement.

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

In view of the circumstances in Korea, of the damages caused by war, of the bloody intervention and of the constant threats, we feel that this draft resolution reaffirms a concrete desire to achieve a unified, democratic and independent Korea with a representative form of Government which will ensure the restoration of peace and security in the area. We will thus be reaffirming the double objectives of the United Nations in Korea, which are undoubtedly interlinked. We are thus proving that we are trying to achieve the unification without overlooking the principles that have been constantly supported by us. These are the principles that must be applied.

There is no need now to revive the tragedy of the Korean war or to live through it again, although it is true that we cannot forget that between the forces of the Unified Command of the United Nations 400,000 victims resulted, without counting the fact that countless persons lost their lives, their material possessions and their homes in Korea.

I think that we should pay tribute to the sponsors of this draft resolution when they mentioned elections as the only democratic way of expressing the will of the Korean peoples in accordance with the principles of the United Nations, since we are all bound to abide by such decisions. We feel that this draft resolution clearly seeks the unification of Korea, but wishes to achieve it along the only lines possible within the purview of our Organization and its principles. We could never countenance unification under despotism since it would only lead to the strengthening of totalitarianism. Therefore, we feel that this draft resolution is a necessary and a determined reaffirmation of the principles of the United Nations since it clearly restates them. Only by these means can we achieve a solution in Korea, without leaving ourselves open to games that we do not know too well.

The report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea that is before us for consideration at the present session points out that that Commission took note of the information gathered from the Press that elections took place in North Korea on 27 August 1957. It also stressed that the authorities concerned, as in the past, did not make it possible for the United Nations to control such elections.

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

The report also states:

"On 5 February 1958, the North Korean authorities issued a statement on 'the measures that should be taken without delay for the peaceful unification of Korea under the present situation.' They proposed:

"(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 may be conducted under the observation of a neutral nations organ';

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

"(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; and

"(iv) That the armies of North and South Korea should be respectively reduced to the minimum in the near future." (A/3865)

This quotation is from page 2 of the Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

Two days later the Government of the Chinese People's Republic published a declaration supporting this proposal and seconding it, describing it as an important contribution on the part of the Government of North Korea; and a few days later on 22 February 1958 the Communist side of the Military Armistice Commission transmitted to the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission a "Statement of the General Headquarters of the Chinese People's Volunteers," dated 20 February 1958, according to which the Chinese People's Volunteers, following a proposal made by the Government of the People's Republic of China after discussion with the North Korean authorities had "decided to withdraw from Korea in stages and complete the withdrawal before the end of 1958".

In later declarations from the Communist authorities concerned it was said that the Chinese People's Volunteers had already been partially withdrawn

The Commission stated that this occasioned an exchange of notes between the Government of the United Kingdom on behalf of the Governments of the countries which had contributed forces for the United Nations force in Korea, and the Government of the People's Republic of China. In the note of the United Kingdom satisfaction is expressed at the fact that the authorities of North Korea and the People's Republic of China appeared to be in favour of free elections; and the note also states that the United Kingdom received with pleasure the announcement that the Chinese forces would be withdrawn from North Korea, but seeks clarification regarding the interpretation to be given by these authorities to the principle of free elections, in view of the fact that news had been obtained that the representatives of North Korea had made various statements in Peking and Moscow to

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

the effect that the purpose of supervision by a neutral nations organization is not to intervene in the elections. The United Kingdom therefore stated that the Governments of the countries concerned would be glad to know whether, when the North Korean authorities speak of a "neutral nations organization" to supervise the elections, they accept that these elections should be held under United Nations auspices and that there should be adequate supervision not only of the preliminaries but also of the elections themselves. They also stated they would be glad to know whether it was accepted that representation in the new National Assembly would be calculated in proportion to the indigenous population.

As all members of the Committee know, this clarification was not forthcoming. Therefore, we can conclude, when all is said and done, only the withdrawal of foreign troops -- which is the way the United Nations forces that were sent there to fulfil the express mandate of the Charter to defend the basic principles of international law, are described -- only this withdrawal will satisfy the conditions laid down by the North Korean authorities for a peaceful solution of the Korean question, including the holding of free elections. Only when this condition is complied with will the Governments of North Korea and China propose that a conference be held with the countries concerned with the aim of completing negotiations for a peaceful settlement of the Korean problem; and therefore, once all foreign troops have been withdrawn from Korea these conversations might begin. According to this view, the so-called Chinese People's Volunteers would have to withdraw only a few kilometres, whereas the already reduced forces of the United Nations in Korea, defenders of law -- and may I say parenthetically, following the Armistice more than 275,000 men were withdrawn from Korea, leaving behind only two divisions and reserves, and the United Nations provided for these forces to remain in Korea as necessary to achieve the aims set forth in sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) of the operative part of resolution 376 (V) namely:

"(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;"

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

-- these United Nations forces, I say, would have to withdraw to their own countries or their bases, which, as the representative of the United States so clearly pointed out a few days ago, means nothing less than transporting them enormous distances away from Korea itself. Therefore, the intention is to establish an equation, taking elements, however, that are completely heterogenous. What analogy can be found between the withdrawal of the so-called Chinese People's Volunteers to the frontier of Korea and the withdrawal of the United Nations troops which were entrusted with their mission by this Organization to establish and maintain peace as well as to unify Korea?

The representative of the United States of America correctly recalled in his statement that once before the troops that some representatives here call the "foreign troops" had been withdrawn from Korea, and that later the Communist authorities of North Korea, pursuing their policy of aggression, had invaded the South, and that set the stage for the tragic conflict the consequences of which are still being lived through by us and suffered by the people of Korea.

The departure of the United Nations forces immediately and without delay would leave the objectives set forth in resolution 376 (V) unfulfilled. It would also frustrate the aim that the United Nations wishes to see achieved in Korea, that is to say, a unified, independent and democratic Korea. The armed attack unleashed in July of 1950 against the Republic of Korea by the forces of North Korea, forces which invaded the territory of the Republic of Korea along the 38th Parallel made it most dramatically evident that the system of regional security was insufficient. There was no previous agreement that would cover that area of the world, but the Security Council, acting in accordance with the report of the Special Commission of the United Nations which was in the field, found that there was incontrovertible proof of an act of aggression and armed attack, and therefore could recommend to Members that they help the victim of the aggression. The Security Council adopted the resolution by 9 votes to none, with 1 abstention, Yugoslavia, and with one country, the Soviet Union, absent, thereby deciding and affirming that the armed attack was a breach of the peace, requiring immediate cessation of hostilities and immediate withdrawal of forces to the area behind the 38th Parallel.

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

A few days later, by a vote of 7 to 1, note was taken of the fact that the authorities of North Korea had not ceased hostilities and had not withdrawn their armed forces behind the 38th Parallel. Since urgent military measures were required to re-establish peace and international security, it was recommended that Members of the United Nations should supply the Republic of Korea with the required assistance so as to repel the armed aggression. All this indicates that the various stages were undertaken in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter.

First, we tried to avoid bloodshed. We also tried to avoid the further aggravation of the situation, allowing sufficient time for peaceful methods of arriving at a solution. It was only when we saw that the provisional measures were not able to repel the aggression that we recommended that force should be used in the legitimate self-defense of the victims of aggression.

Thus, the resolutions of the Security Council, supported by fifty-three Members of the United Nations, and the decision of sixteen countries to contribute with their armed forces to the legitimate self-defense of the victim of aggression, became the first example of organized collective military action to repress the crime of aggression in the field of international relations. In this manner the great majority of the Members of the United Nations took their stand.

The essential element in this was that the aggression drew the condemnation of those who were not directly affected by it. The simple recommendation by the Security Council was sufficient to arouse the Members of the General Assembly to act together in fulfilment of the most essential of all the purposes of the United Nations, as set out in Article 1 of the Charter, to take effective collective measures to suppress acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace.

It is perfectly obvious that new horizons were opened in the field of collective security. With the resolution of the fifth session of the General Assembly, which made the Assembly competent to act in the field of collective security, we have witnessed the most constructive step taken since the San Francisco Conference to maintain international peace. Undoubtedly the five great Powers still bear a heavy responsibility which they assumed in Europe in the nineteenth century, but the new system has also added responsibilities

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

to the role of the smaller States in connection with international peace and security. Since the smaller nations lack the military power for aggression and conquest, they represent a very important influence for peace and international law. The smaller nations are devoted to peace. They are countries which cannot be suspected of conspiring to make war. It is therefore among the small nations that the true judges can be found to determine impartially whether or not aggression has taken place and what measures should be taken to repress it.

That is why, after careful consideration of the question, we have decided to speak in this debate and to express our views. We cannot accept the views expressed by the representative of the Soviet Union at our meeting on 5 November. He stated that there are two States in Korea. As far as we are concerned, there is only one Korea and only one Korean people with one history and one tradition. We are convinced that when the Korean people can once again really express their will, they will unhesitatingly reject any attempt to maintain the division.

The present situation in Korea is the result of a military situation of the Second World War when the Soviet Union began its domination of the area north of the 38th Parallel. This is a part of history which is too close to forget. Since that time the unification of Korea has been ~~harpered~~. Korea has not been able to establish itself as a unified democratic State.

Members will recall that in all the Assembly resolutions at the various sessions, the only feasible solution has always been warmly supported by the United States, which acted as the champion of peace and law when the United Nations required the assistance of Member States to repel aggression.

Our main concern must be that violence cannot be used as a solution of international problems. The law of the strongest must no longer prevail. The principles of our Charter and of international law must regulate the behavior of peoples and relations between States. A great jurist and humanist of our country, Dr. José Irureta Goyena, stated that aggression concentrates itself at the same time as it grows. It goes from the individual to the family, from the family to the city, from the city to the State. We have seen aggression retreat through the endless roads of history, and the State is the last bulwark of aggression. If aggression could be eliminated in this last bulwark, justice would take its place and the selfish motives of the cave dwellers would be wiped from the mind of man.

(Mr. Bouza, Uruguay)

And why not? Because if the justice of the family is substituted for that of the individual; the society for that of the family, and the state for that of the city, why is it that the justice of the community of states cannot once and for all replace the justice of the state itself?

When voting as we have stated we shall vote, we intend to imply that we insist that the United Nations will not shirk its responsibility before the Korean people. The Korean people have a right to live in accordance with their desires, to live in their entire territory and in full enjoyment of all their freedoms.

We hope that the draft resolution will be adopted by an overwhelming majority, and I add my voice to the appeal made by Mr. Tinaud, representative of France, that the authorities of North Korea and the Governments supporting it will bow to the inevitable and accept the holding of free elections leading to a reunification of the country according to the desires and the will and the interests of the people, as set forth in the draft resolution before us.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We are approaching the end of our debate on the Korean question. The Soviet Union delegation has listened carefully to the statements made by other delegations and, as we listened to the speeches of the representatives of the United States and some other countries, we wondered whether the United States representatives were not carried out away by their rocket launchings towards the moon, and whether they were thus carried away to the detriment of their sense of observation as to what is happening on earth.

The Korean question has been under discussion for more than ten years and it has not moved forward one iota. Even the representative of Australia, whose Government is so active in UNCURK, was constrained to acknowledge in the course of our deliberations that, as he put it, no substantial progress had been achieved towards the unification of Korea. He was too reticent and too euphemistic in his remarks. Not only has there been no substantial progress -- why not say it? -- no progress has been achieved towards the unification of Korea.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Now why is it that progress is lacking? The United States, the United Kingdom, Australia and certain other representatives told us that North Korea and the People's China would not listen to or obey the United Nations which adopts a resolution on the question every year. They will not obey the United States and all those others who maintain troops in South Korea. They will not heed the behest of these countries and the conditions which these countries would impose. They are -- listening to the statements of the representatives whom I have mentioned -- naughty and disobedient children and the United Nations, presumably, should spank them for being so naughty.

At the same time, the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom and some other countries spoke about the alleged aggressiveness of the People's China and of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea. And in so doing, for some reason, they overlooked the simple fact that it is not China which maintains military bases off the shores of the United States, but it is the United States which occupies South Korea and a part of China's inalienable territory, Taiwan. It is not the Chinese fleet which steams up and down off the shores of the United States, but it is the United States fleet which threatens the vital centres of the Chinese People's Republic. They forgot to mention that it is not Chinese military leaders who threaten the population of the United States, but United States Cabinet members and generals who boast of their readiness to use atomic and hydrogen weapons against the People's China and its population.

All the charges levelled at the People's China and the Korean People's Democratic Republic are utterly groundless and they have been bandied about in this Committee in the absence of representatives of the People's China and the Korean People's Democratic Republic. United States representatives and representatives of other countries apparently assume that this situation will continue for all time. But the majority in this Committee will surely agree with us that the time is bound to come when the Chinese People's Republic will come to the United Nations, when the Korean People's Democratic Republic will assert its rights as well. Surely everyone will agree that the time for the restoration of the People's China's legitimate rights is not so very far away; and then the People's China will come here and will supply answers to all these slanderous outbursts against its policy, and it will present its invoice to all those slanderers who so boldly speak in the absence of the legitimate representatives of the People's China.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

At the same time, it has been given to us to listen here to the representative of South Korea. In his speech, quite apart from a number of slanderous allegations against North Korea, there was one passage to which I should like to draw the attention of the Committee. The representative of South Korea said:

"... Some solution is going to emerge -- whether it be by force or by reason, in war or in peace." (A/C.1/PV.975, p. 23-25)

Now, one is bound to raise the question, why would the representative of South Korea present such an alternative?

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Why does he not only talk for the peaceful way of solving the Korean question? Why does he contemplate the two possibilities, either by force of war, or by reason and peace? It would seem to me that this statement of the representative of South Korea is not accidental. It is in keeping with the frame of mind and temper that prevails among the ruling circles of South Korea, and that is encouraged and fostered by the United States and by all those who maintain occupation troops on South Korean territory.

In July 1958, the South Korean President said that, at any cost, Communism must be put to an end, and he said only a very strong policy of liberation is compatible with the foundations of democracy. Statements of this kind by Syngman Rhee and other South Korean leaders are disseminated in very large publications in South Korea, and they frequently find their way into the pages of the American Press as well. South Korean leaders, like the representatives of the United States, continue to dream not only of a peaceful unification of Korea, but also a warlike way of achieving that objective. And, surely, this represents a manifest danger. That is why the delegation of the Soviet Union and the delegations of a number of other countries have emphasized the point that in the question of the unification of Korea a specific course must be chosen, and that is, to exclude altogether any military solution of the question, to ensure a peaceful unification of Korea only. And this is only possible on condition that foreign troops are withdrawn from both parts of Korea.

During the past year an important change has occurred in the situation in Korea, a change which all truly political men cannot fail to notice. The People's Volunteers have been withdrawn from North Korea. Even though representatives of individual countries for some reason would not send a representative commission to Korea to ascertain that the People's Volunteers have, in fact, been withdrawn, and however much these representatives, I say, may disparage or question this fact, their statements can, nevertheless, be disregarded. The People's Democratic Republic of Korea and the Chinese People's Republic likewise called for the withdrawal of American and other foreign troops from South Korea. Was this a legitimate demand? Surely, no objective observer, whether politician or statesman, will deny that foreign troops have been withdrawn from North Korea. It is only legitimate to raise the question of the withdrawal of troops from South Korea.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

What was the response to this legitimate demand on the part of those who speak of the unification of Korea and the liberation and the freedom of Korea?

The Australian representative who spoke here told us that the withdrawal of United Nations troops from South Korea would have vital importance because -- and I wish to draw attention to this -- it would remove the fundamental safeguard or guarantee that, at some time and in some way, the unity, freedom and independence of the whole Korean people will be secured. Consequently, the thinking of the Australian representative is that United Nations troops, or, rather, American troops supply the guarantee that, at some time and in some manner, the unity, freedom and independence of the whole Korean people will be secured. This statement cannot be construed in any way other than this: that in order to unify Korea and secure the freedom and independence of the whole Korean people, foreign troops must be kept there, and, presumably, they must be kept there because they are the ones who will carry out this unification of Korea. Surely no other sense can attach to the statement of the representative of Australia. So, as you see, in that statement, the representative not of South Korea, but a member of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea expressed the thought, not of a peaceful unification, but of a military unification.

The representative of the United States who spoke in this Committee likewise spoke of United Nations troops as constituting a guarantee or a safeguard, and he spoke of the impossibility of withdrawing these troops from Korea; and then he passed on to the topic of free elections, on which he had this to say:

"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." (A/C.1/PV.973, page 64-65)

But it is permissible to ask the representative of the United States: Why are you afraid of getting your troops out of South Korea? Why are you afraid of free elections after the withdrawal of American troops from South Korea? Are you scared lest the South Korean population repudiate your stooges, who are maintaining themselves on the bayonets of your troops?

You speak of free expression of the will. According to the rules of American democracy, is the freedom of expression of will secured by foreign troops who are foisted on a foreign territory? It suffices to put the question in this manner to reveal the spuriousness of the assertions of the representative of the United States, who speaks of freedom and democracy, and then ensures such freedom and democracy by dint of foreign bayonets.

We are opposed to the type of freedom and democracy that is imposed by the bayonets of foreign troops, and that is why we, incessantly and urgently, demand the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of other countries. If you stand for freedom and democracy, go ahead and elicit democratically the free expression of the people's will. Get your troops out of there, lest and before the Korean people itself throws them out.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

The representative of the United Kingdom, in his speech here, told us that:

"... at an earlier stage in our deliberations here, it was suggested that unification might well be achieved if only we were to get the two sides round a table." (A/C.1/PV.975, page 54-55)

Then Sir Pierson Dixon went on to say that:

"Very often, indeed, this is the right way of settling differences..." (Ibid.)

I was about to agree with Sir Pierson Dixon wholeheartedly, but then came the payoff in the next part of the sentence:

"...but, in my submission, it is not applicable to the present case." (Ibid.)

Now there was quite something. Everything sounded right and proper and then came the utter non sequitur that it is not applicable in the case in point. Why is it not applicable for North Koreans and South Koreans to sit around the same table and settle their differences peacefully? Why is this not applicable in the case of a people which by force of concatenation of circumstances over the past ten years has found itself split in two and now has the will and determination and desire to be unified? Why can you not do without foreign nurses, foreign nannies and foreign troops who are supposed to guarantee and secure and safeguard the freedom of the Korean people? We fail to understand logic of this kind.

We take it that the representative of the United Kingdom simply could not venture to follow his own accurate logic at the beginning, perhaps because he sits in such close propinquity to the representative of the United States, and this I profoundly regret. Among the orators, however, there were some of the members of that camp which maintain, or at least used to maintain, troops in South Korea, and who repeatedly helped adopt resolutions which endorse the general policy of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and other countries that participated in the Korean war.

I cannot pass over in silence, for example, the speech of the representative of Canada who, at the very end of his speech, very modestly and reticently expressed certain thoughts which are distinctly worthy of attention. He said:

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

"Yet we cannot make progress towards reunification unless we understand what it is that we can do and what, in the light of the facts of the situation, we cannot do." (A/C.1/PV.976, page 8)

Then he added the following:

"We must not cling to attitudes and formulae which do not fit the facts." (Ibid.)

I would suggest that this statement of the representative of Canada was a wise one. The time has come no longer to cling to positions and formulas which are not in keeping with the real facts. The time has come to float down out of cosmic space and on to our sinful earth. The representative of Canada added the following, departing somewhat from the framework of his previous statement:

"Yet we cannot probe for new positions as long as we are faced with nothing but intransigence from the other side." (Ibid.)

He concluded by saying that his delegation would vote for the draft resolution sponsored by Australia and twelve other countries. I can note that the representative of Canada tried to put one foot on the soil of sound and relevant facts. But then he shyly pulled it back and stood again on the old and what he thought safe and sound positions as set out in the draft resolution of Australia and the other twelve countries -- the old familiar soil.

Nevertheless, the thoughts of the representative of Canada may well cause those who will vote in favour of the thirteen-Power draft resolution to ponder the fact that the time has come to take new steps in a new direction.

The representative of Japan also was shy but a consistent follower of the position adverted to by the representative of Canada. The representative of Japan said:

"We believe, however, that the modalities through which these principles are to be embodied, can be flexible if certain conditions are accepted ... 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." (A/C.1/PV.977, page 47)

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

In other words, the representative of Japan adhered to the statement of the representative of Canada and let it be understood that he recognized that the modification of previous United Nations resolutions on the Korean question was possible and might be desirable, and that the General Assembly is competent to take such a reasonable step.

The fact that thoughts of this kind have been expressed by the representative of Canada, who has been a party to the general policy with regard to Korea, and by the representative of Japan, who has also supported, as a whole, the policy of the countries whose position is expressed in the thirteen-Power draft resolution, this circumstance has given us some second thoughts. Apparently the new situation which has obtained within the last year at least, seems to have called for or required a review of certain old positions and surely has compelled the representatives of these countries to think of a new way of approaching the solution of the Korean question.

In this connexion, we should like to draw attention to the speeches of many representatives in this room, especially representatives of Asian countries, who urged the necessity of finding it possible to review some old positions, finding or displaying some spirit of conciliation, which was mentioned by the representative of Ceylon and which even the representative of the Philippines seemed to touch upon.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

The Soviet delegation, like the delegations of other socialist countries, has repeatedly raised the question, and raises this question now, of the necessity of reviewing the old policy with regard to Korea, a policy which has found its expression in numerous resolutions adopted in past years, a policy which, however, has manifestly not moved the unification of Korea one step nearer. The old policy on the Korean question, the old way, must be dropped. The Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Chinese People's Republic are not naughty children, after all. In fact, may I suggest that they are not children at all. Those who have not succeeded in forcing them to do something by force of arms will surely not be able to force them to do something by means of draft resolutions, especially draft resolutions that are adopted by the force of votes of members of military blocs of the Western Powers.

A realistic path must be chosen taking into account the real state of affairs instead of engaging in phantasies and fancies, instead of floating fancy-free toward the moon. It is time to come down to earth. If we take a realistic look at the present situation, then I submit that there can be no doubt that only the withdrawal of foreign troops from Korean territory will open the door to genuine negotiations, to genuine steps to bring both sides of Korea closer together, bringing closer together the two States which are actually and very really existing in the two parts of Korea, getting them unified peacefully. That is one way. There is another way, the way of war. If anybody wants to take that path again, he is bound to rue the day he takes that decision.

The old approach must be abandoned; we must abandon the method of seeking to impose one's own positions on the other side, especially in the absence of that other side.

The representative of the United States and the representatives of the other countries that have co-sponsored the present draft resolution can draw some consolation, I suppose, from the fact that they are likely to put this resolution through by a certain majority of votes. But I submit that this is a poor consolation. We can tell them this: You are perfectly free to adopt another resolution, but this will not change anything in Korea. The adoption of another resolution of the same type that has been adopted over the past few years will only show that in reality you are opposed to the peaceful unification of Korea,

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

that you are committed to have Korea continue divided. You want to keep South Korea as a military marshalling area for aggressive actions against North Korea and against the Chinese People's Republic. In the opinion of the Soviet delegation, this is a policy which had best be dropped and the quicker the better, both for the prestige of the United Nations and for the sake of all of those who are indeed eager to achieve the peaceful unification of Korea.

Today the United States is still in a position to gather enough votes to put through its resolutions. Perhaps tomorrow the United States will no longer be able to do so because those who already have certain misgivings and qualms, but who are unable to break through the vicious circle to which they have been committed ever since the beginning of the Korean War, will by then have dropped out.

The Soviet delegation will vote against the draft resolution sponsored by the United States and certain other countries whose troops participated in the Korean War, or who otherwise participated in the Korean War, because the Soviet delegation feels that this draft resolution will bring no solution of the Korean question. It merely puts the stamp of approval on erroneous decisions adopted previously, decisions whose incorrectness have been proved by life itself.

We are opposed to the division of Korea. We favour the peaceful unification of Korea. That is why we urge the withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea and the solution of the question through peaceful negotiations between the Governments of North and South Korea.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): With the statement we have just heard from the representative of the Soviet Union, the list of speakers in the general debate is concluded. There are some representatives who have asked to be allowed to exercise their right of reply. The first is the representative of Sweden, and I now call on her.

Mrs. ROSSEL (Sweden): Since the representative of Ceylon in his statement this morning made some remarks as to the responsibilities of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission, of which Sweden is a member, I wish under rule 116 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure to make the following brief observations.

First of all, I want to recall that the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission derives its existence from the Korean Armistice Agreement and that the terms of reference of the Commission are laid down in articles 13 and 28 of that Agreement. It follows from these articles that the task of the Commission is limited to certain clearly-defined functions of control, inspection and investigation.

As the Swedish Government has stated on various occasions, it has for a number of reasons not been possible for the Commission to exercise even the above-mentioned limited functions assigned to it by the Armistice Agreement. In this connexion it might be recalled that this situation has led the Swedish Government to consider whether Sweden should continue to serve as a member of the Commission. It is also obvious that under the present mandate the Commission is able to act only on the basis of agreement by the two parties to the Armistice Agreement, and consequently is not entitled to assume any task of such a kind as was suggested by one of the parties to the Armistice Agreement in requesting the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission to supervise the withdrawal of the Chinese volunteers. There can, therefore, be no doubt that the position of the Commission in this matter was taken in full accordance with its duties and responsibilities.

What I have said now does not, of course, mean that the Swedish Government would be indifferent as regards the efforts to find a positive solution of the Korean problem. On the contrary, we are most anxious that a peaceful and equitable settlement of this vital question should be reached.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (United States of America): I scarcely think it is necessary to make a categoric reply to many of the things that have been said here. I think the facts, the evidence and the history make the replies self-evident. I should like, however, for just a moment, with your indulgence, and exercising the right of reply, to recount a few facts of history.

In the first place, it is undisputed that the division between North and South Korea was occasioned solely to accept the surrender of the Japanese forces in the peninsula of Korea. It was thoroughly agreed, as members will recall, that immediately thereafter the question of unification and free elections in Korea was to be decided and to be implemented. This the Soviet occupying forces in North Korea adamantly and consistently refused to grant. They even refused to reply to the requests for the implementation of that agreement.

The question of freedom of elections perhaps can be referred to as a matter of definition. The overwhelming number of nations of the world know what free elections mean. They mean elections where the citizen has a choice, where he can freely exercise his choice to vote yes or no, either on candidates or on issues. He can have a selection of candidates and he can vote in secrecy and with the protection which a free government could give him. Those are free elections in the eyes of most of the world. Apparently, under the Soviet philosophy of free elections, one has freedom to vote yes for the ruling clique but has no freedom to vote no against the ruling clique. That, apparently, is the Soviet definition of a free election. There is a vital difference of definition, apparently.

With regard to the matter of the troop withdrawals about which we have heard so much, I once heard an old saying that was attributed to a very wise fellow. He said, "If you deceive me once, shame on you; if you deceive me twice, shame on me." We of the free world have been deceived once on a troop withdrawal. In good faith the United Nations withdrew its troops from Korea, and the deception immediately began.

(Mr. Hickenlooper,
United States)

It has been said here repeatedly by the Soviet bloc that South Korea was the aggressor. Well, if defending one's territory after having been invaded is aggression, then it is a new, or at least a novel and distinct, definition of the term "aggression". I think I do not need to belabour that point as to who was the aggressor in the Korean war. This body has decided that question overwhelmingly.

The representative of the Soviet Union said that the United States desired to hold elections in Korea at the point of American bayonets, or words to that effect. The United States has never sponsored the holding of elections, nor the determination of regimes, at the point of American bayonets. I can only say that I prefer the policies of the United States and the rest of the free world to the ruthless suppression of freedom and the bloody putting down of the aspirations of those who desired freedom in Hungary. I prefer the methods which the United Nations desires to use, rather than the methods which the Soviet Union used in the recent Hungarian catastrophe.

Mr. FORSYTH (Australia): I should like to make a brief reply to a remark by the representative of the Soviet Union in his statement made this evening. In one passage the representative misinterpreted the statement made in **this debate** on behalf of the delegation of Australia. In effect the representative of the Soviet Union interpreted the Australian statement as saying that the purpose of the United Nations forces now in Korea is to bring about unification by force. Of course, this was not the meaning and not the intention of the passage which the Soviet representative cited out of its context. He also ignored another passage in the Australian statement which gave our view on the purpose for which the United Nations forces remain in Korea. My statement is on record and, read as a whole, it will not bear out the interpretation placed upon it by the representative of the Soviet Union.

There is no intention to suggest that United Nations forces would ever be used for aggression, and the very idea is absurd. The United Nations forces **remain in Korea in order** to ensure that there will not be a new aggression from the North. It is in this sense that the statement was made: to preserve conditions in which a peaceful solution will be possible.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): With the statements that we have just heard, we have now concluded the general debate on the Korean question. In accordance with the general practice followed in the United Nations, we should now proceed to specific consideration of the one draft resolution that is before the Committee: namely, that contained in document A/C.1/L.217, a draft resolution submitted by thirteen countries.

Mr. AMADEO (Argentina)(interpretation from Spanish): I should like to speak on a point of order. In view of the late hour it can hardly be presumed that we shall finish the debate on this item today, considering the stage we are now at. Therefore, for this reason and because some delegations might wish to exchange viewpoints on other problems connected with our work, I would request you, Mr. Chairman, to submit for the consideration of the Committee a proposal to adjourn the meeting until tomorrow morning. I make a formal motion that we adjourn now and reconvene tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of Argentina has made a motion for the adjournment of the meeting. According to the rules of procedure, I must put this motion to the vote immediately.

The proposal for adjournment was adopted by 48 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee will reconvene at 10.30 a.m. tomorrow to take up the specific matter of the draft resolution presented on the Korean question.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.