



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 33:	
The Korean question (<i>continued</i>):	
(a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea;	
(b) Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations;	
(c) Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea	1
Organization of work	13

Chairman: Mr. Ismail FAHMY
(United Arab Republic).

AGENDA ITEM 33

The Korean question (*continued*) (A/6696 and Add.1-3, A/6712, A/6836, A/C.1/947, 949, 950, 951, A/C.1/L.399/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.400/Rev.1, L.401 and Add.1-2, L.404, L.405 and Add.1, L.407)

- (a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea;
- (b) Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations;
- (c) Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea

1. Mr. LAVENTURE (Dahomey) (*translated from French*): I shall be very brief. Representatives here present are well enough informed about the questions we have been discussing since yesterday, so that my delegation need not dwell overmuch on that hoary subject. Today it can be summed up schematically under three headings: (1) invitation to both the Korean parties to participate without right of vote in the consideration of the Korean question; (2) withdrawal of United Nations forces from South Korea; and (3) dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

2. Invitation to both Koreas: the Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not recognize the competence and authority of the United Nations, within the framework of the Charter's provisions, to act on the Korean question, although, as we know, the United Nations aim in Korea is to create by peaceful means a united, independent and democratic Korea with a representative form of government and to restore international peace and security completely in that region. The delegation of Dahomey therefore considers that the statement made by the North Korean

Minister for Foreign Affairs on 20 October 1967, in which he said that "the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will consider null and void and will not recognize whatever 'resolution' the United Nations may adopt arbitrarily without the participation and consent of its representative" [A/C.1/949], far from constituting a constructive element to help to solve the problem, tends to take us further away from our goal.

3. Hence without going at length into a matter on which so many distinguished speakers have already stated their views, I should like on behalf of the delegation of Dahomey to state clearly that the amendments [A/C.1/L.400/Rev.1] submitted to our draft resolution [A/C.1/L.399/Rev.1] are unacceptable.

4. With regard to the withdrawal of the United Nations forces, the delegation of Dahomey is also unable to support that proposal. It will be recalled that in 1950, the move to effect such a withdrawal resulted in North Korea's invasion of South Korea. We all remember the tragedy that ensued, entailing the loss of hundreds of thousands of human lives. The United Nations forces had to be reinstated in order to restore order and peace in the country.

5. It must be recognized that the arrangement is a sound one, since we understand that at the present time the Republic of Korea maintains diplomatic relations with seventy-six countries, seventy-two of them Members of the United Nations, that it is a member of most of the United Nations specialized agencies, that it is affiliated to many important subsidiary United Nations bodies, that it has ratified hundreds of treaties and international agreements, and that it has acted as host to many international conferences.

6. It is indeed surprising and paradoxical to see such stress laid on the withdrawal of the Korean peace-keeping forces by Powers that in the very recent past reproached the United Nations Secretary-General for his decision to withdraw the United Nations troops from the Middle East, and seemingly blamed the unfortunate events that have occurred in that part of the world largely on the withdrawal of those troops.

7. For those various reasons, the delegation of Dahomey will vote against the draft resolution calling for withdrawal [A/C.1/L.401 and Add.1-2].

8. We shall do likewise with regard to the draft resolution calling for the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea [A/C.1/L.404]. My delegation wishes to state that, since the Commission's task is to try to bring about an equitable and peaceful solution to the Korean question, it will oppose

any resolution calling for the dissolution of that Commission.

9. U SOE TIN (Burma): As this is the first time the delegation of Burma has taken the floor in this Committee, it is my pleasant duty to convey to you, Mr. Chairman, and to your able colleagues, the Vice-Chairman, Mr. Tchernouchtchenko of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Rapporteur, Mr. Örn of Sweden, the warm and sincere congratulations of our delegation on your well-deserved elections to the high offices of this Committee.

10. After so many years of heated and long-drawn-out discussions in this Committee as to whether the representatives of one or two Koreas should be invited to our discussions on the rehabilitation and unification of Korea we again find ourselves today going through the same exercise. Much has been said in favour of or against the invitation. Forceful arguments and fervent appeals have been addressed to the sense of fair play and justice, without having the slightest effect on the rigid stands taken along bloc alignments resulting from the unfortunate Korean war of 1950.

11. Many Governments have recognized either the Government of the Republic of Korea or that of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as the only legal Government in the whole of Korea; and decisions taken within the United Nations were based on these erroneous stands, which were hardly supported by facts.

12. This naturally leads one to ponder and ask oneself whether it is really necessary to argue once again on the issue. My delegation has accordingly decided to make only a very brief intervention by way of explaining our stand and the reasons therefor in the voting which will follow.

13. Burma maintains friendly relations with the Governments of both the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and has all along been in favour of the principal objectives of the United Nations in Korea, namely, to bring about by peaceful means the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of Government, and the full restoration of international peace and security in the area.

14. Unfortunately, all the discussions within the United Nations on the Korean question have centered around power-bloc politics and decisions have been made with voting taking place along Power bloc alignments. Despite repeated resolutions adopted in successive United Nations sessions, the outcome remains far short of the desired objectives. This, we are inclined to observe, is due to a large extent to attempts to assume a supra-national role for the United Nations in dealing with this matter by imposing conditions made and resolutions adopted without the participation of all the principal parties involved.

15. In the past the United Nations has failed even to give a fair and impartial hearing to all the principal parties, and discussions on the question in this Committee have at best remained a cold war exercise in futility, adopting year after year resolutions which do not have even the slightest chance of implementation.

16. Experience has thus clearly indicated that no solution to the Korean question can be found unless an atmosphere in which the issue can be considered on its own merits, and not as part of the cold war, is created. To create such an atmosphere a new approach will have to be sought. Bitter memories of the unfortunate past must give way to constructive and objective thoughts for the future. The United Nations should offer its good offices with the utmost impartiality in bringing together the two régimes of Korea, for the avowed objectives of the United Nations can be achieved only through ultimate agreement between these two parties. Unless this is done, the solution of the Korean question is beyond the range of possibility of the United Nations and will remain, as before, basically a perennial cold-war exercise in the United Nations, with Korea constituting a source of tension which prevents the full restoration of international peace and security in the area. With these considerations in mind the delegation of Burma will support measures to bring about meaningful and equitable discussions of the problem, with the full and unconditional participation of all the interested parties.

17. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation feels compelled to speak again to make some remarks in connexion with the statement of the United States representative, Mr. Broomfield, and also in connexion with other statements made in this Committee.

18. In an attempt to demonstrate, in defiance of common sense and justice, that this time too the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea must be deprived of the possibility of making themselves heard during the debate on the Korean question, the United States representative made a lengthy excursion into the past. It is indeed characteristic that in his historical disquisitions he went so far as to praise the aggression unleashed in 1950 by the United States against the Korean people, an aggression designed to deprive the Korean people in the north of the country of its democratic and social gains.

19. In his statements the United States representative quite deliberately, of course, glossed over the fact that the forces of United States aggression, having invaded the land of Korea, still remain there, in the shameful role of the occupier, lording it over the land of Korea.

20. The United States representative spoke with pathos of the principles of "self-determination", "freedom" and "peace". He was presumably hoping, with the help of such sentiments and rhetoric, to make the Committee forget that it is Washington that is shamelessly violating the elementary principles of international law and the United Nations Charter by expanding its aggression against the people of Viet-Nam, that is violating the sovereign rights of the Korean people by force of arms and not by reason, and that prevents the enjoyment by the heroic peoples of Korea and Viet-Nam of their lawful rights to national unity, self-determination and freedom, the inalienable rights of any sovereign State and people. But these tricks unmask even further the falsity and hypocrisy of those who want to act the part of staunch defenders and guardians of the United Nations Charter, while in fact violating these principles in the most flagrant manner.

21. Disregarding well-known facts, the United States Congressman tried to tell us that it was not the United States but somebody else that was responsible for the continuing partition of Korea, for the tragedy of the Korean people and for the dangerous tension in the Korean peninsula. But whom does he wish to delude through such statements and falsification of facts? This is not a national assembly here but an international Organization made up of representatives of sovereign States.

22. The United States representative lavishly praised and portrayed as almost a paragon of democracy the military fascist régime which the United States imposed on South Korea by brute force and which it maintains with its occupation forces. And the old familiar and well-worn contention was brought up again that all elections in South Korea were carried out “under the aegis and with the intervention” of the United Nations, that those elections were “free” and that as the result of such elections, each time a “national Government” was set up.

23. There is a limit to everything. Was it not under the aegis of the occupation forces of the United States that the Syngman Rhee regime was set up—Syngman Rhee, of whom Washington was so happy to make a kind of idol? Do we not know that the Syngman Rhee régime was abhorred by the people of South Korea—was hated to such an extent that despite the presence and, as we well know, the opposition of the United States forces of occupation, the people of South Korea was able in April 1960 to express its will and angrily expel this bankrupt dictator who was kept in power with the help of foreign bayonets?

24. The fate of the puppet Syngman Rhee is well known. The same sorry fate befell another American idol of evil fame in South Viet-Nam, Ngo Dinh Diem, who was also being represented by Washington as an exemplary pillar of democracy, but who later met the fate of a puppet.

25. Now the United States of America, following the law of the repetition of history and of crimes is trying to protect the puppet South Korean régime of Pak Jung Hi whose anti-popular stance became particularly clear in the elections of the spring and summer of 1967, which were accompanied by such a wave of terror and repression against all possible opponents of the Seoul clique that all records for the violation of the freely expressed will of the people seem to have been beaten on that occasion. Even the Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea which obediently does Washington's bidding was compelled in its last report [*document A/6712*] to note that the so-called parliamentary elections in South Korea were marked, to put it mildly, by “numerous instances of overt and covert violations of the laws”. We all know very well what lies behind such polished diplomatic expressions; we know what is meant by such “violations of the laws”.

26. In the light of these facts the attempts of the United States representative to whitewash the policy of Washington, while alluding in addition to the dependence of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the Soviet Union, are somewhat surprising.

27. It is generally known that there are many ties between us and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. We have

common ideals, ideals born in the great October Revolution. Our alliance is based on brotherly concord and co-operation between equal socialist States.

28. But let me remind the United States representative that the Soviet troops were completely withdrawn from North Korea as early as 1948. After that, socialist Korea had to endure severe trials during the war imposed upon it by American imperialism and its South Korean henchmen and it stood up to those trials. The patriotic upsurge of the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, who fully supported their Government, helped to heal very rapidly all the wounds caused by the war.

29. Everybody knows that for the last ten years there have been no foreign troops on the territory of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Presumably according to the ideas of the American Congressman, the socialist régime of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should have collapsed long ago, but, alas, it is becoming ever stronger and is exerting its force of attraction on the people of South Korea. The plain facts show this.

30. Many delegates spoke of the occupation of South Korea by American armed forces. Do we not know that an American army of 60,000 men continues to occupy the southern part of Korea to this day, while we are examining in this Committee the question of the fate of Korea which has been tragically partitioned and is suffering from the partition. Foreign intervention is the main obstacle to the unification of Korea. It has already been pointed out here that Washington is very much interested in maintaining its occupation of South Korea as an important strategic stronghold and large military base used by the United States in its fight against the people of Korea and other Asian peoples who are defending their right to an independent national existence.

31. Has the American Congressman come to this Committee to tell us that the American Government has finally decided to withdraw its occupation forces from Korea and to allow the Korea people themselves to settle their own fate, or has he come merely to obfuscate matters and to conceal the continuing occupation of the southern part of Korea? Is it not significant that great generosity is being evinced by the White House in the matter of the maintenance of so-called United Nations forces in Korea? The Pentagon spares no expense, pays the cost of maintaining these troops in Korea and the United Nations has no problems at all as far as the financing of these forces is concerned. Should we not reflect upon the reason for this generosity of the Pentagon? Clearly the United States is afraid of losing its influence in South Korea and its occupation by military force is the main trump card in this game. But this is not a game and the people are not pawns.

32. If the United States wants to show by deeds, not words, that it supports self-determination and peace in Korea, it must immediately withdraw its armed forces from South Korea and give the Korean people the right to settle their affairs by themselves and find the way to unite their country without any foreign intervention. That is what is meant by the principle of self-determination, which the American Congressman quite inappropriately tried to relate to the notorious United Nations Commission.

33. Since the Korean people must settle their fate by themselves, like any other people, we must recognize that since the Korean question has still not been stricken off the agenda of the United Nations, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea must be able to state their views in the United Nations on the problems of uniting the country, and also on the role of the United Nations. The invitation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea could be the first constructive step taken by the United Nations on the Korean question in the twenty years that that item has been on the agenda.

34. We should like the majority of the present composition of the United Nations to understand us correctly. The so-called Korean question arose when the membership was only half of what it is today. The main role in the United Nations was played by the imperialist Powers, and the United States at that time succeeded in carrying through a decision on the "Korean question" which was in its own interest, but not in the interest of the Korean people. Its lead was followed and is still traditionally followed by certain countries. But half of the present membership of the United Nations had nothing to do with the birth of the so-called Korea question. Is not then the desire of many States legitimate that they should learn at first hand and from clean sources what the policy of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is, and not from the false reports of the United Nations Commission, that they should judge the intentions of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from the statements of its representatives and not from the attacks made on it by the United States representative and some of the supporters of the United States who are its allies in military blocs set up in Asia?

35. The United States Congressman, in trying to justify the discriminatory and hostile policy of Washington with regard to inviting the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, referred, if you please, to the fact that the United States in the past had frequently succeeded in extracting from the United Nations decisions to its liking which gave it a free hand in Korea. He tried to convince other delegations that the illegal decisions which the United States had succeeded in imposing in the past gave Washington some kind of right to continue to interfere in the affairs of the Korean people in the future. We should like to make it clear that these arguments have of course not given the slightest semblance of legality to the actions of the United States and do not justify the continuing use of the United Nations to camouflage interference in the internal affairs of the Korean people.

36. The United States representative vehemently defended the "dignity" and "authority" of the United Nations, almost as if he were the sole guardian of our international Organization—the "dignity and authority" which he alleged might suffer if a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were invited to speak in the General Assembly.

37. We regard this as hypocrisy and sanctimony. There is not the slightest doubt that the prestige and true dignity of the United Nations would not suffer if it invited the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take part in the discussions on the Korean

question. The prestige of the Organization is damaged only by the fact that certain forces are preventing the participation of a sovereign State in the consideration of a question which directly concerns the interests of the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Is it not obvious that an invitation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would enhance the authority of this international forum? It would be a sign of objectivity on the part of the United Nations in its approach to the unjustly divided people of Korea. Obviously, the invitation must not and cannot be accompanied by any conditions imposing in advance on the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea agreement to all decisions of the United Nations, past and future. Many representatives have quite rightly emphasized this point, and we say that it must also apply to South Korea, so that the representatives of the United States cannot accuse other delegations of trying to place it on a different footing from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as far as invitations are concerned.

38. The United States representative also tried to persuade us that discriminatory conditions which are inadmissible in the case of a sovereign State, and which it is being attempted to impose upon the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, are apparently not discriminatory. In support of this statement he instanced the régime in South Korea, which he said had agreed to such conditions. But puppets are called puppets because they do the bidding of those those who pull their strings. This kind of argument cannot be used in the United Nations.

39. In his statement the representative of the United States tried to distort the clear-cut and definite attitude of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations and to use it to justify a discriminatory approach in the matter of inviting its representatives. At the same time the American representative did not wish to take into account the fact that that Government has never opposed the objectives or the Charter of the United Nations and has not in its activities undermined the authority of this Organization. This clear-cut policy of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was again set forth clearly and definitely at a high and authoritative level in the statement of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of that country dated 20 October 1967, in which, as we have noted earlier, he emphasizes that "the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has constantly abided by the principles of the United Nations Charter". [A/C.1/949.]

40. Having set forth all these considerations, the Soviet delegation would like to note with satisfaction at the same time that many representatives who took part in the discussion took a just and objective stand, firmly supporting an unconditional invitation to representatives of both parts of Korea to participate in the discussions on the Korean question.

41. The Soviet delegation expresses the hope that the delegations of all States that are truly concerned about the authority of the United Nations and guided by the purposes and principles of its Charter will also take the only correct course which is in the interests of the Korean people.

42. The Soviet delegation asks the delegations of all States to support the amendments of the ten sponsors of document A/C.1/L.400/Rev.1, calling for a simultaneous invitation to be sent to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of South Korea to take part in the discussion of the Korean question. This decision, in our firmly held view, would be in the best national interests of the people of Korea.

43. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Hungary in exercise of his right of reply.

44. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): In the course of the discussion yesterday [*1512th meeting*] the representatives of New Zealand and Australia saw fit to refer to the declaration my delegation made on the subject under discussion. The representative of Australia went to the length of calling my statement on the war waged under the banner of the United Nations against the people of Korea an insult to the United Nations.

45. It is not my intention to engage in polemics with those representatives, nor do I wish to prolong the discussion unduly, but I feel it my duty to reply in a few words.

46. I must express my surprise when I hear these rather strong reactions coming from representatives of States who do not find it insulting to their countries, nor to the United Nations, to send their armed forces—this time without the cover of the United Nations—to Viet-Nam, and when I hear their passionate pleas in favour of systematic interventions in the internal affairs of other nations. It is not surprising, of course, to hear these permanent allies of every United States military intervention in Asia tell us that it was Australia and New Zealand which defended Korea against the Koreans, as they are today the ones which defend Viet-Nam against the Viet-Nameese, and especially in these days when, according to the available information, the United States of America is engaged in the extensive and most cruel bombardments of Hanoi and Haiphong—the main cities of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam—with the apparent aim of completely destroying them with their civilian populations. These inhuman atrocities perpetrated by the United States and its allies constitute the darkest and indeed the most shameful pages of modern history and are condemned by all mankind.

47. Were not these facts of armed intervention so tragic in their consequences, one would not pay too much attention to this typical imperialist argumentation, but whatever the arguments, facts speak louder and nothing—I repeat, nothing—will hide the true nature of these aggressive adventures against the freedom-loving peoples of Asia. The memory of those who died in the far-off battlefields is insulted not by those who speak up against these adventures but by those who send them there and are still sending them to die for selfish foreign interests.

48. After hearing the lengthy, passionate and somewhat less than objective pleas of the representative of Australia telling us how to stand up for the principles of the United Nations, we cannot help wondering why we do not hear the same representative stand up and offer his country's rich experiences in forcing military expeditions when the rights of millions of human beings are brutally suppressed in

South Africa, South West Africa or in Southern Rhodesia. But here we hear no passionate appeals to take up arms in defence of freedom. Instead we hear appeals for moderation, for so-called realism and the like. The contrast is too glaring not to be noticed, and I should like to tell the representatives of Australia and New Zealand that it is in this contrast of attitudes rather than in my statements that they should find cause for insult.

49. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the United States in exercise of his right of reply.

50. Mr. BROOMFIELD (United States of America): I will only take a few moments of the Committee's time to reply to the abusive ramblings of the representative of Cuba at this morning's meeting [*1513th meeting*], and also to comment briefly on the Soviet representative's recent statement [*1511th meeting*].

51. I will simply note that the Cuban representative has again demonstrated that he sees everything now happening in the world, as well as the history of the past, through the distorted lens of a hatred for the United States. That lens enables him to see as aggression the collective action undertaken by Members of the United Nations in 1950 to defend the Republic of Korea against an armed invasion of the North, action to which sixteen Member States contributed their forces. That lens enables him to pretend it is progressive for the North Korean régime to close its doors to the outside world, including the United Nations, and to refuse its people any chance to choose its government through free and popular elections. That lens enables him to pretend it is peace-loving for North Korea to sponsor increasingly serious armed provocations against the people and the forces of the Republic of Korea within the territory of the Republic of Korea. That lens enables him to label the Republic of Korea as puppet and blinds him to the fact that it is a highly respected sovereign Government which has friendly relations with more than seventy Members of this Organization, is a member of thirteen specialized agencies, and has been consistently willing to keep its doors open to the world and to the United Nations, including observation of its electoral processes. That lens distorts all that he sees and thus all that he says. He can hardly expect this Committee to accept these distortions for anything other than what they are.

52. As to the remarks of the Soviet Ambassador, I would make only these comments. First, United States forces were withdrawn from the Republic of Korea in June of 1949, a withdrawal observed and verified by the United Nations Commission. And nearly one year to the day following that withdrawal the North Korean forces unleashed an aggressive attack across the thirty-eighth parallel, an attack which brought three years—yes, three years—of death and destruction to the people of Korea and to those Members of the United Nations which came to their aid. One cannot but wonder if the current emphasis upon the need for United Nations forces to leave the Republic of Korea may not stem from similar intentions towards the future.

53. I say it is regrettable that the Soviet representative has chosen to use every trick of the trade including the borrowing of glasses through which the Cuban representative sees the past and the present world. It proves once

again his expertise in venom and personal attacks, and his complete disregard for history as it is written—but not frequently rewritten—in free societies.

54. Finally, I would note this: the Soviet claim that the North Korean régime is in any way representative of the people of that area simply cannot be squared with two facts known to the entire world. Nearly 1 million people from North Korea have chosen to vote with their feet—the only vote available to them—by leaving North Korea to come to the South. The North Korean régime is unwilling to permit any partial observation of its electoral processes, whether by an agency created by this Assembly or by the inquiring eyes of a free foreign Press. His claim that North Korea is a model of democracy will continue to have a very hollow ring until North Korea is willing to open its doors to the outside world as the Republic of Korea has done ever since its creation.

55. The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Australia has asked for the floor in exercise of his right of reply.

56. Mr. SHAW (Australia): I am sorry that at this stage in the debate I have to ask for the right to reply to remarks just made by the representative of Hungary. Yesterday the representative of Hungary described the United Nations war in Korea as a shameful record [*1512th meeting, para. 71*] and I replied that I found this reference insulting to the memories of the soldiers of the United Nations Forces including those of my own country [*Ibid. para. 141*].

57. I am rather surprised at his surprise at my reaction. My reaction was the least that could have been expected from such a reference. When all is said and done, as the representative of the USSR said, history is not a card game. Neither can history be rewritten, although attempts are made to rewrite history in certain countries.

58. The facts of the North Korean aggression in 1950 are established in the records of the United Nations. They are established in history. The United Nations effort to restrain aggression, to resist the aggressors over a long and bloody struggle, which as I said yesterday involved nearly half a million casualties, is a matter of historical record. It is a matter also of pride and not of shame, and I for one will not sit here and hear that United Nations effort described as shameful.

59. The representative of Hungary went on to make some probably irrelevant remarks about the war in Viet-Nam. We are not discussing Viet-Nam here. My delegation for its part is prepared to see a proper discussion of Viet-Nam at whatever place and time is proper, but—the remarks having been made—I must say quite categorically that what Australian armed forces are doing in Viet-Nam now, at the request of the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam, is entirely in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter concerning the right of self-defence. What we and other States contributing forces are doing there is supporting the right of a State to defend itself against aggression—first of all indirect and now direct—coming from a neighbouring country under a ruthless régime and supported and abetted by powerful allies.

60. The majority of the countries and peoples of the Asian and Pacific area know very well what the war in Viet-Nam

is about and what the implications are for all of us living in the area. Already the successful resistance to aggression in Viet-Nam has had profound effects in the region and for all the peoples of the region. They understand the importance of that barrier to aggression. They understand also the significance and the motives of that group of countries which consistently has encouraged and supported aggression in Asia.

61. In conclusion, the representative of Hungary proffered some advice to Australia as to when and where we should take up arms overseas. I can say simply that Australia certainly is one country which requires no advice from anyone as to when it should undertake its international responsibilities.

62. Again, perhaps I might go back a little in history because it is relevant. In September 1939 Australia declared war against Germany at a time when certain Member States were in a different relationship with Germany. Germany is very far away from Australia, but we felt that the international interest, the international principles involved required that we should send our forces to Europe to fight in September 1939.

63. In December 1941 we declared war on Japan. At that time Japan had not attacked Australia but the principles were obviously clear and our obligations were obviously clear.

64. Since the conclusion of the European war we have done all we can to bolster and support efforts for the maintenance of international peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations. We contributed to the airlift which helped to sustain the free city of West Berlin in 1949-1950. We were the first contributors, apart from the United States, to the resistance of aggression in South Korea. We gave assistance over a number of years to Malaya when it was struggling to overcome the problem of communist guerilla activity and terrorism in that country, and we have come at the request of the Government of Viet-Nam to assist that country in a similar situation.

65. Those activities have not been undertaken lightly or simply in the defence of our country. Australia is a small Power, at the most a middle-sized Power, but as a small and middle-sized Power we have a sense of responsibility. We have a deep sense of the importance to our country and countries like ours of the United Nations principles and purposes. Without these principles and purposes we do not see the framework of the world within which small and middle-sized Powers can live. And it is in pursuit of those principles of international conduct and relationship that we undertake our foreign policy, including the disposition of our forces overseas.

66. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Soviet Union to exercise his right of reply.

67. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Using the formula that is usual here, and with all due modesty, we deem it necessary to reply to some of the remarks made by the United States Congressman. We hope that the statements of representatives of this Committee which we assume he heard, have

convinced him that he is not in his electoral district here and that to expect the laurels of success in this room is rather risky.

68. We should like to remind him that the so-called open-door policy has a rather painful history in the Far East. We know how those doors were opened; we know that master-keys had to be used, what gunboats and "black ships", such as those of Commodore Perry, were used. History teaches us that and no one will rewrite or change that history. But we should like to say that if the American Congressman is so enthusiastic about opening windows and doors, then why does he not speak out in favour of opening the door wider so that the United States occupation forces may leave the territory of South Korea and cease disgracing that land and the flag of the United Nations?

69. If Washington supports an open-door policy, why does the United States itself, or with the help of its servile attendants, not want to open the doors of the United Nations to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea? Perhaps after the exchange of views in this Committee, the United States representative will be bold enough to adopt a different attitude, not only here but also in Congress.

70. We do not wish to pursue the matter at this time but we should like to hear an answer to our question: why are the doors of our Organization bolted so firmly by Washington's representatives in the face of the representatives of foreign States—small States, not as powerful as the United States. But our Organization is not composed only of States of the latter type, and those who speak of open doors but in fact slam the door shut are resorting to nothing less than demagoguery.

71. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Cuba to exercise his right of reply.

72. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): This morning [1513th meeting] I quoted evidence from American sources that the so-called United Nations action in Korea is not and never has been anything more than United States aggression against the Korean people, clumsily camouflaged by the United Nations flag. Since the representative of the United States was unable to refute any of the facts that I put forward and yet insisted, with a puzzling reference to spectacles, on denying their significance, I should like to reiterate some of those arguments now and to put forward some new ones. I shall do so without wearing glasses to see whether the United States representative will find them any more convincing.

73. This morning I quoted General Clark, the Commander of the so-called United Nations forces in the Korean War, a United States citizen taking his orders from the Pentagon, as having stated at the end of the war of aggression against Korea that the United Nations was incapable of implementing any of the resolutions it had adopted. Although he was Commander of the United Nations forces stationed in Korea, he did not recall having received any orders from the United Nations itself on the conduct of the war.

74. I also cited the spokesman of the United Nations General Staff, Mr. William Powell—also, of course, an

American citizen—who, according to the *Asahi Evening News* of 5 December 1956, said it was incorrect to call the American troops stationed in South Korea "United Nations troops", and that the Supreme Command of the American troops in Korea could not be termed "the Supreme Command of the United Nations forces".

75. Let me add another such statement. In 1962, General Van Fleet, Commander-in-Chief of the United States Eighth Army, and likewise a participant in the aggression against the people of Korea, said that Korea had been a blessing. There had to be a Korea, he said, either here or somewhere else in the world.

76. I must also point out—and the representative of the United States is fully aware of it—that on the very morning of the day on which the Security Council was to meet at 3.15 p.m. to endorse the Yankee aggression in Korea, President Truman had ordered the American armed forces to invade the Korean peninsula, so that the Security Council that afternoon had no option but to endorse the military intervention already under way. I must remind him too that that Security Council resolution was adopted in flagrant violation of Article 32 of the Charter, since it was adopted in the absence of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, one of the parties to the dispute. I must also remind him that on that same occasion Article 27 (3) of the Charter was violated, since not all the permanent members of the Security Council participated in the vote, nor did they all vote in favour of that Council decision.

77. I repeat that the United Nations troops—as the representative of the United States insists on calling the United States troops, even though their commanders called them something else—have never at any time, either during the war or since, reported to the United Nations on their activities, and the United Nations has at no time discussed or been in a position to discuss what those troops have been doing in South Korea.

78. Finally, here is another pertinent fact which emphasizes the very slender connexion between the United Nations and the despicable aggression by the United States in Korea.

79. As the representative of the United States well knows, on 15 April 1951 the United States Government decided to replace the Commander of the so-called United Nations troops in Korea, General MacArthur, and to appoint another United States General.

80. I should like to ask whether any representative here present has information concerning any participation by his own or any other country Member of the United Nations in the various changes that took place in the United Nations command.

81. And now, putting my glasses on again, I would like to tell the representative of the United States that we do indeed look at the world and at history through different-coloured spectacles. His own and those of his Government are spectacles of hate as they focus on people who are fighting for independence; mine are spectacles of hate as I look at the United States policy, hate of the oppressors of the world.

82. The CHAIRMAN: With the statement we have just heard by the representative of Cuba, the general debate on the procedural part of the Korean question is closed.

83. I believe members of the Committee would agree with me that after the thorough debate which has taken place on that part of the Korean question the Committee could very easily dispense with a separate debate on the relevant draft resolution and the amendments thereto. If it is acceptable to the members of the Committee we shall proceed accordingly.

It was so decided.

84. The CHAIRMAN: Certain representatives have expressed the desire to explain their votes before the voting, and if I hear no objection I shall give them the floor, in accordance with rule 129 of the rules of procedure.

85. Sir Leslie GLASS (United Kingdom): I propose at this time to confine myself to explaining the way in which my delegation will vote on the proposals on invitations, which are before us in documents A/C.1/L.399/Rev.1 of 30 October and A/C.1/L.400/Rev.1 of the same date.

86. The proposal in the second of those documents, though submitted in the form of amendments, is, as we all recognize, a quite separate and distinct proposal. In the view of my delegation it should have been submitted as such. This device of putting forward as amendments new and conflicting proposals in order to circumvent the rules relating to the order in which proposals are put to the vote is making nonsense of our procedures. If we are not careful we shall soon have amendments calling for the total deletion of the original proposals and the substitution of entirely new texts, and we shall have amendments and sub-amendments *ad infinitum*. That could only lead to disorderly debate and damage to the prestige of our Organization.

87. My delegation is accordingly strongly opposed to the manner in which the sponsors of the amendments have chosen to put forward their proposals.

88. With regard to the substance of the two alternative proposals, the second which I have referred to would have the Committee ignore entirely one aspect of the Korean question which in our view is fundamental to the whole problem, namely, the fact that the North Korean authorities continue to hold the view that the United Nations has neither the competence nor the authority to concern itself with the Korean question. That does not seem to my delegation a realistic approach.

89. The alternative proposal recalls the Committee's previous view that:

“... representatives of the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea may participate in the discussion of the Korean question provided they first unequivocally accept the competence and authority of the United Nations within the terms of the Charter to take action on the Korean question,” [A/C.1/L.399/Rev.1, *first preambular paragraph*].

It recognizes that the

“... participation of the interested parties would contribute to an equitable and effective discussion of the Korean question,” [Ibid., *second preambular paragraph*].

At the same time, however, it takes account of the respective attitudes towards the United Nations of the Republic of Korea and the North Korean authorities. In the light of those contrasting attitudes it concludes with the decision to invite a representative of the Republic of Korea, which has accepted the United Nations competence, and at the same time reaffirms the Committee's

“... willingness to invite a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take part in the discussion of the Korean problem without right of vote provided it first unequivocally accepts the competence and authority of the United Nations within the terms of the Charter to take action on the Korean question.” [Ibid., *operative para. 2.*]

90. My delegation deeply regrets that the North Korean attitude should be what it is. We would hope to see that attitude change, but we do not believe it possible for this Committee to ignore it. Accordingly, we support and shall vote for the proposal in document A/C.1/L.399/Rev.1, which, while taking account of all the facts, enables this Committee to allow both the Republic of Korea and North Korea, if it is in fact the wish of the North Koreans to do so, to co-operate with this Committee and with the United Nations.

91. We shall vote against the proposal in document A/C.1/L.400/Rev.1.

92. Mr. GHORBAL (United Arab Republic): We have heard during the debate, and we share the view, that logic, justice and experience require that the parties most interested in a dispute should participate in the discussion of that dispute. In our view it would be illogical to listen to one side and exclude the other. It would be unjust on our part to base our views, our judgements, indeed our verdict, on views expressed by one side while at the same time closing our ears, and hence our minds, to the views of the other. It would be going against experience, for the United Nations at certain times in the past allowed the participation in its discussions of parties concerned in a problem without setting preconditions. We have even allowed, in accordance with the Charter and supported by practice, individuals to come as petitioners and express their views, grievances and ideas to the General Assembly, the Trusteeship Council and other principal organs of the United Nations and its subsidiary bodies. It is thus surprising to us to witness the pressure to exclude from our discussions, and to close our ears to, the representatives of a sovereign and independent State which is mostly concerned. It is unfortunate that we are called upon to practise discrimination in our discussions and the conduct of our deliberations at a time when we are concerned and determined to abolish discrimination everywhere, whatever form or shape it takes.

93. My country entertains friendly relations with the Governments of the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. We are pleased to exchange with each of them duly accredited representatives. We enjoy growing economic and cultural relations with them.

To our mind, we are under an obligation to give each his due and to allow each of them to participate on an equal footing, without conditions, in our deliberations.

94. If this is their right as sovereign independent States, it is equally our right to listen to all sides before we express our views on what concerns their future and that of the Korean people as a whole. It is not only our right but our duty to do so. It would be strange to create obstacles to the exercise of those rights and responsibilities and then to hide behind those obstacles.

95. We practise towards each other tolerance of freedom of speech and expression of views. We have accorded ourselves the right of reply when we feel it is necessary and fitting. It is ridiculous to withdraw the inherent right of participation from an interested party—and the most interested party—in our discussions of a problem affecting that party. Thus it was neither illogical nor unreasonable for the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, in such conditions of exclusion, to consider any resolution adopted by the United Nations as null and void.

96. Such a view indeed represents a rule of law practised by every system of jurisprudence—that every verdict of a court of law which is based on the denial of the right of a party concerned to be heard is null and void. In this regard I wish to refer to a statement made in the Committee yesterday that any party coming before a tribunal must *a priori* accept the competence of that tribunal. I would say that in certain instances the party concerned could challenge, and has the right to challenge, the competence of the court and still be heard by that court by the exercise of the party's inherent right to present his case.

97. Much has been said about what constitutes an insult to the United Nations and a danger to its prestige. The real insult to the United Nations is the aggression committed by one Member of the United Nations against another Member, notwithstanding obligations under the Charter and the numerous resolutions adopted by the United Nations in this regard.

98. In this connexion I wish to associate myself with the remarks made yesterday by my colleague and friend, Ambassador Amerasinghe of Ceylon. He said:

“What constitutes the greater, the more insolent affront to the dignity of the United Nations: for a Member State of the United Nations, which has acknowledged the competence and authority of the United Nations, to spurn that authority's decisions whenever it chooses, or for a party, whilst stating that it cannot accept United Nations competence, to agree nevertheless to participate in United Nations discussions? Surely the greater affront to United Nations dignity comes from the insubordination of the peccant Member State.” [1512th meeting, para. 170.]

99. I may add that what is more of an insult is the assistance and support given by some Powers to such aggressors, further enabling them to make a mockery of the principles of the Charter. Not only has this policy dealt a blow to the basic principle of our Organization that aggression must not be rewarded, but it has equally encouraged the aggressor to resume and increase his

aggression in violation of the resolutions of the United Nations.

100. Thus it was strange to our ears to listen to appeals to save the prestige of the United Nations by denying a most interested party its right to be heard during our discussion of its particular problems. It is for that reason that we shall support the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.400/Rev.1.

101. Mr. TOMOROWICZ (Poland): I should like to make a few remarks on the motives which prompted my delegation to choose the way in which it intends to vote.

102. At the beginning I would say that at least some important factors have been made clear during the debate which has just closed. As my delegation sees them, these are:

103. First, it has been established beyond any doubt that the procedure proposed by the authors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.399/Rev.1 is without any precedent. This was made particularly clear by the representative of Sudan. We have heard no valid counter-arguments: it is just as well, for they do not exist. I am certain that the Secretariat could corroborate this point, testifying to the fact that so far there have been no precedents. We are thus confronted here with a proposal which is discriminatory in character, without any precedents, politically harmful and unacceptable from the moral point of view.

104. Second, it has also been made clear beyond any doubt in the course of our debate that the so-called United Nations Command in South Korea is in fact nothing else but the United States military command in charge of the United States military contingents stationed there. Should there be any doubts in the minds of some representatives here, perhaps the Secretariat could inform us whether the General Assembly has been offered reports due from this body at any time up to now—that is, since 11 May 1967. I mention 11 May 1967 because on that date, when the Secretary-General was asked whether the United Nations Command in Korea had been keeping him directly informed, he had to reply thus according to a press release: “I must admit that I have not received one single report from the United Nations Command in Korea.”

105. Third, the arguments to the effect that the proposed draft resolution is equitable in its provisions fail to convince us. We are not in a position to question the fact that these or other conditions have been accepted unilaterally by South Korea, and especially the fact that it has done so under the prevailing conditions—that is in the presence of the occupying American forces—but this cannot and must not affect the sovereign rights of any other State.

106. Fourth, in the present circumstances we have to choose whether to vote in accordance with justice, our conscience, moral laws, the interests of the Korean nation and the interests of our Organization, or whether to vote under pressure of policies based on a position of strength, closing our eyes and rejecting all the principles, save one perhaps, which might be expressed in the slogan “What is good for the United States has to be good for the United Nations”.

107. My delegation has chosen to act in accordance with its conscience, with logic and moral responsibility, in accordance with the true spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. That is why my delegation will vote for the proposed amendments as formulated in document A/C.1/L.400/Rev.1.

108. Mr. MENA SOLORZANO (Nicaragua) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, before explaining my delegation's vote I should like to express our pleasure at your election to preside over the Committee. We are also gratified at the election of your fellow-officers, Mr. Tchernouchtchenko and Mr. Örn.

109. My delegation believes that it is a rule of absolute honesty, and one we have always followed, as the records of the United Nations will show, to hear both parties to a conflict. We feel that any honest judge, before he can reach an impartial verdict, must be acquainted with the arguments of the parties to the dispute. But in the present situation there is an anomaly which cannot pass unnoticed, namely that North Korea has clearly and categorically declared that it does not recognize either the competence or the authority of the United Nations to provide guidelines for its problem with the Republic of Korea.

110. This Organization has serious commitments and also has to safeguard its dignity. If the authority and competence of the United Nations are not recognized, what use is it to invite here people who deny us in advance our full right to seek peace and security in the world? All our efforts would be in vain, and even worse, we would be condoning an insult to the prestige of the Organization and setting a most unfortunate precedent; for any group of people or any nation would feel at liberty to accept our hospitality with the deliberate intention of mocking and insulting us. In my delegation's view that is not the sensible and logical course. If the parties to the dispute promise to recognize our authority and competence and to express their views in accordance with the strictest rules of courtesy, then let them both come and welcome. But if one of the parties repudiates the great prestige which the United Nations enjoys in the minds of men, as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea does in this instance, we see no reason to invite it to come here.

111. We are here to make constructive recommendations based on the strictest good faith; we are not here to connive at the weakening of our moral fibre or to witness the destruction of the lofty, forward-looking labours by which we are all inspired. In this frame of mind my delegation will vote against the amendments [*A/C.1/L.400/Rev.1*] and in favour of the draft resolution [*A/C.1/L.399/Rev.1*]; at the same time I wish to place it on record that we would be in favour of the Committee's inviting the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in the debate, without the right to vote, provided, and not before, it unequivocally accepts the competence and the authority of the United Nations, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter, to adopt measures on the question of Korea.

112. Mr. MIDDELBURG (Netherlands): At the conclusion of a lengthy and comprehensive procedural debate on the representation in this Committee of a non-member and a Government whose existence is not in accordance with the

resolutions of the General Assembly, this Committee is about to take a decision on this matter by a vote.

113. The delegation of the Netherlands has listened with attention to the numerous interventions in this debate. Although we had made up our mind as soon as the relevant proposal had been submitted, we listened with particular care to those members who advocated here the representation during the debate of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Not only did those delegations not adduce one single argument which could possibly bring us to reconsider our position; they have, on the contrary, strengthened our intention to vote in favour of the draft resolution and against the far-reaching amendments thereto.

114. Much as we agree with the general principle of hearing both sides in a conflict, in the case of the People's Republic of Korea we are left no other choice but to take a negative decision.

115. In the opinion of my delegation no purpose would be served by hearing any representative of a Government that consistently has opposed itself to the authority of the United Nations.

116. It is clear from the North Korean statements and the interventions of those members who support its course that the only decision it would agree with and adhere to would be unification of Korea on its conditions. These conditions would be no more and no less than the imposition of the North Korean one-party system on the Republic of South Korea.

117. These are conditions to which my delegation will not agree. The Republic of South Korea, on the other hand, enjoys a Government constituted on the basis of free and valid elections, a Government, furthermore, that is recognized by a resolution of the United Nations as the only lawful one in Korea [*General Assembly resolution 195 (III)*].

118. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on the draft resolutions and amendments. Once I have declared that we are in the process of voting, points of order will not be allowed unless they are made under rule 129.

119. To clarify the situation before the Committee, I wish to state that the Committee received the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.399 co-sponsored by thirteen Powers. It now appears in document A/C.1/L.399/Rev.1, dated 30 October. In connexion with that draft resolution the Committee received some proposed amendments which are contained in document A/C.1/L.400, co-sponsored by ten Powers, which has now become document A/C.1/L.400/Rev.1.

120. We will, in accordance with rule 131, take up first the amendments, and before the voting on each of the four amendments the Secretary of the Committee will read it out so that every delegation knows exactly what it is voting on. A roll-call vote has been requested.

121. The Committee will vote first on the first amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.400/Rev.1.

122. Mr. VELLODI (Secretary of the Committee): The amendment reads as follows:

"In the first preambular paragraph, delete the words 'its view that' and 'provided they first unequivocally accept the competence and authority of the United Nations within the terms of the Charter to take action on the Korean question'."

123. In the same amendment there is a minor consequential amendment and that reads as follows:

"Insert 'that' after the word *Recalling*'."

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Argentina, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Austria, Barbados, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Cyprus, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Tunisia, Upper Volta.

The amendment was rejected by 50 votes to 37, with 24 abstentions.

124. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on the second amendment.

125. Mr. VELLODI (Secretary of the Committee): The second amendment reads as follows:

"Replace the second, third and fourth paragraphs of the preamble by the following new paragraph:

'*Considering* that no question can be discussed equitably and effectively without the participation of the interested parties.'

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Singapore, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Repub-

lics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania.

Against: South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda.

Abstaining: Sweden, Tunisia, Upper Volta, Austria, Barbados, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Iran, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Mexico, Senegal, Sierra Leone.

The amendment was rejected by 48 votes to 36, with 26 abstentions.

126. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to vote on the third amendment.

127. Mr. VELLODI (Secretary of the Committee): The third amendment reads as follows:

"In operative paragraph 1, after the words '*Decides* to invite', insert the words 'simultaneously and without condition a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and', and after the words 'Republic of Korea', the words 'as interested parties,'."

Operative paragraph 1 would then read as follows:

"*Decides* to invite simultaneously and without condition a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and a representative of the Republic of Korea, as interested parties, to take part in the discussion of the Korean question without right of vote;".

A vote was taken by roll call.

Portugal, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Romania, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland.

Against: Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil,

Canada, Central African Republic, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines.

Abstaining: Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Tunisia, Upper Volta, Austria, Barbados, Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Cyprus, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Mexico.

The amendment was rejected by 50 votes to 37, with 24 abstentions.

128. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on the fourth amendment.

129. Mr. VELLODI (Secretary of the Committee): The fourth amendment calls for the deletion of operative paragraph 2.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi.

Against: Canada, Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil.

Abstaining: Cameroon, Chad, Chile, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malta, Mexico, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Tunisia, Upper Volta, Austria, Barbados.

The amendment was rejected by 48 votes to 36, with 26 abstentions.

130. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.339/Rev.1.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Brazil, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Brazil, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Greece, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, South Africa, Spain, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana.

Against: Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nigeria, Poland, Romania, Sudan, Syria, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Albania, Algeria.

Abstaining: Burma, Cameroon, Ceylon, Chad, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Libya, Nepal, Pakistan, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sweden, Tunisia, Upper Volta, Afghanistan, Barbados.

The draft resolution was adopted by 58 votes to 28, with 25 abstentions.

131. The CHAIRMAN: I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to explain their votes.

132. Miss BROOKS (Liberia): My delegation would have preferred to vote in favour of the amendments in document A/C.1/L.400/Rev.1 because we feel that they are in harmony with the objectives of the United Nations as set forth in the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea—namely, that:

“The principal objectives of the United Nations in Korea are to bring about by peaceful means the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of government, and the full restoration of international peace and security in the area.” [A/6712, para. 1.]

Certainly this objective cannot be achieved by excluding the views of the parties directly interested.

133. However, my delegation had some problem as regards the last paragraph of the telegram that was forwarded by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Secretary-General [A/C.1/949]. While we must agree that the United Nations could not or should not expect the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to implement a resolution when it has been excluded from participating in discussion of an agenda item in which its interest is vitally affected, nevertheless we could not uphold the principle that, *a priori*, we should have the consent of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, because if we did we would be according a right, a privilege, to a non-member State that is not accorded to a Member State of the United Nations.

134. In the United Nations we discuss a problem, and we seek co-operation from those who are vitally interested. However, we do reach a consensus taking into consideration the interests involved, and we adopt a resolution and expect that the parties will implement it.

135. Mr. GHAUS (Afghanistan): May I explain very briefly the votes cast by my delegation on the draft resolution just adopted by the Committee, and on the amendments to that draft resolution.

136. Our votes in favour of the amendments were motivated solely by our desire to see the representatives of both Korean States present during the discussions of the Korean question. We believe that it would have been in conformity with the norms of justice and equity if the Committee had seen fit to invite the representatives of both parties without preconditions and had listened to their views on a matter which concerns them so closely.

137. In our opinion this arrangement would have increased the possibilities of our ascertaining more fully the realities of the situation. No matter how unselfish the motives of those who insist that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should be permitted to participate in our deliberations upon the fulfilment of certain conditions, it can be assumed that this insistence will once again confine the debate of this Committee to a mere repetition of well-known positions and will not make a contribution towards solving any of the real issues at stake.

138. Under the present circumstances one can hardly expect that this method or approach will yield any practical results leading to the peaceful reunification of Korea. From a practical point of view we should not try to be too formalistic about preconditions and competences. On the contrary, it would serve the cause of peace if we tried to encourage both parties to come to the United Nations and to explain directly to us, and in detail, their respective positions.

139. As the amendments in document A/C.1/L.400/Rev.1 were voted down by the Committee, my delegation on the basis of the above-mentioned considerations had no alternative but to abstain on document A/C.1/L.399/Rev.1.

Organization of Work

140. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now concluded its consideration of the procedural part of the Korean item—namely, the question of the invitation. In accordance with the decision taken earlier by the Committee, we shall listen tomorrow morning to the statement of the representative of Malta on the item dealing with the sea-bed and the ocean floor. I understand that his statement will take the whole of the morning meeting. In the afternoon, we shall revert to item 33, the Korean question, and the general debate on the substantive aspects will begin. Representatives are requested to comment simultaneously on the three sub-items of item 33. I urge all delegations to inscribe their names on the list of speakers.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.