

UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED  
A/C.1/PV.814  
3 January 1957  
ENGLISH

---

Eleventh Session  
FIRST COMMITTEE  
VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHT HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH MEETING  
Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Thursday, 3 January 1957, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. BELAUNDE

(Peru)

The Korean question [21]

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.814. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

57-00232

THE KOREAN QUESTION [Agenda item 21]

- (a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE UNIFICATION AND REHABILITATION OF KOREA
- (b) PROBLEM OF EX-PRISONERS OF THE KOREAN WAR: REPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In accordance with the announcement made yesterday, the item on our agenda is the Korean question. The documents before the Committee today are the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/3172) and the report of the Government of India on the problem of ex-prisoners of the Korean war (A/3203). I would also like to draw the attention of members of the Committee to document A/C.1/L.157, the draft resolution submitted by the United States of America.

Mr. GREENBAUM (United States of America): Members of this Committee will recall that it has been its practice to invite a representative of the Republic of Korea to participate in our deliberations on the Korean question. It is right and proper that this privilege be accorded to the Republic of Korea again this year.

The Republic of Korea was the victim of the aggression which called forth the United Nations collective action in Korea. The Republic of Korea represents the vast majority of the Korean people and should be given the opportunity to state its views on this item which so vitally affects its future.

The United States has accordingly submitted the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.157 which provides that a representative of the Republic of Korea be invited to participate, without the right to vote, in our discussions on the Korean question. I am confident that this proposal will commend itself to a large majority of the members of this Committee, as it has in the past.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): It is for the Committee now to make a decision on the proposal submitted by the delegation of the United States to invite a representative of the Republic of Korea to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the Korean question. Are there any objections to this proposal?

Mr. LALL (India): While it is true that in previous years the First Committee in its wisdom has decided to seat a representative of South Korea to participate, without the right to vote, in its discussions on this matter, we have just seen this draft resolution and it will undoubtedly be the case that delegations will wish to submit amendments to it. That being so, and if there is to be any substantive debate on this issue today -- and I would request the Chairman to ascertain whether there will be any debate, whether in fact there will be an opening of this issue today -- if that is the case, and in view of the normal rules regarding resolutions, I would suggest that we adjourn consideration of this matter until such time as we really embark on the consideration of this item. That will give us time to see what amendments would be appropriate and it would be more in accordance with the rules of procedure.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I only wish that I had a divining rod so that I could find out exactly what is the intention of the members of this Committee with regard to this matter and so that I should be able to divine exactly which representatives wish to speak today. In view of the fact that I do not have a divining rod, I cannot reply immediately to the representative of India. I am sure that the representative of India is aware of the fact that according to rule 121 of our rules of procedure proposals and amendments shall be submitted in writing and handed to the Secretary-General so that copies may be circulated to the delegations. The rule goes on to say:

"As a general rule, no proposal shall be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting of the committee unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegations not later than the day preceding the meeting."

It is true that the rule goes on to state that the Chairman may permit the discussion and consideration of amendments or of motions as to procedure, even though they have not been circulated or have only been circulated on the same day. Therefore, if the Indian delegation wishes to submit an amendment to the United States draft resolution, naturally I would entertain such an amendment.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): My colleague said a moment ago that unless the Committee so decided, perhaps we could take this matter up when the debate was opened, but he pointed out that we did not hold any very strong views on this. If it is the desire of the Committee that we should proceed to deal with this draft resolution, we would not stand in the way, but whether we deal with it now or at any other time, we should like this draft resolution to be amended by the substitution of the word "representatives" for the words "a representative" and the addition of the words "North and South" between the word "the" in the first line and the word "Republic".

The purpose of this amendment is quite evident. We think that the Committee should either discuss this question on its own without the assistance of the two contending parties or, alternatively, we should have both representatives here. This is not a new position; it is a position my delegation has always maintained. My delegation believes that it is possible for us to discuss this matter without

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

the presence of either of the two parties, because we have all the material and it will be a decision of the United Nations, of which neither side is a Member. On the other hand, there is something to be said for the position that those concerned should be present, and we would have no objection to that, but both sides should be present. We would be very glad to support an invitation to the representative of the Republic of South Korea parallel with the representation of the other side.

Therefore, my delegation wishes to submit the amendment I have outlined. I apologize for moving this amendment verbally but, as will be appreciated, this draft resolution has only just come before us. If the Chairman decides that the Committee cannot proceed before the text of the amendment is before the representatives, then we shall have to ask for such facilities as are necessary to be given for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to tell the representative of India that the question of an invitation to the representatives of Korea is a procedural question and, therefore, there is no need strictly to apply rule 121. For this reason, as well as for reasons of courtesy towards the representative of India, I shall consider that an amendment has been submitted to the United States draft resolution.

Mr. TERAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union delegation supports the proposal made by the delegation of India that the United States draft resolution should be so amended that a representative of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea would also be invited to participate in the discussion of this question. In submitting his draft resolution a few moments ago, the representative of the United States stated that the question to be discussed was of vital importance to and affected the future of Korea. However, as we all know, the South Korean representatives do not represent the whole country. They can appear here only as representatives of one part of the country, that of southern Korea.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

When we speak of a question of vital importance to the future of the whole country of Korea, then an invitation should be extended to the representatives of both parts of that country. For that reason, we consider that it is necessary to invite a representative of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion. Without the participation of such a representative, the question would be dealt with in a one-sided and biased manner which would not enable us to carry out the tasks involved in arriving at a correct decision on the Korean question as a whole.

Mr. TSIANG (China): The draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the United States corresponds to the procedure which has been adopted in the proceedings of this Committee when the question of Korea has been discussed. We have issued an invitation to the representative of the Republic of Korea year after year for five or six years.

The Republic of Korea has a special place in this Organization. In fact, the Government of the Republic of Korea was established under the auspices of the United Nations. The members of the Committee will recall that early in the history of this Organization the United Nations sent a commission to supervise the establishment of a government in Korea. The authorities in South Korea co-operated with the United Nations. They did everything the Commission asked of them. Elections were held and, as a result, a constitution was drafted and the Commission certified to this Organization that the Government of the Republic of Korea was the only legal government for the people of Korea. Therefore, the recognition of the Republic of Korea as the only legal government has a known history behind it, and it has been certified to us as such by the United Nations Commission.

(Mr. Tsiang, China)

On the other hand, the northern regime in Korea has also a special status in the United Nations, the status of an aggressor, and I do not believe it is right that this body should treat the regime of North Korea on a basis of equality with the Republic of Korea. If we did that, we would be contradicting and destroying all our efforts in the past to uphold democratic and peaceful procedures for the Member States and for the other countries of the world. I think it is only proper and just that we should adopt this draft resolution without any amendment whatsoever.

Mr. WINKLER (Czechoslovakia): The paramount objective of any settlement of the Korean question is and must remain the national unification of Korea by peaceful means.

When proceeding to our deliberations on the Korean question with this paramount objective in our minds, it is necessary, in our opinion, to arrange for such conditions as would ensure a comprehensive, objective and unbiased consideration of the question. The unification of Korea being the ultimate objective, our discussions here directly affect the vital interests of the entire Korean people. Consequently, the Korean problem cannot be usefully discussed in the absence of the representatives of the Korean people, and in particular in the absence of a representative of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea. It is therefore only reasonable and just that representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic should also take part in our discussions. To exclude these representatives from participation in our deliberations would not only be contrary to the requirements of justice and to the fundamental principles of democracy, but it would also mean that we were approaching the consideration of the problem without any real hope of achieving positive results. How can we hope to achieve the creation of a unified, independent and democratic Korea or even contribute to this end without the participation of the parties most directly concerned? The experience of past years proves that the creation of a unified Korea cannot be brought about by a unilateral action. Unification requires broad co-operation of both parties in Korea and calls for actions in many fields by mutual agreement based on mutually acceptable principles. The cessation of hostilities in Korea was achieved, and could only have been achieved, through agreement of the parties concerned. A peaceful solution of the Korean problem

(Mr. Winkler, Czechoslovakia)

must also be sought by those same means. The participation of representatives of the Korean people in our discussions could, in our opinion, be an important step towards this end.

The representative of the United States referred to the fact that in past years only representatives of South Korea were invited to participate in the deliberations of this Committee on the Korean question. It is true that such has been the practice in this Committee up to now. But it is equally true that no positive results have been achieved in this Committee or in the General Assembly towards the peaceful solution of the Korean problem. In our opinion this lack of results is to a great extent due precisely to this unjust practice in our Committee. I submit that the time has come to abandon this unfair practice of the past and to adopt a procedure which would be in accordance with justice and which, moreover, would help to make real progress in the realization of our objective, namely, in the national unification of Korea by peaceful means and thereby also in the strengthening of international peace and security in the Far East.

For these reasons, the Czechoslovak delegation supports the amendment submitted to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.157, an amendment submitted by the delegation of India, namely, the proposal that, along with representatives of South Korea, representatives of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea should be invited to participate in the First Committee's discussions on the question of Korea. Should this amendment be rejected, the Czechoslovak delegation will oppose the proposal submitted by the delegation of the United States which invites only one of the parties concerned to participate in the discussions.

Mr. KHOMAN (Thailand): I should like to say that the question that is now before the Committee is very simple. The First Committee has examined this question before and it decided to invite only the representative of the Republic of Korea, that is, South Korea.

In this question my delegation feels that the invitation to the Republic of Korea is made on the basis that the Republic of Korea has been the victim of an aggression and that it is proper for the United Nations, which has taken part in resisting aggression in Korea, to invite the representative of the Republic of Korea.



(Mr. Khoman, Thailand)

As to the argument that the representative of North Korea should also be invited so as to facilitate a settlement of this question, I should like to refer the members of the Committee to the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. Paragraph 9 on page 2 of this report states:

"There has been no evidence during the year that the attitude of the authorities in North Korea has undergone any basic change. They have been reported as expressing a wish for contacts between the north and south, but have shown no signs of acceptance of the principles on which the United Nations believes progress can be based."

(Mr. Khoman, Thailand)

I believe that the statement in paragraph 9 of the report of the Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea is self-explanatory and will dispel any illusion that the members of this Committee may have as to the possibility of settlement which might be brought about by the invitation of a representative of North Korea.

Under these circumstances, my delegation will support the draft resolution presented by the United States delegation and will have to oppose the amendment that has been submitted to that draft resolution.

Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): My delegation agrees with the proposal to invite a representative of the Republic of Korea to participate without the right of vote in the discussion of the Korean question, and it will therefore support the draft resolution put forward by the United States delegation. As to the amendment proposed to the resolution, the effect of which would be to extend an invitation to be represented to the North Korean authorities, my delegation finds itself unable this year, as it was unable last year, to support such a proposal.

As I said when the same question came up at a meeting of the First Committee on 10 November 1955, it would be neither appropriate nor useful to invite the North Korean authorities to this table. It would not be appropriate, I said at the time, because the North Korean regime had "not shown due respect for the authority of the United Nations". Nothing that I am aware of has occurred during the past fourteen months which would lead me to change that view. It would not be useful to invite the North Korean authorities because their presence here could not contribute to a settlement of the Korean problem.

Mr. BELCVSKI (Yugoslavia): Before addressing myself to the particular problem before us, I wish to point out that, in the opinion of my delegation, the present situation with regard to the Korean question does not offer much hope that we might make a significant step forward toward the solution of the Korean problem as a whole or at least of some of its most important aspects. For this reason, my delegation believes that it was perhaps not advisable to undertake the study of the Korean question at such a relatively early date, and it altogether fails to understand, from the point of view of the political expediency of achieving real

(Mr. Belovski, Yugoslavia)

progress, the steps taken in that direction. In fact, my delegation believes that no real progress can be achieved by trying to force the issue. Our previous debates relating to this problem have proved with sufficient clarity that progress can be attained only if there is agreement among all the parties involved and if an atmosphere of greater confidence prevails among them.

This does not mean, of course, that my delegation considers that no sincere and energetic efforts should be made in order to find a solution. My delegation has followed with the greatest attention all the initiatives aimed at reaching such a solution. The participation of all the parties involved and the manifestation of mutual understanding and co-operation of the interested parties for the purpose of finding acceptable solutions are indispensable pre-conditions for the attainment of genuine progress, as has been amply proved by the experience of our earlier debates and the history of the Korean question itself.

My delegation therefore believes that at the present moment, when we are beginning to consider the Korean question, it is impossible not to take a clear stand in favour of inviting representatives of both parties, the Government of the People's Republic of Korea and the Government of the Republic of Korea, to take part in the discussions concerning this question within the framework of our Organization.

The stand of my delegation and of my Government is not at all new. It has been stated and explained at the previous sessions of the General Assembly. I merely wish to emphasize again that the first step toward the solution of this question, if we do not wish the debate concerning this problem to pursue a one-sided course and if we are sincerely striving to have the debate contribute to the attainment of a solution, should be to hear the views of all the parties concerned. Otherwise, in the opinion of my delegation, it would be impossible to make progress toward the solution of the serious problems which have arisen as a result of the situation in Korea -- a situation which is certainly not in harmony with the justified wishes of the Korean people to achieve its unity and to eliminate all tensions in that area, which is of such vital importance for world peace.

(Mr. Belovski, Yugoslavia)

Consequently, my delegation will give its support, as it has done in the past, to all proposals pursuing the above aims, and it will vote accordingly -- which, in this particular case, means supporting the amendment submitted by the delegation of India. In my opinion, the best way to promote an improvement of the atmosphere and to establish the foundations of genuine and lasting solutions would be to provide the competent representatives of all the interested parties with the opportunity of participating in the discussion of the Korean question.

Mr. GREENBAUM (United States of America): The United States delegation strongly opposes and will vote against the amendment submitted by the delegation of India. We should not for one moment forget that the North Korean regime was found by the General Assembly to be guilty of having committed aggression in Korea. That regime has done nothing whatever to purge itself of its aggression. It has never accepted the competence of the United Nations on the Korean problem. In our view, it would be unthinkable to invite representatives of that regime to participate in our debate. The attitude of the Communists remains unchanged, and it therefore would not be useful to hear them now. For these reasons, we will vote negatively on the amendment offered by the Indian delegation.

Mr. GLEBKO (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Yesterday a majority of the First Committee voted to consider the Korean question as the first item on our agenda, although, as a number of representatives rightly pointed out, we have more urgent and imperative problems before us, such as disarmament, the Algerian question and other problems. However, since the decision was adopted to consider the Korean question first, we must exert all our efforts to see that the discussion takes place in a calm and business-like atmosphere and under conditions of impartiality and justice.

But what we see is that the representatives of the United States and other countries want to lead us onto another path -- the path of a unilateral, tendentious and biased consideration of the Korean question. How otherwise

(Mr. Glebko, Byelorussian SSR)

can we explain the submission by the United States delegation of a draft resolution which would have the effect of inviting to our Committee the representatives of South Korea only? This year, we witness once again this unworthy political game as the representatives of the Korean Democratic People's Republic are denied access to a discussion of a question which directly affects the people of the Korean Democratic People's Republic. Manoeuvres designed to exclude the representatives of the Korean Democratic People's Republic, where a considerable part of the entire population of Korea live, are repeated annually. But is it not clear that without the participation of the Korean Democratic People's Republic no discussion of the Korean question can yield positive results? As many years of discussion of this question in the United Nations without the participation of the representatives of the Korean Democratic People's Republic have shown, such a procedure cannot go beyond the framework of an abstract discussion.

(Mr. Glebko,  
Byelorussian SSR)

In order to promote a businesslike solution of the Korean question we must invite the representatives of the Korean Democratic People's Republic and hear their point of view. Who but these people can know the real aspirations of the Korean people?

We know the great contribution made by the Korean People's Republic to ending the war in Korea. The Korean People's Republic has unfailingly exerted its efforts towards bringing about the peaceful utilization of Korea; and it has unfailingly pursued a policy of friendship and peace among peoples. We are convinced that the participation of a delegation of the Korean Democratic People's Republic in the discussion of the Korean question in the United Nations might furnish constructive and valuable proposals which would assist in settling the Korean question.

The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers that it is time to put an end to the policy of discrimination against the Korean Democratic People's Republic. The Korean Democratic People's Republic must have the opportunity to participate in the discussion of the Korean question. To deprive it of this opportunity means not only failing to reckon with elementary principles of justice and the requirements of the Charter; it means embarking once again on the path of fruitless general discussions on Korea.

In view of all this, we wholeheartedly support the amendment submitted by the Indian delegation. If this amendment is rejected, the Byelorussian delegation will be compelled to vote against the draft resolution submitted by the representative of the United States.

Mr. KATZ-SUCHY (Poland): Yesterday during the preliminary debate in this Committee, when discussing the order of the items on the agenda, my delegation supported those moves in favour of having the Korean issue placed as the last item on the agenda of the Committee. We did so because we share the pessimism expressed today by the representative of Yugoslavia inasmuch as there is not much hope of reaching a solution even at this session. This pessimism of ours has been fully confirmed today by the attitude which seems to be taken by a majority of the members of this Committee with regard to a

(Mr. Katz-Suchy, Poland)

proposal which aims to correct the abnormal situation, that in an issue concerning two parties, consistently and year after year, only one party is being heard, in violation of the generally accepted principle of audiatur et altera pars.

It may be that the issue seems this year to many of the representatives present to be repetitious. It may be that all of us know that it has already been prejudged and that in spite of all the moves the representative of the Korean Democratic People's Republic will not be invited. If I take the floor in spite of these feelings, I do so because, in my opinion and in the opinion of my delegation, the approach to the problem of giving a hearing to both parties is a test of the sincerity of the desire of this Committee to find an acceptable solution.

We must be aware that this issue is not an issue concerning one party only; it is an issue concerning two parties, two countries, and no agreement reached here can be implemented if it has not been worked out with both parties concerned, with their agreement and their support.

The representative of the United Kingdom considers that it is neither appropriate nor useful to invite the representatives of the Government of North Korea here, because their presence will not contribute to a solution I beg to submit a question. Does the United Kingdom delegation consider that the absence of a representative of the Korean Democratic People's Republic will contribute to a solution?

We have already the experience of many years that resolutions have been adopted by larger or smaller majorities without our moving one step nearer to a solution. In addition, our experience in the past of inviting the South Korean representative, and the South Korean representative only, has shown that this has made very little contribution towards a solution of the problem. On the contrary, we all remember a certain unpleasant incident here before this Committee, when the representative of South Korea took the liberty of attacking certain delegations in an unprecedented manner. I think that should be a warning to many delegations against repeating the unwarranted practice followed in the past.

The representative of Thailand considers that there is no need to invite the representative of the Korean Democratic People's Republic, because according to

the report there is no evidence to show that during the year their attitude has undergone a basic change. However, the same paragraph of that report mentions that the representatives of the Korean Democratic People's Republic have been expressing a wish for a contact between North and South Korea and that they were supporting moves for a conference outside the framework of the United Nations to discuss the settlement of the Korean question. I wonder whether they can be blamed for that.

First, the majority of the Committee bars their admission here and adopts a resolution concerning them without even asking their opinion, adopts a resolution directed against their Government, and continuously bars it from appearing here. The Committee says, "We cannot admit them, because they do not accept our decisions." I think that is an attitude which could be called at least unfair. The report says that they have not accepted the principles of the United Nations. I think that such an attitude is contrary to the principles of the United Nations. The principles of the United Nations demand that decisions and solutions be reached by agreement and arrived at by mutual understanding. This is going very far from such an attitude.

I raise this issue because, under the terms of the Korean armistice, my country is one of those which, as a member of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission, was entrusted with the task of supervising the terms of the Armistice Agreement and seeing that they were maintained and implemented. We are therefore concerned, out of our general attitude, that a speedy solution be reached and that such a solution be found that will move the question nearer to the basic aim, which should be common to all of us; a unification of Korea as one unified democratic State.



(Mr. Katz-Suchy, Poland)

For these reasons, we consider that the preliminary issue must be solved in a spirit of understanding and justice, in a spirit of impartiality. If this is not done, we have grave doubts whether the debate could bring us any closer to the solution which we must seek.

My delegation welcomes the amendment submitted by the representative of India and we shall vote for it. We shall oppose, however, the invitation of the representative of South Korea only, because we consider that such action would be unjust. From our past experience, we doubt that such action could contribute in any way towards a solution of the problem and the creation of a proper atmosphere which is so necessary in attempting to settle this thorny question.

Mr. JAMALI (Iraq): My delegation maintains this year the same attitude that it held last year. We support the draft resolution to invite South Korea and we oppose the amendment to invite North Korea. We do this for a few very clear reasons.

In the first place, we believe that there is only one Korea and not two Koreas, and we believe that South Korea represents all of Korea. If the Korean people were free and if there were no Communist domination and pressure from the outside, we feel sure that South Korea would represent all of Korea.

As for North Korea, we believe that it has defied the United Nations. It has been branded as an aggressor. The report of the Commission states on page 2, paragraph 9:

"There has been no evidence during the year that the attitude of the authorities in North Korea has undergone any basic change. They have been reported as expressing a wish for contacts between the north and south, but have shown no signs of acceptance of the principles on which the United Nations believes progress can be based. They have supported moves for a conference outside the framework of the United Nations to discuss settlement of the Korean question."

(Mr. Jamali, Iraq)

In view of this paragraph, my delegation cannot see any value in inviting North Korea to come here. It is an aggressor and it has not given any word that it is going to abide by our decisions and resolutions. If my colleague from India can promise us that the North Koreans wish to come here and abide by the decisions of this August Assembly and that they are ready to free themselves from external influences, then there might be some room for inviting them. As matters stand, however, my delegation cannot change the stand which it has taken in previous years. Therefore, we shall vote in favour of inviting South Korea and against inviting North Korea.

Mr. NASE (Albania) (interpretation from French): The Korean question has been on the agenda of the General Assembly for a number of years, but there has been no progress made since the cessation of hostilities. The settlement of this difficult question would most certainly have very beneficial repercussions on the world situation. The First Committee now has before it the draft resolution of the United States to invite a representative of the Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of the Korean question. We believe that, in accordance with rules of equity and proper procedure, we should also invite the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in our discussions. This certainly would contribute to the possibility of reaching a settlement of this question, which is the unification of Korea. It is time that we remedied the abnormal situation which has existed during the past years and which was permitted to exist because only one of the parties was invited to participate in our discussions. Inviting both sides would also be in keeping with the dignity of the United Nations and the principles of the Charter. It is impossible to discuss the Korean question when the representatives of only one side are invited. This question, after all, concerns all the people of Korea. It is indispensable, therefore, that a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should be invited along with a representative of South Korea.

For these reasons, we support the Indian amendment to invite the representatives of North and South Korea. However, if the Indian amendment is rejected, my delegation will vote against the United States draft resolution.

Mr. KIZYA (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR considers it its duty to make a brief statement on the substance of the question now under consideration. We are firmly convinced that a favourable settlement of the Korean question is impossible without the participation of the Koreans, and by that we are referring to North Korea and South Korea. The attempt of the United States delegation and some other delegations to represent Korea by the representatives of South Korea only is the old bankrupt policy of discriminating against the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The experience of the work of this Committee testifies to the bankruptcy of such a policy.

The representative of the United States, in objecting to inviting the representatives of North Korea, indicates an attempt at the very outset of our discussion to bury the possibility of reaching a favourable settlement of this question.

The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR warmly supports the Indian proposal to invite simultaneously the representatives of North Korea and South Korea. We shall vote in favour of the Indian amendment. If that amendment is rejected, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR will vote against the United States draft resolution.

Mr. BATO (Japan) (interpretation from French): I should like to explain the position of the Japanese delegation on the United States draft resolution, which was submitted this morning.

(Mr. Sato, Japan)

The Japanese delegation has only been seated in the United Nations for a short while and therefore we do not know too well the practice followed in this Committee and very possibly we may commit an error. But as far as we can see, the draft resolution submitted by the United States would, if adopted, invite a representative of the Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of the Korean question. The Japanese delegation will vote in favour of it. We know that there is strong opposition to this resolution, the opposition represented by the delegation of India in the form of a counter draft resolution inviting at the same time the representative of North Korea.

But as far as we know, there are already precedents in this Committee to inviting the representative of the Republic of Korea without inviting the representative of North Korea to participate. If that be the case, why not follow the same procedure this year and invite the representative of the Republic of Korea to participate? If there is reason to invite the representative of North Korea, then that can be discussed later, if it is necessary, after we have heard the explanations and the statements of the representative of the Republic of Korea. For this reason, the Japanese delegation will vote in favour of the United States draft resolution.

Mr. QUIROGA GALDO (Bolivia)(interpretation from Spanish): During the ninth session of the General Assembly the Bolivian delegation felt that the presence of the representatives of Korea was not necessary when discussing this matter. In view of the absolute disagreement which existed between the Governments of the Republic of Korea and the People's Republic of North Korea with regard to the unification and rehabilitation of their country, we held that their participation in our debate would add nothing to it. I recall that at that time the presence of the representative of South Korea only disturbed the already troubled waters of the discussion. That is why during the tenth session of the General Assembly the Bolivian delegation reaffirmed the previously stated point of view.

(Mr. Quiroga Galdo, Bolivia)

However, I do feel that we ought to mention now that at the tenth session the behaviour of the representative of the Republic of Korea was more discreet and more serene than had been the case at the earlier session.

Therefore, as an encouragement to that improved behaviour, and in the understanding that the serenity of our discussions should not be disturbed by the participation of the representative of the Republic of Korea, my delegation would not object this time to the Committee hearing the views of the representatives of the Government of South Korea. But my delegation will abstain both in the vote on the draft resolution of the United States and on the Indian amendment.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Many representatives have already expressed their views -- and correctly, in our opinion -- to the effect that the discussion of the Korean question without the presence of representatives of North Korea, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, would be one-sided and biased and would not promote the possibility of finding a correct and just solution of the Korean problem.

I think that one should especially emphasize the fact that a discussion of the Korean question with the presence of the representatives of only one part of the country, in the absence of the representatives of the other party, would be a crude violation of the United Nations Charter. Reference was made to precedents and reference was made to the fact that on previous occasions we got along without the representatives of North Korea, and it was argued that, accordingly, there was no need to violate that precedent. However, one can answer that by saying that the discussion of the Korean question without the representatives of North Korea, without the representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, has not given results and, as is recognized in the report before us, the Korean question has remained unsettled up to the present time. In addition, I should like to draw the attention of representatives to the fact that, for example, in chapter II, paragraph 8, of the report before us, it is stated that South Korea continues to insist that the Armistice should be denounced and that the South Korean authorities intend to resort to force

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

against North Korea, against the Korean People's Democratic Republic. This is set down in paragraph 8 of chapter II of the report.

Now the following question arises: There is insistence here to invite the representatives of South Korea who have such intentions and who are following such a policy of war against North Korea. Are we to invite these people and hear them here? But as regards the representatives of North Korea, who want a peaceful settlement of the question, we are asked not to invite them. If that is the decision to be taken on representation during our discussion of the Korean question, then we must note that if only South Korea is invited, this would put a definite stamp, a definite colouring, on our whole discussion of the Korean question. This would not be a discussion designed to find a correct solution of the Korean problem, but it would be a one-sided discussion for the purpose of imposing a settlement which is to the liking of one Power or a group of Powers, but not to the liking of the Korean people.

This is not the task of the United Nations. If we are going to tackle the discussion of this question, then, as the Charter requires, we must invite both parties. The Charter obliges us to do this. Otherwise, if we do not invite both sides, if we invite only South Korea, this would provide no useful foundation for a discussion of this question. It would turn into a one-sided discussion of the matter and the Soviet delegation could not support such a proposal, namely the proposal of the United States, and it will vote against it unless the amendment moved by India to invite representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic is also adopted.

Mr. GUNEWARDENE (Ceylon)(Vice-Chairman): As the representative of Ceylon I should like to make a few observations. The discussion has gone along on the footing that the United Nations has been a party to the dispute with regard to Korea and that therefore the other party should not be invited to participate in these deliberations. Let us have the issues clear before us. Does this Committee act here in a semi-judicial capacity or as a party to a dispute? It is true that there was a dispute in which the United Nations took an active part. Are we still in the same stage? Are we acting in a judicial capacity in order to elucidate the actual position with a view to a final settlement of the question?

AW/rh

A/C.1/PV.814  
29-30

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

If we divest ourselves of the position that we are a party to the dispute, that we are judges, then of course it is necessary that both parties to the dispute should be invited. Is there a dispute to be settled? Obviously there is. Are there two Koreas in fact? There are two Koreas. There is a North Korea and a South Korea. The question of recognition is not the issue.

Is there a dispute? Are there two Koreas? Is there a genuine desire on the part of the United Nations to bring about the unification? If we are anxious to bring about unification, then some means must be found by which the two parties can be brought together.

(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

How do we propose to bring these two parties together? It must be through the only available machinery; that is, the United Nations, acting not as a party to this dispute, but as an arbiter. We have now, therefore, assumed a different jurisdiction -- not the jurisdiction of a party to a dispute, but the jurisdiction of a tribunal -- and ordinary fairness, law and justice demand that parties to a dispute should be heard. If we concede the position that we are acting in a semi-judicial capacity, then both parties must be heard. If, on the other hand, it is thought that neither party is required, that their presence would only make the situation much worse and the possibility of a settlement more difficult, then the right attitude would be to exclude both parties and, with the information which we have -- from whatever sources we obtain it -- to arrive at some correct decision which would enable us to bring about peace.

What exactly is our objective? Is our objective the unification of Korea? Is our objective peace? If that is our objective, I cannot understand the attitude taken by some Member States that North Korea has been an aggressor and, therefore, we must have nothing to do with it; it is an outcast. If that is the position, we are perpetually isolating that section of Korea. And if we are perpetually isolating it, how can unification be obtained? In what manner is this magic to be performed? If Members of the United Nations assume the attitude that North Korea is an aggressor, that it continues to be an aggressor forever and that there can be no peace between North Korea and South Korea, then, of course, there is only one solution possible: the United Nations must engage in a war to liquidate North Korea. If that is not the objective, if it is not intended to carry on a war in order to achieve that objective, if peaceful methods are what we seek, then, of course, we must be sometimes even unconventional.

In this case it is not unconventional; it is perfectly legal, perfectly just, perfectly correct and perfectly fair that both parties should be invited if anyone is to be invited at all, that we should not hear one party only.

That being the position, I sincerely hope that this invective and abusive language will cease. We must think in terms of human understanding in the solution of the problems which come before us. The fact that there has been a precedent does not mean anything. Certainly there has been a precedent. Immediately after the aggression it was understandable that the state of mind and feeling then existing would prompt the exclusion of North Korea. The same



(Mr. Gunewardene, Ceylon)

procedure could be repeated for ten years and could be called a precedent. Surely that is not the way to look at questions of world importance, of international magnitude.

It is my sincere hope that we may find some means of negotiation; and negotiation becomes impossible if the United Nations persistently acts as if it were a party to a dispute. I hope that better relations can prevail. The report indicates that there seems to be a genuine desire on the part of the two areas of Korea to come into contact. The most we can do is not to repeat words of indignation, but to enable the two sections to come together so that the ultimate reality of unification may be possible.

Mr. BRUCAN (Romania): The main issue before this Committee in connexion with the Korean question is the encouragement of a peaceful unification of Korea. Our task is not to act in a manner which may bring about new tensions between the two parties involved.

It is not my intention to repeat all the arguments which have been put forward in the debate. What is the strongest argument against the participation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea? The fact that it was guilty of aggression. I feel that such an argument is not at all valid, even if we accept it, for the simple reason that there are nations which were obviously guilty of aggression and whose representative have not been prevented from participating in the debates and the general functions of the United Nations.

There is another point to which I should like to draw attention. The only occasion on which the Korean question was considered with the participation of both parties was when the armistice was concluded in Korea. It is obvious, therefore, that if we wish to draw a lesson from the past, we must invite both parties to participate in our present debate.

For these reasons the Romanian delegation supports the proposal of the representative of India.

Mr. SERRANO (Philippines): I shall explain briefly the position of the delegation of the Philippines on the question of inviting representatives from North and South Korea.

At the ninth and tenth sessions of the General Assembly we took the consistent position that the Republic of Korea alone should be invited to participate in the discussion of the Korean question, as in fact it was. We are again faced with the question of inviting representatives of North Korea. In our opinion, there has been no change in the situation since the ninth session which would warrant a change of position in this body.

It is alleged that, in order to bring about a peaceful, just and unbiased solution of this problem of the unification of Korea, both parties should be represented. This a very appealing argument, especially to those with legal training. We who are lawyers never wish to hear only one side of a case; we always wish to hear both sides. But here we are in a peculiar situation. We are not trying to resolve any dispute; we are trying to solve a problem, not a dispute. Historically, there is only one Korea, even if there is said to be two Koreas. The existence of two Koreas is purely an artificial one brought about by an unlawful act on the part of North Korea, and for us to invite the North Koreans to discuss the question of unification and the establishing of a democratic government in Korea would be to recognize an unlawful act. I do not think that the United Nations, which made such tremendous sacrifices in blood and money, could reconcile itself to the legal consequences of such an act.

This is the position of my Government. I repeat, we are not here to solve a dispute; we are here to solve a problem. The United Nations is not a party to any dispute. It utilized the forces at its command to arrest aggression, and if the consequences of an unlawful act still persist, it does not necessarily mean that we should be reconciled to such act, thereby defying the Charter upon which the United Nations stands.

(Mr. Serrano, Philippines)

I know that it may have been appropriate, for practical reasons, to permit North Korea to be heard, and my delegation is willing to forgive and forget, upon being assured of conclusive evidence that North Korea will abide in good faith by the principles announced for the solution of this problem. So long as that evidence is not forthcoming, however, my delegation cannot see its way clear to invite North Korea to discuss the problem of Korea in this Assembly. As far as the principles of justice and law are concerned, unless this evidence can be found in a conclusive way, in addition to evidence that North Korea will be willing to abide by the decisions of this body, I do not see any propriety or any justification for the invitation being made to North Korea.

This is the position of my delegation and accordingly we will vote in favour of the United States resolution and will vote against the Indian amendment.

Sir Percy SPENDER (Australia): I have no desire to prolong what I believe to be a rather profitless debate, since we have had this discussion now for a number of years. It has been said, with some apparent show of reason, that the United Nations is an arbiter between the North Koreans and the South Koreans. With great respect to the Vice-Chairman, I heartily disagree with that proposition. The actual position is known to all of us. We are not a party to a dispute in any juridical sense; we acted, in the United Nations, to meet aggression in Korea and we set out certain clear objectives when that aggression came to an end. It is not now a question of being an arbiter between North and South Korea. It is indeed solely a question of determining what we will do in respect of this problem -- the problem of unification of Korea.

It is significant that the Republic of South Korea has been regarded by our Assembly as eligible for membership of this Organization. The record of South Korea -- whatever may be said in criticism of this or that matter -- has been one of co-operation with the United Nations in carrying out its purposes in Korea. On the contrary, the record of North Korea has and has been consistently one of aggression, and very serious aggression.

(Sir Percy Spender, Australia)

Whilst I appreciate that the view is genuinely held by the representatives of India and Ceylon that their proposal is the only way in which to deal with this matter and to bring about a solution of the Korean problem, I have heartily disagreed with their proposition. Furthermore, if one looks behind all this, the Communist purpose is to get equal representation in this Organization for the section which was subject to aggression, and the section of Korea which was guilty of the aggression. That has been consistent with the whole pattern.

In the Geneva discussion in 1954 the Communists put forward the idea, which they have never withdrawn, that the whole question of Korea could only be solved by equal representation of North and South Korea. If we have not learned in this Assembly that this is the classic technique by which the Communists seek to take over a country, then we have learned nothing at all during seven years. It therefore seems to me that, just as we have decided in previous years, this is not a question where we are an arbiter. We are involved, not as a party to a dispute, but as an international organization having taken steps to meet aggression in Korea and having set out our objectives in relation to that aggression. The cardinal objective, of course, is the unification of Korea. There is no point in saying that if we again pass a resolution nothing will happen for twelve months. The purpose of Communism is always to force us to yield, and once we yield we will yield a bit more, until ultimately we will give in to the demands of the Communists.

If there is, in fact, any desire on the part of the Communists to find a solution to this particular matter -- other than the classic technique to which I have referred -- there is every opportunity for them to make their views known. After all, I suppose it might be said that the representative of the Soviet Union, when he advanced the views he outlined today, and last year and the year before, of course did so after some consultation with the Communist authorities in North Korea. There are many representatives of the Soviet Union and others who speak on their behalf who are able to advance these views. However, they have never retired one inch from their previously stated position, that the only way in which we will have unification of Korea is by giving equal representation to both sides. What is the use of talking about arbitrament in these circumstances? We know what the position is and it is just as well for us to face up to reality. The course which we have to adopt in this matter, no matter how long it may take, is the course of adhering steadfastly to our principles, and pursuing that course. To yield now would be

simply to take a step backwards in favour of the Communist objective. Let me say this: there is no reason at all why any Member nation should not advance, to solve this question of Korea, a proposition which is not the Communist proposition of equal representation but which is somewhat different from that which we have discussed in the past, so long as it entails a decision by this Organization as to what attitude it adopts on the problem. I will finish where I started: the real issue for us is, "What is our objective?". What do we intend to do as an organization involved in this problem? It is not a question of arbitrament at all; it is a question of "Where do we stand and what course do we think we should pursue?". We do not want the assistance of the aggressor to enable us to determine what we shall do in those respects.

Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) (interpretation from French): Several reasons have been given during this debate, and during previous debates, in explanation of the proposals made in connexion with this question, and those reasons would have been sufficient for my delegation to oppose the proposal to invite the representative of the authorities in North Korea to participate in our debate. Among these reasons I would like to mention the following principal ones: firstly, we do not ourselves recognize the Government of North Korea; secondly, the United Nations has so far recognized only the Government of the Republic of Korea; thirdly, the United Nations has condemned North Korea as an aggressor; fourthly, the authorities of North Korea have never accepted the principles of the United Nations for a peaceful settlement of the Korean problem; and, fifthly, the North Koreans have never given any evidence of wishing to accept decisions which might be made or which have already been made by this Organization in connexion with Korea. All these problems could have been alleviated by a genuine desire for tolerance and goodwill on the part of the aggressor, but there is one problem to which my delegation finds no solution. For this reason we are compelled to oppose an invitation to North Korea to appear before us on the same basis as South Korea, and this reason is that the representatives of North Korea have never accepted the authority of the United Nations to deal with the question of Korea.

(Mr. Azkoul, Lebanon)

During the ninth session, I remember that I read to the Committee statements made by the authorities of North Korea which proved that they did not recognize the right of the United Nations to deal with the question of Korea. If that is so and as long as they persist in that attitude of refusing to recognize the jurisdiction of the United Nations on this question, I do not understand how they can agree to come here for reasons which would not contribute to a solution of the problem. As long as this is the situation, my delegation will be compelled to vote against their representation here.

If we were confronted with a frank and clear acceptance by North Korea of our jurisdiction, the other reasons, which are also valid, might be overcome by a special effort of tolerance and conciliation. But as long as this is not the case my delegation will continue to vote as it has in the past, namely, to invite representatives of the Republic of Korea and to refuse to invite representatives of North Korea.

Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): Yesterday the First Committee had a long discussion on the sequence of the items on the agenda. A number of representatives felt that the Korean question should be placed first on the list because it is an extremely important matter. Today, on arriving here, we were confronted by a draft resolution of the United States of America which proposes to invite a representative of the Republic of Korea to participate without the right to vote in the discussion of the Korean question, presumably to give us explanations.

Many arguments have been invoked for not inviting a representative of North Korea. It appears to me, on looking at the list of subjects before the Committee, that we are supposed to be discussing the unification and rehabilitation of Korea. How can we talk of the unification of Korea without having here representatives of the parts that are to be unified? I must say that it is bizarre to try to unify peoples by inviting representatives of only one part, who are to participate not only in a discussion but possibly, we hope, in a solution. How can you discuss this matter in this way? The representative of South Korea is ready, on behalf of his Government, to violate the armistice, and

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

he will insist that his Government be permitted to solve the problem -- or at least that the United Nations close its eyes to this solution -- by going to war and taking the law into its own hands. We feel that there are a number of delegations here, those who are most concerned at the way in which this matter is presented to us, who want to have representatives of both parts here so that they can be heard and a valid decision taken, and who want such a decision to be taken only after hearing the representatives of both parts.

Certain arguments have been raised here for not inviting the representative of the People's Republic of Korea. One representative said that there were precedents. If we are to go by precedents, those very precedents have so far certainly not led us to a solution of the problem of the unification of Korea. Therefore we will have to create new precedents in order to solve the problem since the old ones have led us nowhere. It is certainly time for us to decide to create new precedents. Otherwise the solution of the Korean question will not proceed by one step.

Furthermore, we are confronted with the question of whether the First Committee of the General Assembly, by not hearing both parties, wants to solve the question of Korea. Does the Committee want to solve it in such a way as to ease tension in that region? Or does the Committee want to make the tension in that part of the world more acute? If there is a desire to increase tension in that part of the world, then the only way of doing so will be to invite a representative of only one part of Korea. If a true solution is to be found to this question, then representatives of both parts of Korea will have to be invited to participate.

The Bulgarian delegation wishes to see the question of Korea solved equitably. We want to see this problem of the unification of Korea solved. We therefore agree with the Indian amendment to invite a representative of North Korea to participate. If that amendment is rejected, we shall vote against the United States draft resolution.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): When my delegation intervened to move this amendment to the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the United States of America, we purposely refrained from entering into the merits of the question under discussion, and therefore observations were merely put forward to place the amendment before the Committee in order that we might come to a speedy decision

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

on it. But as the discussion has proceeded matters of substance have been brought in. While we shall still refrain from substituting this intervention for our intervention in the main debate, it is necessary for me to place the position of my delegation before the Committee.

We do not take the view that has been taken by some members of the Committee who supported the amendment or have spoken against it that it is essential for the Committee to have the presence of anybody other than its own members for the limited purposes -- I emphasize these words "for the limited purposes" -- which are before us in the consideration of this item. My delegation, however, did not face a situation corresponding to a clean slate in this matter. There was a draft resolution proposed by the United States of America and we had no desire to oppose it. For those reasons we sought to alter it in such a way so that we could support it. That is our position.

Taking that into account, I would invite the Committee to examine what is really before us. This report is called the Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. That "Korea" obviously is a geographical Korea; otherwise there cannot be any problem of unification. It must also be a Korea that includes all its population; otherwise there cannot be a question of rehabilitation.

The objective of the United Nations ever since this problem came before it has been the unification of Korea. If that is our objective, then both wisdom and the duties imposed upon us by the Charter require us to take every step from time to time which will attain this objective. It has been argued that we did not do this last year, we did not do something else the previous year and so on. I submit that if you could only do each year what you did the previous year the exercise of coming here would be purposeless. It argues against the whole conception of our civilized existence and the purposes of the United Nations, which are to promote harmony and international peace.

It has been argued that if we ask these two authorities to be present, there would be some equality of representation. So far as my country is concerned, we do not recognize either of them as States or Governments, but we do recognize them as de facto authorities which have control and which function as administrative and governing units in different parts of Korea, the two together making the country of Korea.



I want to submit that there is no provision anywhere in the Charter whereby this Committee of the General Assembly can, by a resolution inviting any representatives here, give them representation. All we are doing is conceding to them some position whereby their views can be presented, in the same way as petitioners come before the Fourth Committee. The question of representation in this Assembly is provided for by the Charter and in that connexion it is important to realize that the United Nations -- and we cannot in this connexion talk about the General Assembly or this or that organ, we have to talk about the United Nations -- is the body charged by the Charter with admitting States to membership, and even in all the elaborate discussion which resulted in the admission of a large number of Members recently, countries where a problem of division exists were excluded. This is not only an implicit but an expressed pre-condition for admission to membership.

Therefore we say that even for the strengthening of the United Nations and the achievement of its objectives as a universal organization it is necessary for us to have a unified Korea.

There are only two or three ways of unification. Either you unify or bring together parties which are in disagreement and in physical separation, by persuasion, adjustment, compromise and consent, or by imposition. The war which was waged by the United Nations on Korean territory was not for the purpose -- and I challenge anybody to say that these are not the facts -- of unifying Korea by force. The collective action taken by the United Nations in Korea was admittedly and by resolution and decision for the purpose of halting an aggression. If you examine that, what does it mean? Halting an aggression means that there is a territory outside the territory from which the aggression has come. Therefore, that resolution itself argues that there are two entities to be brought together. When people speak about there being only one Korea, we go so far with them as to say that as an objective there is only one Korea. Historically there is one Korea, although for a long time that unhappy country has been under foreign domination and has been merely a field of exploitation by imperial interests of one kind or another, Asiatic or European.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

In historical terms, there are two compartments and, again historically, it is incorrect to suggest that the division between North and South Korea came as a result of the act of aggression or the decision of the United Nations. Korea was divided along the 38th parallel by circumstances and factors which took place before there was an aggression and for which the great Powers are responsible and for which the post-war situation is also responsible. Therefore, factually, there are two functioning units which it is the objective of the United Nations to bring together.

The problem we are facing is: are we taking the right steps towards this unification? I submit that unless the United Nations changes its objective and totally subscribes to the view of the President of the Republic of Korea, Southern Korea, and says that this should be established in some form different from the purposes of the United Nations, then we have to seek methods of bringing them together. My delegation does not hold the view that this is an impossible task. When this item came up yesterday in this Committee, we suggested that it might be considered at a later date because it was thought that whatever we might say, even if it did not take us forward, would not become an irritant and perhaps take us backward. That was the reason for my delegation's statement yesterday, but unfortunately owing to the time table of this Committee it was not possible to have adequate discussions before Committee meetings.

Now I come to the position of the United Nations in this matter. References have been made to precedents, and I will not travel into the field in which other States which have committed either de jure or de facto acts of aggression are still Members of this Organization, but will take this into account, that in the case of North Korea whenever this Organization has made an effective decision, it has taken into account the two parts as being in existence de facto, that is, realistically.

In the spring of 1953 we passed a resolution asking for a political conference to be called and that political conference was not a conference outside the United Nations, it was an extension of the United Nations. To that political conference North Korea was invited. No one seemed to be bothered at that time. If they were worried, they suppressed their worries about equality of representation. This is not the proper place to discuss the fact that that conference was inconclusive or unfruitful and what the reasons were; all I am

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

saying is that the precedents are not exclusively in one direction. But this is not the major precedent. The major precedent is the work done in this Assembly in the autumn of 1952 in the spring of 1953, when a grievous war involving considerable casualties and the death of many millions of the civilian population and military casualties on the side of the United Nations of very considerable proportions, was brought to an end by an armistice with a great deal of heartfelt thoughts and sentiments.

What does an armistice mean? An armistice means an adjustment between two hostile parties. And that armistice is based not on implication, as anybody who read the text of the Armistice Agreement, as we have all had to do so many times, would see; it is based on the acceptance of the two equal commands, and the whole of the machinery -- this was its weakness, some people said -- was based on that position. But it is only by the two sides agreeing to hold the peace, or at least not to resort to war, that we could get an armistice. My country was asked to go into Korea with the troops for the peaceful purpose of supervising the armistice. There would be no supervision required if there was only one country; that would be an interference into the internal affairs of another country and a force of occupation, and we would never have gone there.

Whichever way you look at it, there have been, realistically speaking, two authorities, two units or whatever you like to call them, and it is the avowed, and I believe the real purpose of the United Nations to bring them together. Even if you take this report, which no one can say shows any tendency in favour of the people of Korea as a whole or of North Korea, what does it say in its first line? The Korean question has to do with the fundamental objective -- I did not put in the word "fundamental" -- of the United Nations in Korea, which is to establish a unified, independent and democratic government for the whole of the peninsula. There is no unity as for the territory of the whole peninsula, and if we are going to bring about this unity, as I said before, we have either to impose that unity by war or bring it about by conciliation -- conciliation is not appeasement -- by adjustments, by finding an accommodation between the different points of view, and this is the purpose of the mandate placed upon this Organization by the Charter, and that is what we should be considering.

EIG/bd

A/C.1/PV.814  
49-50

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

Whether the realistic facts of the world today in the early part of 1957 warrant the hope that these objectives will be realized or not, we have no right to depart from the direction in which we are pointing. I myself share some of the pessimism that nothing very much can be achieved immediately, but that does not mean that we do not have the obligation to do something which will go in the other direction.

The second part of the item, that is part (b), concerns the peoples of Korea as a whole even more. The whole prisoner issue is based upon whether they should go, why they do not go and so forth. Therefore, even from that point of view, it is necessary for everybody concerned here. So far as my delegation is concerned, if it had been the general desire of the Committee to discuss this report among ourselves -- and after all the Commission must be presumed to have known all the facts in South Korea, in fact there is only a description of South Korea in this report, there is nothing else except South Korea -- this extraneous evidence is, as I said, not essential.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

We do not object to the presence of a representative of South Korea; we would welcome it if the Committee decided that the other side should also be here. I do not think it would make a lot of difference either way. Therefore, I return once again to the purposes of the United Nations.

One of these purposes is the unification of Korea; the other is the maintenance of the armistice, pending unity. That maintenance of the armistice requires that a degree of contact and a degree of balance should be maintained between the two parties, and if we are to continue this position without war, then it is necessary for us to rid ourselves of the idea that there is only one Korea, meaning by that that there is only one authority in Korea, because then we would be subscribing to what is set out in the report, and if people quote that report, then I think they might also quote other parts of it. The report (A/3172) states:

"The Republic" -- that is, the Southern Republic -- "continues, therefore, to press strongly for denunciation by the United Nations side of the Armistice Agreement." (para. 7)

The Committee will recall that the Government of South Korea refused to sign the Armistice Agreement. It was signed by the United Nations Command and the other side. It might well be asked whether there is not some inference to be drawn, when we are speaking about loyalties to the United Nations. The Republic continues, therefore, to press strongly for denunciation by the United Nations side of the agreement. Now, the Armistice Agreement was painfully worked out by this Assembly and afterwards implemented by the strenuous labours, so far as we are concerned, of the United States representative of the United Nations Command in Korea. We know of the difficulties there were at Panmunjom. The report goes on to say:

"As regards a solution of the Korean question in general, the Republic takes the view that a peaceful solution of the problem can come about only when the Chinese Communist forces have withdrawn completely from the territory of North Korea." (para. 8)

We agree that all foreign forces should be withdrawn from the whole of Korea, but the next sentence is even more important. It states:

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

"It" -- that is, the Republic of Korea -- "maintains that, in the meantime, it must itself remain strong and prepared for the possibility, though not necessarily the inevitability, of resort to armed force." (Ibid.)

If that sentence spoke of the "inevitability", I could understand, but what that sentence says is that it is the Republic's policy, in the last instance, to establish unification, according to this report, by the use of armed force. Therefore, we have a situation in which the United Nations must keep its objectives fully in view and bring about the unification of Korea by peaceful means. That is why, in every little step we take, I do not think that very much turns upon the question of who sits at these meetings, because we know more or less what the South Korean representative will say. We have heard all this before. I believe that even our own speeches may be very much the same as in previous years.

Then the representative of Iraq asked me whether the delegation of India could guarantee something on behalf of some other Government. My colleague knows that that is one thing which he cannot ask of the Indian delegation. It does not want its actions to be guaranteed by other Governments, nor does it seek other Governments to guarantee their actions. That is not a policy or a philosophy which we support, and we warmly hope that Iraq will depart from that one day.

But we are entitled to point out some things, and I say, in all seriousness, it is not correct to say that the two parts of this country cannot be brought together to observe United Nations principles. United Nations principles are not identical with any particular resolutions or procedures which we may adopt. For example, what is at issue at the present moment is the unity of Korea on a democratic basis, unity based on the will of the people. My Government confidently believes that that can be brought about only by contacts between the two sides of Korea and, what is more, by some form of expression of the popular will which is not controlled by external pressures but which is subject to supervision by international authority.

The break comes, as last year, when the countries supporting the United Nations Command take the view that that international supervision can only be achieved by United Nations supervision. We do not share that view. We did not share that view with regard to Indochina. There are various other places where other international authorities have been considered. I will not mention the problems, but one of the most crucial problems of the world is being discussed outside the United Nations, so far as the form goes.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

Therefore, it is wrong to argue that because there is not agreement on the procedure, there is a departure from principle. If there was an unalterable opposition to international supervision or to free elections by secret ballot and to the conducting of them without external pressures, then there would be a departure from principle.

I submit that, irrespective of what we did in 1949 to 1956, our task at the moment is to take the situation as it is, and if we can move one step forward in this direction, it will be possible for us to move this Organization nearer to universality and to contribute an instalment, however small, towards stability, pacification and the lowering of tension in the Far East, and to establish better and more wholesome relations between the countries immediately proximate to Korea, countries which I do not wish to name.

It is for all these reasons that we moved our amendment. The amendment was not put forward as a matter of ritual. The proposal would not have been made had there not been a draft resolution for exclusion on the other side, and we believe that the draft resolution was put forward not so much for the purpose of exclusion as in order to give the South Korean Government, which the United States Government recognizes and with which it has relations, an opportunity to be present here.

We recognize all that, but if we are to move towards the implementation of the principles of the United Nations in this matter, and to operate in some way against those tendencies that exist to bring about the unification of Korea under the terms I read out just now, and not to fan the flames of hatred and of tension, then I think we ourselves must show a degree of tolerance, a recognition that we are not admitting anybody to the United Nations. A representative can sit here under a blue label in order to state his case, and we hope that it will be stated courteously. My Government has no quarrel with the populations of either side of Korea. We wish them well and we hope that the unity of their country will be attained. They have a very long history going back to antiquity, and we hope they will take their place among us as a free and equal Member.

It is for these reasons that, in spite of the precedents that exist, we felt it our duty to place before the Committee the submission that it is in the interests of the objectives we have before us that both these authorities should be invited.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Unless there are any objections by the members of the Committee, the debate will be closed. We will now proceed to vote on the Indian amendment to the United States draft resolution. This amendment would change the draft resolution to read:

"Decides to invite representatives of the North and South Republics of Korea to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the Korean question."



The Indian amendment was rejected by 40 votes to 20, with 11 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We will now vote on the text of the draft resolution submitted by the United States of America as it appears in document A/C.1/L.157.

The draft resolution was adopted by 51 votes to 10, with 12 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In view of the adoption of this resolution, I am happy to invite the representative of the Republic of Korea to participate, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the Korean question in our Committee.

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

Mr. TARAZI (Syria) (interpretation from French): I should like briefly to explain my delegation's vote.

During previous sessions of the General Assembly my delegation voted in favour of an invitation to be extended to the representatives of the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Republic of Korea to participate in the debates in our Committee on the Korean problem. For the reasons which my delegation explained at previous sessions, it maintains its position and therefore voted in favour of the Indian amendment. The Indian amendment having failed of adoption, my delegation did not find itself in a position to vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by the United States of America because my delegation has always adopted the position of allowing representatives of all parties concerned in a conflict to be heard. Therefore, my delegation abstained on the United States draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As there are no speakers on the substance of the question before us, the meeting scheduled for this afternoon is hereby cancelled until tomorrow morning.

(The Chairman)

Inasmuch as we have approximately forty days to study five very serious problems, problems which all of us, I would say, wish to solve, I should like to make an appeal to the members of the Committee -- and I want this appeal to be accepted by the Committee with the same warmth with which I express it -- to include their names on the speakers' list as soon as possible so that we may adopt a resolution on this first item and so that we can go on to the second, third, fourth and fifth items, items which are equally as important as the first item.

I appeal to the representatives here to inscribe their names on the speakers' list on this matter so that we may dispose of it as quickly as possible. We will meet again tomorrow morning at 10.30.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.