

**General Assembly  
Security Council**Distr.: General  
1 December 2014

Original: English

---

**General Assembly**  
**Sixty-ninth session**  
Agenda item 68  
**Promotion and protection of human rights****Security Council**  
**Sixty-ninth year****Letter dated 28 November 2014 from the Permanent Representative  
of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations  
addressed to the Secretary-General**

I have the honour to transmit herewith a detailed report issued by the Association for Human Rights Studies of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) on 28 November 2014 with regard to a resolution adopted by the Third Committee of the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly on the situation of human rights in the DPRK (see annex).

The report reveals the background of how the anti-DPRK human rights resolution came into being, in disregard of the cooperative efforts made by the DPRK.

The DPRK will make every possible effort to check all human rights attempts made by the U.S. and other hostile forces and defend the socialist system where the people are masters and their genuine human rights are guaranteed at the highest level.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly, under agenda item 68, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) **Ja Song Nam**  
Ambassador  
Permanent Representative



**Annex to the letter dated 28 November 2014 from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General**

**Detailed report of the Association for Human Rights Studies of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea**

Pyongyang, 28 November (KCNA) — The DPRK Association for Human Rights Studies released the following detailed report on 28 November 2014:

A draconian anti-DPRK resolution on the human rights aimed at seriously hurting its dignity was railroaded through the Third Committee of the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly, on 18 November.

The U.S. and other forces hostile to the DPRK fabricated the resolution peppered with misinformation malignantly abusing its genuine human rights policy and, not content with this, even asserted that the DPRK's human rights issue should be referred to the International Criminal Court.

This was the most vivid expression of the U.S. hostile policy towards the DPRK as it was a hostile action against it, a product of the U.S. strategy to bring down the socialist system centred on the popular masses under the pretext of human rights.

Such hostile actions of the U.S. and its followers are naturally compelling the army and people of the DPRK to launch the toughest counteraction to cope with them.

Under the present grave situation where the human rights issue is at the crossroads of sincere cooperation or war, the DPRK Association for Human Rights Studies releases a detailed report to lay bare the secret behind such political fraud as the anti-DPRK human rights resolution, which has no relevance to the protection and promotion of genuine human rights, and clarify the responsibility for the ensuing consequences.

**1. DPRK's policy and efforts for international cooperation in the field of human rights**

It is the consistent political stand of the DPRK to make sustained efforts to protect and promote genuine human rights and positively promote international cooperation in this field.

The DPRK Government has encouraged and developed the international exchange and dialogue in the field of human rights since long ago.

To cite a few examples, a delegation of Amnesty International visited the DPRK twice in April-May 1991 and in April-May 1995. It met with law enforcement officials and prisoners and visited reform institutions and detention rooms, etc.

The reform institution visited by the delegation was just the same as the one where U.S. citizen Pae Jun Ho served the term of hard labour from May 2013 to November 2014.

In May-June 1995, members of the International Association against Torture visited the DPRK and witnessed its reality.

In July 1995, the Special Rapporteur on violence against women and her party visited our country and were briefed on the DPRK Government's policy and measures for combating violence against women and learned about the reality.

The human rights issue has been included in the agenda of the regular political dialogue between the DPRK and the European Union since the DPRK-European Union highest level meeting in May 2001.

In September 2001, the delegation of parliamentarians from different political parties of France visited a reform institution and met with its inmates and officials concerned in the DPRK and learned about its reality.

In May 2002, the head of the division for East Asia at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Germany visited the DPRK and met those who had served their terms in prisons to understand the legal system in the DPRK.

The European Union, however, made a U-turn in its stand of dialogue, with no reason, all of a sudden in April 2003, when the international cooperation was making progress in the field of human rights, and sponsored together with Japan a resolution on human rights situation in the DPRK, the first of its kind, and rammed it through the fifty-ninth session of the then Commission on Human Rights.

This was a follow-up politically motivated hostile act of the European Union in the wake of the Bush administration's labelling of the DPRK as an "axis of evil", renegeing on the DPRK-U.S. agreed framework.

This scuttled the DPRK-European Union human rights dialogue. Since then, the European Union has introduced anti-DPRK human rights resolutions to the United Nations every year, blocking any cooperation with the European Union, which has followed a one-sided policy of confrontation.

However, the DPRK has not ceased its efforts to promote multilateral cooperation in the field of human rights.

The DPRK Government submitted the second report on the implementation of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in November 2003 and took a sincere part in its examination.

It submitted its second report on the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child in June 2004 and participated in its examination.

It presented its first report on the implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women in July 2005 and took part in its examination.

It submitted its third and fourth reports on the implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child in January 2009 and participated in their examination.

The DPRK took part in the first cycle of the universal periodic review under the Human Rights Council in December 2009 and the second cycle of universal periodic review in May 2014.

The DPRK signed the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities on 3 July 2013.

It signed the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography on 9 September 2014 and ratified it in November.

The DPRK Government has made these efforts under the serious situation where the U.S. hostile policy towards the DPRK has escalated to the field of human rights.

For example, the U.S. passed a North Korean Human Rights Act through its Congress in July 2004, legalizing its interference in the internal affairs of the DPRK and its scenario to bring down its social system under the pretext of human rights protection.

The keynote of this act is to air 12 hours of Korean language broadcasts a day for the purpose of creating discontent with the DPRK Government among its inhabitants under the signboard of promoting human rights, democracy and a market economy in it, smuggle transistors capable of listening to its programmes, lure its people to defect from their country, emigrate or take refuge in the U.S. and give financial and material support for doing so, etc.

The U.S. is spending tens of millions of U.S. dollars every year to implement the North Korean Human Rights Act which forces different international organizations and neighbouring countries to get involved in it.

Even recently, when the U.S. and its allies laid bare their attempt to introduce the human rights resolution seriously hurting the dignity of the DPRK to the General Assembly this year, the DPRK Government made ceaseless efforts for dialogue and cooperation in the field of human rights.

Under the situation where the human rights situation in the DPRK was seriously misrepresented due to the persistent plots of the hostile forces, the DPRK Association for Human Rights Studies released a report on 13 September 2014 for the purpose of clarifying truth and helping the international community understand it.

The report was warmly welcomed by the international community and it was registered and circulated as a document of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Human Rights Council for making a comprehensive and objective clarification of the human rights situation in the DPRK where the people became its master.

The DPRK Foreign Ministry in September 2014 declared its readiness to have dialogue over the human rights issue with Germany, the UK and other European countries, and on 17 September formally expressed its intention to receive technical assistance if the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights provides it.

On 17 October the DPRK formally invited the Special Representative for Human Rights of the European Union to visit the country.

On 27 October the roving ambassador of the Foreign Ministry of the DPRK met the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in New York for the first time and expressed such goodwill and magnanimity as saying that the DPRK would allow his visit to it if he is sincerely interested in the settlement of the human rights issue.

Some European Union countries understood and positively affirmed the DPRK's broad-minded efforts and called upon the European Union to opt for cooperation with the DPRK. However, the European Union under the pressure of the U.S. finally took the road of confrontation by joining in adopting the resolution. By doing so, they closed the door of dialogue including human rights dialogue and exchange and cooperation by themselves.

## **2. Falsity and reactionary nature of the anti-DPRK resolution on human rights**

The hypocrisy of the resolution lies, above all, in that it is based on the report of the commission of inquiry on human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, a collection of lies and fabrications called "testimonies" made by a handful of defectors from north Korea who fled it after committing crimes here or were abducted.

For a decade the U.S. has prodded the European Union and Japan into ratcheting up pressure on the DPRK in the international arena including the United Nations and finally cooked up the commission of inquiry on human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The commission of inquiry is a plot-breeding body whose political nature is clear from the background against which it was established.

An anti-DPRK resolution on establishing the commission of inquiry was adopted by the Human Rights Council in Geneva in March 2013. It was the time when the DPRK-U.S. standoff was ever more acute due to the sanctions slapped by the U.S. against the DPRK in the wake of its successful satellite launch on 12 December 2012 and the third nuclear test on 12 February 2013.

The U.S. launched a new offensive of pressure on the DPRK over its human rights issue, aware that it is hard to bring down its social system by sanctions only.

The commission of inquiry made up of three persons was reported to have worked out a report in which it allegedly made an overall judgement and estimation of the human rights situation of a country and made even a recommendation in a matter of less than a year. This itself raises a serious problem in view of scientific accuracy and credibility.

The report claims that commission of inquiry members met about 300 witnesses in different countries. But among them there was not a single citizen of the DPRK and none of the members of commission of inquiry has ever visited our country.

The countries which members of the commission of inquiry claimed to have visited were such countries as the U.S. and Japan, hostile to the DPRK, and those persons whom they insisted they met were either citizens of hostile countries or defectors from north Korea under the control of the south Korean authorities.

From the outset, the commission of inquiry was hostile to the DPRK in its nature and had no intention to visit it. From its inception, the commission of inquiry declared that it would conduct its inquiry mainly on the basis of testimonies made by defectors from north Korea and satellite photos.

The Chairman of the commission of inquiry, Michael Kirby, in an interview with the Australian broadcasting service on 7 May 2013 said there were a series of

press reports about human rights abuses in north Korea but there was a lack of grounds to confirm them.

The report failed to publish the names of most of the defectors from the north who made testimonies.

The commission of inquiry made such poor excuse that confidential interviews were held to prevent their families from being hurt, a very serious flaw in a document of an international body.

For example, the report claimed on the basis of a statement made by defector from the north Sin Tong Hyok that there is a camp for political prisoners in the DPRK and unethical crimes are committed there. Why did it not feel worry about Sin's father living in the DPRK at a time when it opened Sin's name? Maybe Sin is such a *bête noire* who discarded human ethics so completely as having no worry about his real father that he made a false testimony that his father was dead.

A video clip was posted on the website By Our Nation ([www.uriminzokkiri.com](http://www.uriminzokkiri.com)) to prove the false name, career and testimony made by Sin.

Even the author who released a book dealing with Sin's story about defection from the north admitted that recently Sin told a lie about the reason for the punishment of his mother.

The book is the fictional novel that touched U.S. Secretary of State Kerry so strongly and sparked off his unusual antipathy towards the present social system in the DPRK.

Whoever has visited the DPRK even once, a man or woman from the West, is not ignorant of the human rights situation in the DPRK.

An Italian lawmaker who witnessed the reality of the DPRK in an interview with Italian Broadcasting Service 24 stated that what Sin Tong Hyok, defector from north Korea, said at a press conference is a lie to get some money and that the book based on his lie is on sale, declaring he would not buy such book.

A journalist of Ireland on 29 October 2014, in an article dedicated to the Internet magazine *The Diplomat*, said that Pak Yon Mi, a 21-year-old girl who defected from north Korea, spoke about the serious human rights situation in north Korea in tears at the World Youth Summit held in Dublin early in October, and BBC, Al-Jazeera, Daily Mail and other media gave wide publicity to it, but not a few critics claimed what she said was contrary to the truth, expressing scepticism about her speech.

Swiss businessman Felix Abt who had worked in north Korea for seven years until 2009 asserted that most of the stories told by those defectors from the north were not confirmed and clearly hyped or they were sheer lies.

Denying the claim made by Pak Yon Mi, comparing Dublin Canal with a river in the area where she had lived, that she saw dead bodies afloat in the river every morning, Abt refuted her story by saying he had been to north Korea many times but had never seen dead bodies, showing a picture of children in north Korea wading in rivers with joy.

Challenging the assertion of Ri Kwang Chol, defector from the north, who said there is no physically disabled person in north Korea due to infanticide, Abt recalled

that Pyongyang dispatched disabled players to the Paralympic Games held in Incheon, south Korea.

Michael Bassett, who served the U.S. forces as an expert for north Korea in the demilitarized zone on the Korean peninsula for years, said that the story made by Pak Yon Mi, defector from the north, was a sheer lie, that Pak described the human rights situation in north Korea as a “massacre”, prompted by her intention to create a great sensation and that such anti-DPRK organizations in south Korea as Freedom Factory were behind her. Bassett, referring to the fact that Pak Yon Mi sent him an article refuting his story, ridiculed that her English was too perfect though she was a foreigner.

A researcher of the French Institute for International Strategic Affairs in an interview with the French paper La Croix on 19 February 2014 said that the United Nations human rights report on north Korea is a biased and unscientific report and an unscientific document worked out on the basis of testimonies made by victims of the north Korean regime only without confirmation of information through visits to north Korea. In the light of the case in which a satellite photo of a nuclear test of north Korea several years ago was opened to public and proved to be false later, even the satellite photo showing a management office of north Korea is hard to believe, and a biased report based on rumours or public opinion on the human rights of north Korea should not be worked out but attention should be paid to more objective and scientific information, the researcher held.

A vice-president of the Party for Free Motherland of Brazil contributed a statement to the paper Ora Du Pob under the title, “A servant of Obama faked up a Nazi report against the DPRK” on 19 February 2014. It said:

“Michael Kirby’s basic mission is to fabricate evidence as required by Washington, make persistent and old big lies of monopoly reptile media meeting the U.S. interests sound plausible, spread lies about the DPRK and participate in the international cooperation steered by the U.S. against the DPRK.

“Michael Kirby had never visited Pyongyang, met and talked with representatives of the DPRK Government. Following without any consideration the theory of the Nazis that if one repeats lies many times, everybody will believe in them, he was only invited many times to visit Seoul where all structures were made to provide ‘evidence’ necessary for working out the false ‘United Nations report’ having 372 pages through interview with persons in Seoul and several ‘defectors from the north’.”

The reactionary nature of the present resolution lies in that it serves as a tool for inciting confrontation, not cooperation, and a war, not peace.

The above-mentioned resolution is designed to secure a justification for armed intervention by branding the DPRK as a “tundra of human rights” in the arena of the United Nations.

History clearly remembers the Yugoslav war which the U.S. ignited under the pretext of protection of human rights and minority in 1999.

The gravity of the resolution lies in that a dangerous precedent is made to politicize and internationalize the human rights issue of an individual country and use it for overthrowing the social system of that country.

### **3. The European Union bereft of independence**

The history of the United Nations knows no such document as the report of the commission of inquiry on the situation of human rights in the DPRK which was fabricated in clumsy and hasty manner.

The European Union, too, must be aware of the fact that the report has a lot of flaws and requires at least a verification.

The DPRK offered an opportunity for the verification under the situation where there are two conflicting reports thanks to the publication of the DPRK Association for Human Rights Studies' report fully reflecting the DPRK's policy on human rights, human rights regime and the reality of the people's enjoyment of human rights.

This was the reason why we consented to the visit of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the special representative for human rights of the European Union and proposed the resumption of the human rights dialogue with the European Union on our initiative.

But the European Union said that it discussed the matter within it but a country in the European Union opposed it and decided to pass the resolution because of opposition from the U.S. and Japan outside the European Union and proposed dialogue later.

Those countries that opposed it were precisely the ones that have not recognized the state sovereignty of the DPRK where the people are fully guaranteed human rights.

The Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea said at the contact with the DPRK on 27 October 2014 that he would propose to the European Union to delete the issue of the International Criminal Court from the resolution but a few days later he made a U-turn in his stand and insisted that the DPRK's human rights issue should be referred to the International Criminal Court and his visit to the DPRK be realized.

This is little short of having negotiations with the DPRK while levelling a gun at it.

As shown by the 20-odd-year-long history of the course of dealing with the nuclear issue, it is the stand of the DPRK never to have any dialogue under pressure but to recognize and approach the dialogue based on equality only.

The behaviour shown by the European Union this time makes us think once again of the independence oft repeated by it.

Some years ago, the prime minister of a member State of the European Union earned ill fame as a poodle of the U.S. but today the European Union has itself created a strong impression that it is just a poodle of the U.S.

How can proper dialogue and negotiations be held with a party bereft of reason and its own principle?

Witnessing the shape of the European Union bereft of independence, we cannot but question whether the DPRK's relations with the European Union have any meaning.



#### **4. Extreme partiality of the United Nations**

The course of the forcible passage of the resolution clearly proved that the United Nations has turned into a theatre of rampage, where everything is decided by the high-handed and arbitrary practices and dollar bag of the U.S., quite contrary to the principle of equal sovereignty specified in its Charter, and the fate of the individual countries might be adversely affected in a moment if they are weak.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the DPRK, with this year's General Assembly at hand, had contacts and dialogue on human rights issue with more than 150 United Nations Member States, except for some die-hard hostile countries.

Most of the Member States the DPRK got in touch with were sceptical about the commission of inquiry report and admitted that the document was politicized. While doing so, not a few countries noted that they cannot but take the stand of abstaining from or not participating in the voting for the resolution as the U.S., Japan and others threatened them to suspend their economic aid and loans while putting so strong political pressure on them. They asked the DPRK side to regard this as their support and solidarity with the DPRK.

There were many such countries in Asia and Africa, in particular.

Who is opposed to having dialogue on human rights, in actuality, was brought to light during the recent General Assembly.

On September 23 the U.S. announced that high-level event on human rights of north Korea would be held in New York on the sidelines of the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

Prompted by the desire to set right the wrong opinion and view on the human rights issue in the DPRK and help its participants know truth, the DPRK expressed its will to participate in the meeting in the capacity of the party concerned and proposed this to the U.S. side.

The U.S. side said it would give an answer later, after thinking about it for a long while, but refused the DPRK side's participation in the meeting under the absurd pretext that it was not appropriate at a time when the meeting was imminent.

By origin, it is a practice and procedural regulation to invite the party concerned with the agenda item to be discussed at United Nations meetings and all other international meetings.

But it was evident that the U.S., holding a meeting concerned with the DPRK only, had no willingness to agree with the participation of the DPRK, the party concerned, or held the meeting in the back lane in a bid to hatch a plot from the outset.

Are such a country and its servants entitled to talk about human rights dialogue?

Not a few countries asked for understanding that they voted for the resolution not because they were concerned for the human rights issue but because the U.S. and Japan threatened them to halt economic aid. This fully revealed to what extent the U.S. high-handed and arbitrary practices have reached in the United Nations.

As a Western personage said, the United Nations is now becoming an arena where 99 per cent of its member nations sacrifice themselves for 1 per cent of its membership.

We do not want anyone's recognition as regards the human rights issue and, moreover, do not feel the need to read the face of others at all.

What our people like and what conforms with their requirements and interests is precisely our human rights standards.

The recent farce orchestrated at the United Nations is shameless political chicanery to put down justice with injustice and conceal truth with lies and the height of brazen-faced burlesque to deceive the world people with intrigues and fabrications.

The U.S. and its followers are trying hard to bring down the man-centred socialist system chosen by the Korean people, the cradle which they regard dearer than their own lives. This is lashing them into great fury.

Growing stronger are the voices calling for dealing merciless sledgehammer blows at those who hurt even the dignity of the supreme leadership of the DPRK fully representing its people, which cannot be bartered for anything.

The DPRK will make every possible effort to shatter all human rights rackets kicked up by the U.S. and other hostile forces and defend the socialist system where the people are masters and their genuine human rights are guaranteed on the highest level.

---