

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1426th
MEETING**

(Closing meeting)

Tuesday, 21 December 1965,
at 3.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 32:</i>	
<i>The Korean question: reports of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (concluded) . . .</i>	461
<i>Completion of the Committee's work.</i>	467

Chairman: Mr. Károly CSATORDAY (Hungary).

AGENDA ITEM 32

The Korean question: reports of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (concluded) (A/5812, A/6012 and Corr.1; A/C.1/897, 899, 925, 927, 928; A/C.1/L.355 and Add.1, L.362)

1. Mr. RAMANI (Malaysia), speaking on a point of order, asked the Chairman to ascertain whether one third of the members of the Committee were present; if not, the quorum referred to in rule 110 of the rules of procedure would be lacking.

2. The CHAIRMAN announced that there was a quorum. He invited the Committee to proceed with its consideration of the agenda item before it.

3. Mr. CORNER (New Zealand) said that the Government of the Republic of Korea was the only democratically elected Government in Korea, whereas the North Korean régime owed its original installation to the Soviet occupation forces and since then had never obtained any valid mandate from the people it claimed to represent. Despite many difficulties, the Republic of Korea had continued to progress politically and economically—as witness the reports of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea—and had strengthened its democratic structure. In that connexion he paid a tribute to the Commission and its members for the objectivity they had shown in setting out the facts; despite the diatribes of the North Korean régime there was no gainsaying those facts, particularly with regard to the contrast between the free elections in the Republic of Korea and the single list and the absence of secret balloting in the northern part of the country. For the purpose of the reunification of Korea, therefore, the two systems could be reconciled only by a process which met certain well defined standards and which took into account the interests of the Korean people and the role of the United Nations. The Committee should examine the two draft resolutions before it in the light of those considerations.

4. In South Korea, the Government and the opposition parties had made it clear that they supported the objective of the United Nations in Korea: namely the establishment, by peaceful means, of a unified, independent and democratic country under a representative form of government, and the full restoration of international peace and security in the area. That objective was reaffirmed in operative paragraph 1 of the thirteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.355 and Add.1), of which New Zealand was a sponsor. In order to attain the objective it would be necessary to hold free, nation-wide elections, organized in such a way as to ensure that the people could express their wishes fully. Such freedom of expression could be assured only by some form of impartial international supervision, arrangements for which could no doubt be negotiated. That, in essence, was what the North Koreans were being asked to accept, but so far they had not dared to accept it. Yet there was nothing unreasonable or sinister about those principles and proposals, and it was surely obvious that the question of withdrawing the troops under United Nations jurisdiction could be taken up in the process of applying the principles he had spelled out. That could not, however, be made a prior condition for agreement. Experience had shown that political and geographical facts must be taken into account; one attack had been launched from the north, and the United Nations had learned its lesson.

5. He therefore considered that the two-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.362) should be rejected, for it was tendentious in both fact and expression and sought to deny the role and competence of the United Nations. The thirteen-Power draft resolution, on the other hand, reaffirmed the principles which had governed the United Nations in seeking the peaceful reunification of Korea, and urged that continuing efforts should be made to that end. That was an objective which warranted the support of the Committee and the General Assembly.

6. Mr. WYZNER (Poland) saw little point in keeping the item entitled "The Korean question" on the agenda, particularly since the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was unjustly deprived of the right to participate in the discussion. The United States, with the support of some other countries, stubbornly continued to use the United Nations to cover its own political aims in Korea, which were in direct contradiction to the interests of the Korean nation. The overwhelming majority of the Members of the United Nations, including the sponsors of the thirteen-Power draft resolution, were well aware that the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea was a relic of the cold war and was neither able nor willing to contribute

in any way to the unification of Korea. The Commission was itself a party to hostile actions against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and therefore had no legal or moral grounds for offering its services for the purpose of unifying Korea. It existed only in order to enable the United States and the South Korean authorities to reject systematically the many realistic proposals which the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had made with a view to the peaceful unification of the country.

7. Thus, UNCURK had become a tool for the division rather than the unification of Korea. Moreover it was not contributing to the rehabilitation of the country. Events in the southern part of Korea followed the pattern established in other regions of Asia where the United States had arbitrarily assumed so-called "special responsibility": the build-up of American military forces, internal unrest, and changing dictatorships. There was therefore no place for UNCURK in the United Nations system, and it should be dissolved immediately.

8. If a just solution to the Korean problem was to be found, the United States must refrain from exploiting it for the sole benefit of its Far Eastern political and military strategy, which constituted a great danger to international peace. No progress could be made while United States troops remained in South Korea, or while the United States continued to intervene in the area. In those circumstances, unification would amount to placing the territory of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea under the umbrella of United States "special responsibilities", under which South Korean troops had recently been dragged into the aggressive war waged by the United States against the people of Viet-Nam. The constructive proposals concerning the unification of Korea which had been made repeatedly by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should become the subject of serious negotiations among the Korean people themselves, free from any foreign interference. The present state of affairs was purely a product of United States Far Eastern policy; the United States and those countries which supported its policy in the region must accept full responsibility for the consequences. There was no reason whatsoever for the United Nations to lend its name to that policy, which it was, nevertheless, again requested to do. Rejection of that request would do much to strengthen the Organization, and for that reason his delegation would vote in favour of the two-Power draft resolution and appealed to other delegations to do the same.

Mr. Benites (Ecuador), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

9. Mr. SHAW (Australia) noted with regret that in Asia there had been no developments such as those that had recently been taking place in Europe—as had been shown by the Committee's debate on agenda item 33—towards an improvement in relations between States with different political and economic systems. The fundamental reason for that was that in Asia there was still one great Power which regarded war as an instrument of policy, and smaller Powers which did not hesitate to work for the overthrow of neighbouring régimes. Future action had to be considered in the light of that situation.

10. Some representatives believed that the problem of Korea could be solved by bringing together spokesmen of the two parties; but that was not such a simple matter. The Committee should bear in mind not only the aggression committed by the régime established in North Korea but also the manner in which that régime expressed itself in its latest communication (A/C.1/925). In the circumstances it was shocking to hear described as a mockery the participation of the representative of the Republic of Korea in the debate; on the contrary, that was the only legitimate procedure, since the Republic of Korea had the only validly elected democratic Government in Korea. The facts, then, must be taken for what they were; the United Nations should continue its work and should show the régime installed in North Korea that it would not be allowed to unify the country by force of arms or to place it under a dictatorship. The South Korean people had already rejected that solution, at great sacrifice, and the United Nations should support the Republic of Korea.

11. The report of UNCURK showed the economic progress made in the Republic of Korea and the favourable trend in its international relations; in that connexion he congratulated the Republic of Korea and Japan on the treaty they had recently concluded. If that policy was to be pursued freely, the United Nations forces would have to be kept in Korea. It was absurd to claim that they dominated the country; they were far too few and scattered for that. It should be remembered, however, that in 1949 North Korea had taken advantage of the withdrawal of the occupation forces to launch an armed attack on South Korea. The same situation would recur today if the guard was dropped, and as he saw it the only course open was to reaffirm the objectives of the United Nations in Korea, as stated in operative paragraph 1 of the thirteen-Power draft resolution, of which Australia was a sponsor. Only when those objectives were accepted by the régime installed in North Korea could attitudes be so far relaxed as to open the way for the reunification of Korea. To judge from the tone of certain statements, that time was still far off. Australia therefore hoped that the Committee would adopt the thirteen-Power draft resolution.

12. Mr. PACHARIYANGKUN (Thailand) said that the differences between the two texts under discussion were so great that it was not hard to make a decision. The thirteen-Power draft resolution, of which Thailand was a sponsor, was lucid and complete. It stated the relevant facts briefly and supported United Nations decisions which had as their object the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Government for the whole of Korea and the restoration of international peace in the area. Another purpose to be served by adopting that draft resolution was that of reaffirming the authority of the United Nations and its determination to complete its task; that was a vital necessity, especially at the current critical stage in the Organization's history.

13. The other draft resolution under discussion had diametrically opposite aims: by falsifying facts and concealing the truth, it distorted the role of the United Nations in the area. The matter had been

debated so often in the General Assembly that there was no need to review or refute all those allegations. By adopting such a text the Committee would only endanger the security of the area, encourage disturbances and, ultimately, strip the United Nations of its authority.

14. At the time of North Korea's aggression against South Korea—a territory under direct United Nations jurisdiction—his country, like many others, had responded to the Organization's appeal and had thus reaffirmed its faith in the principles of the United Nations. The war had ended, but the essential task, that of unifying Korea through the United Nations, had still to be carried out. Efforts to perform it must be continued, so that all the sacrifices already made would not be in vain; Thailand was convinced that the Committee would take its decision accordingly.

15. Mr. TREMBLAY (Canada) referred to the part played by Canada on the United Nations Temporary Commission in 1948, then at the time of the aggression by North Korea, and lastly at the 1954 Geneva Conference. His country was well aware of the complexity of the problem, to which a great many solutions had already been suggested. His delegation was still convinced that there was only one way to bring out the unification of Korea: namely, by allowing the Korean people to express their wishes freely in a national election held under effective international supervision. That was the primary objective of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, and it was to be hoped that the Commission would eventually be able to accomplish its task. For that reason his delegation had willingly joined in sponsoring the thirteen-Power draft resolution.

16. Mr. RAKOTOMALALA (Madagascar) said that his country had been expressing its opinion on the question under discussion only since the General Assembly's fifteenth session. Its attitude was based on simple reasoning. It considered that the Government of the Republic of Korea was the only legitimate Government of that country, since it alone was the product of proper elections held under effective international control. He reviewed the history of the efforts made by the United Nations and described the help it had received from the Republic of Korea; the régime established in North Korea had refused to apply the resolutions which had been adopted, and its attitude alone prevented the termination of a situation fraught with danger to world peace. The international prestige of the Republic of Korea was growing from year to year; Madagascar commended UNCURK on the part it had played in that process, of which there was further evidence in the recent conclusion of a treaty with Japan. All those who had visited the Republic of Korea had been able to see for themselves that freedom prevailed there, that fundamental rights were respected, and that the opposition parties could express their views in the National Assembly. It was true, however, that economic and social development was handicapped by the separation of the two parts of the country; it was the duty of the United Nations to end that separation and enable 40 million people to go forward to a better future.

17. He therefore invited the Committee to vote for the thirteen-Power draft resolution, of which his country was a sponsor; that text was needed to safeguard the interests of the whole Korean population and to reaffirm such great principles as the right of self-determination and the right to hold free elections. By approving that text, the Committee would demonstrate its concern to remove the causes of the insecurity aroused by the division of nations, not only in Korea but elsewhere as well.

18. Mr. HSUEH (China) said that the whole Korean question in the United Nations was the result of the occupation of the northern provinces of Korea by communists and the armed invasion launched by them in an attempt to extend the communist rule to the south. The United Nations forces had been sent to Korea by the Security Council in order to repel that invasion. Their presence was still necessary, in accordance with the expressed wish of the Korean people, because of the continued existence of the communist threat and for the purpose of carrying out the responsibility of the United Nations under the Charter to maintain peace and security in the area. At the same time, the United Nations sought a peaceful settlement of the question by the application of the principle of self-determination. That effort had already resulted in the realization, in the southern part of Korea, of the United Nations objective, which, in part, was the establishment of an independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of government. The remaining objective of the reunification of Korea had not yet been realized only because of the communist control of the north, where some 12 million Koreans who had been unable to escape were still deprived of their fundamental rights. Those Koreans belonged to the same people as those who lived in the south and were equally entitled to the right to self-determination. It was the duty of the United Nations not to abandon them, any more than it should abandon the people of Southern Rhodesia.

19. Despite the defamatory attacks unceasingly made by the Korean Communists on the United Nations and its Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, the United Nations should persevere in its efforts and strive to attain its objective in all parts of Korea. The political, diplomatic, economic and social successes achieved under the Government of the Republic of Korea, as recorded in the UNCURK reports (A/5812 and A/6012), would undoubtedly encourage the people in North Korea to rid themselves of the Communist régime which had been imposed on them, thereby making possible the reunification of the country. Regretting that it was still not possible to remove the difficulty in the admission of the Republic of Korea to membership in the United Nations, he urged the United Nations to continue unremittingly its excellent work in Korea.

20. Mr. DIACONESCU (Romania) wished to emphasize that his delegation felt that the Korean question should not have been placed on the agenda. It was deplorable that year after year the General Assembly should adopt identical resolutions requesting the inclusion of the question in the agenda of the following session simply in order to perpetuate the situation. Furthermore, the existence of UNCURK was not justified and constituted

one more hindrance to unification. The United Nations presence in Korea was contrary to the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of States proclaimed in the Charter. Only the Korean people had the right to decide their fate. It was perfectly obvious that it was the United States that was concerned with perpetuating the situation in order to justify the presence of its troops in Korea under the United Nations banner—troops whom it was equipping with the most modern weapons.

21. In order to solve the problem in the true spirit of the Charter, find a peaceful solution and reduce tension between the parties concerned, a different attitude must be adopted. The fate of Korea as a whole could be discussed only in the presence of representatives of both Korean States. The withdrawal of United States and other foreign troops from South Korea and the dissolution of UNCURK were the first steps to be taken with a view to eliminating a breeding-ground of trouble and a source of constant concern. His delegation would therefore vote against the thirteen-Power draft resolution, which would perpetuate United Nations interference in the domestic affairs of the Korean people and thus did not serve the cause of international peace and security. It would support the two-Power draft resolution, as would all delegations which sincerely desired to see peace restored in the area.

22. Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) said that the reunification of Korea, which was tragically divided against its will, was made impossible by the fact that the Republic of Korea had become an arsenal directed against the north. Paradoxically, the United Nations was involved in that situation. There was no further justification for the presence of United Nations troops, which were now being used by certain Powers as part of an overall strategy. It was futile for the General Assembly to repeat every year that reunification was necessary; it could not substitute itself for the Korean people. However, the sole obstacle to peaceful reunification was precisely the presence of foreign troops, including United Nations troops. The annual reports of UNCURK on the development of the Republic of Korea were merely a justification for a situation which was originally to have been temporary and was today at variance with the terms of the Armistice Agreement. The Republic of Korea not only continued to tolerate the presence of foreign troops in its territory but had concluded a defensive treaty with the United States and increased its military strength even though the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had proposed a cutback. What was more, the most modern rockets and missiles had been introduced into South Korea, which had thus been transformed into a veritable bastion against the People's Republic of China. North Korea, on the other hand, regarded the presence of the United Nations in Korea as contrary to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. The withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea was thus a prior condition for reunification, as it was in the case of Viet-Nam and all other South-East Asian States, which would remain breeding-grounds of trouble so long as certain Powers denied peoples their self-determination and continued to interfere in the domestic affairs of other countries.

Mr. Csatorday (Hungary) resumed the Chair.

23. Mr. GALLIN-DOUATHE (Central African Republic) said he was indignant and concerned that the completely obstructive attitude of one of the parties continued to discourage any hope of an early solution to a conflict involving the fate of 35 million people. It was nevertheless encouraging to note the dedication with which UNCURK was carrying out its thankless task. The present debate had shown that the Republic of Korea sincerely desired a peaceful settlement of the question under United Nations auspices, whereas North Korea rejected all mediation. He briefly reviewed the history of the question to demonstrate the unflinching spirit of co-operation displayed by South Korea, thanks to which it now had a democratic and legitimate Government—the only one recognized by the General Assembly and many States—which had led the Republic of Korea steadily towards progress and prosperity. By contrast, North Korea had shown a consistently negative, anti-democratic and aggressive attitude and had steadfastly refused to co-operate with the United Nations. The reports of UNCURK were eloquent indeed in that regard, and there could be no question of capitulation by the United Nations; the Organization must continue to protect the Republic of Korea against any possible aggression and to work towards the peaceful reunification of the country. It was therefore the imperative duty of the United Nations to keep its forces in Korea until that objective was attained. A unified, independent and democratic Korea would help to maintain peace and security in the region and throughout the world and to safeguard the sacred principles of the Organization.

24. Mr. VEGA GOMEZ (El Salvador) said that the conscience of the world could not remain insensible to the continuation of the lamentable and abnormal situation prevailing in Korea; it was time to put an end to that situation so that the entire Korean people could enjoy the peace, justice, tranquillity and freedom to which it was entitled. The United Nations, resolved to bring about a unified, independent and democratic Korea by peaceful means, had expressed those feelings in both word and deed. Nevertheless, although some years had elapsed since the signing of the armistice, it had not yet been possible either to restore real peace or to give back to the Korean people their unity and the full enjoyment of their legitimate international rights. The United Nations had repeatedly put forward a democratic, peaceful formula for the reunification of Korea, which had each time been accepted by the Republic of Korea and rejected by North Korea.

25. El Salvador was prepared to do everything in its power to contribute to solution of the problem, and his delegation wished to reiterate its hope that the Republic of Korea would soon be able to occupy its rightful place in the United Nations. It was interesting to note from the statement by the representative of the Republic of Korea and from the reports of UNCURK that the Republic of Korea had made remarkable progress in the political and in the economic and social spheres. If it had achieved such success despite the division of the country and the attendant dangers, the opportunities awaiting a unified Korea could well be imagined. The Republic of Korea had not only

established relations with many countries but was a member of numerous specialized agencies and inter-governmental organizations, which showed the extent to which Korea identified itself with the world Organization; that should ultimately lead to its admission to the United Nations as a Member enjoying the same rights and privileges and bearing the same obligations and responsibilities as all other States.

26. His delegation was profoundly convinced that good faith always prevailed in the end and made it possible to resolve even the greatest conflicts. The United Nations must continue its work in the Republic of Korea through UNCURK. For all those reasons, his delegation would vote for the thirteen-Power draft resolution.

27. The CHAIRMAN announced that the general debate was concluded. Before the voting began on the two draft resolutions he would call on those representatives who had asked to explain their votes in advance. He asked representatives speaking in explanation of vote to limit their statements to five minutes.

28. Mr. RIBIERE (France) said that his delegation would vote for the thirteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.355 and Add.1), which reflected the desire of the United Nations to see Korea restored to normality. The first condition for a return to normal was obviously reunification through the free play of democratic rules, for world events in recent years had shown the dangers inherent in all territorial divisions.

29. As was indicated in the UNCURK report (A/6012 and Corr.1), the Republic of Korea had continued its political, economic and cultural development. It had also strengthened its relations with many Powers, particularly France. It thus satisfied the two criteria by which the existence of States was judged in law and in fact: its Government exercised full responsibility over its territory with the consent of its population, and abroad it maintained normal relations with the international community.

30. Nevertheless, it could not be denied that the division of Korea constituted a potential source of trouble not far from a part of the world that was torn by grave conflicts. The Committee should therefore adopt a resolution expressing the Organization's wish that States should endeavour to settle their disputes not by force but by conciliation and negotiation.

31. Mr. OWONO (Cameroon), observing that he had not taken part in the general debate because Cameroon's position was well known, said that he knew from the experience of his own country how grievous the problem of a divided nation could be. In considering the Korean question in the United Nations, it was essential to bear in mind certain principles which might lead to a constructive solution. Firstly, the principal responsibility of the United Nations was the maintenance of peace. Secondly, the United Nations presence in Korea continued to be the only factor for peace in that area. Thirdly, UNCURK should be encouraged in its task. Fourthly, reunification should be carried out in accordance with the wishes of the population. Fifthly, no effort should be spared to con-

vince the two parties of the need for a peaceful solution.

32. He would support the thirteen-Power draft resolution because it was satisfactory on all those points. There were, however, several comments to be made on both the substance and the form of the draft.

33. The third preambular paragraph dealt with a very important aspect of the question. It would have been a good idea, in order to allay apprehensions, to mention the question of the withdrawal of the remaining forces from Korea in the operative part of the resolution, and a paragraph could have been added for that purpose. In operative paragraph 1, mention was made of a Korea "under a representative form of government". For the sake of precision, it would have been preferable to speak of a Korea "under a representative government". Finally, in operative paragraph 3, an urgent appeal was made without any indication to whom it was addressed. His delegation would have preferred it to be addressed either to all Members of the United Nations or to UNCURK.

34. Mr. DIAKITE (Mali) said that he had not taken part in the debate because the absence of one of the two parties had made it impossible to consider the Korean question in an objective manner.

35. The adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/L.360, which had been submitted by his own and other delegations but had not been adopted, would have created a tranquil atmosphere conducive to a dialogue between the two parties. Such a dialogue remained the essential condition for any further consideration of the Korean question by the Committee. So long as that condition was not fulfilled, it would be pointless to discuss the question. He would therefore not take part in the vote on the draft resolutions. Nevertheless, he wished to emphasize the importance of the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.362), submitted by Hungary and Mongolia, and particularly of the second and last preambular paragraphs.

36. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan), expressing the view that the unification and independence of Korea should be based on the principle of self-determination, said he had always contended that the Korean question should be approached from a new vantage-point. The participation of the two parties concerned would have been a first step in that direction. Since such participation had been refused, he would abstain from voting either on the draft resolutions as a whole or on any of their parts.

37. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) expressed regret that it had not been possible to clarify the substance of the problem, since in the absence of a representative of UNCURK it had not been possible to obtain certain indispensable information. With that reservation, he would vote for the thirteen-Power draft resolution as a whole, the last preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of which he fully supported.

38. The CHAIRMAN, in accordance with rule 132 of the rules of procedure, called for a vote on the thirteen-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.355 and Add.1), which had been submitted first.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

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

In favour: Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil

Against: Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Abstaining: Cylon, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Burundi.

The draft resolution was adopted by 62 votes to 12, with 29 abstentions.

39. Mr. PRANDLER (Hungary), speaking on a point of order, said he deplored the fact that the Committee had not given one of the parties directly concerned an opportunity to state its position and thought it intolerable that the other party had been allowed to be present during the debate even before it had been invited.

40. The draft resolution which had just been adopted was based on several resolutions which constituted intervention in the domestic affairs of a State within the meaning of Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter. Those responsible for the draft resolution had once again succeeded in forging an alliance which prevented any progress towards a solution of the problem. He was therefore obliged, on his own behalf and on that of the Mongolian representative, to withdraw draft resolution A/C.1/L.362. He wished to assure the Committee, however, that he would spare no effort to achieve the objective it had set, i.e. the establishment of a democratic and unified Korea.

41. The CHAIRMAN, noting the withdrawal of draft resolution A/C.1/L.362, invited representatives who had not yet done so to explain their votes on draft resolution A/C.1/L.355 and Add.1.

42. Mr. RAMANI (Malaysia) said he would attempt, in explaining his affirmative vote on the draft resolution, to foretell what the future would bring.

43. The United Nations had a valuable instrument in UNCURK, which had fulfilled the tasks assigned to it beyond all expectations and continued to do so. One delegation, however, had charged that the two latest reports of UNCURK were one-sided. The group of countries to which that delegation belonged

regarded UNCURK as illegal and did nothing to induce the North Korean authorities to permit the Commission to travel north of the 38th parallel. It was therefore not surprising that that delegation should consider the reports one-sided.

44. As he had said at the previous meeting, the régime installed north of the 38th parallel could not and should not be regarded as a sovereign State. The Republic of Korea was the only *de jure* State embracing the whole of Korea, even though part of its territory was *de facto* outside its control. That had been stated time and again by the United Nations. Some had described the South Korean régime as reactionary. If, after free elections by secret ballot and with universal adult suffrage, held in the presence of impartial observers, a reactionary régime was installed, its reactionary nature did not in any way detract from the sovereignty of the State. Even the most sophisticated peoples got the government they deserved. It was time that South Korea was thought of as something other than a country that had fallen into the hands of a Syngman Rhee, for it was the people who, weary of repression and tyranny, had driven out the man on whom it had bestowed power. That fact proved, if proof was needed, that Korea had changed.

45. Nevertheless, Korea remained divided. It was not enough for the United Nations merely to reaffirm its determination to assist in reunifying the country. At the 1423rd meeting, the representative of Saudi Arabia had made a number of constructive proposals that should be given further consideration at the next session of the General Assembly. In the meantime, interested delegations should get out of the rut into which they seemed to have fallen and direct their efforts into new and more productive channels. They should seek, under the auspices of the United Nations, some way of bringing the two States closer together. Debates of the kind that were held every year in the Committee led nowhere. Indeed, they impeded a solution of the problem in that the attitudes of both parties became more inflexible as time went by. South of the 38th parallel there was an objective United Nations presence, but to the north no door had been opened to the United Nations. Those allies of the northern régime which were Members of the United Nations should, in the interests of the State whose sovereignty they recognized, seek to bring the parties closer together rather than to keep them apart.

46. Mr. MATSUI (Japan), observing that at the previous meeting certain delegations, such as those of Albania and Mongolia, had asserted that the Treaty on Basic Relations recently concluded between the Republic of Korea and Japan might hinder the reunification of Korea, stated that the factors hindering the unification of the country derived from the world situation as a whole and from the fact that North Korea refused to recognize that the United Nations had the competence and authority to bring about the reunification of Korea. The Republic of Korea had been recognized by the United Nations as the only lawful Government of Korea and since then had established relations with seventy-two countries and a number of United Nations specialized agencies. Those

facts confirmed Japan in its belief that it had been justified in concluding an agreement with the Republic of Korea.

47. It had also been argued that the Treaty might lead to a military alliance and to the establishment of an aggressive bloc similar to NATO. Such allegations were without foundation, since the Treaty contained no provisions of a military nature.

48. Mr. CHIMIDDORJ (Mongolia), speaking on a point of order, said that the statements made by his delegation on the nature and aims of the Treaty on Basic Relations between Japan and the Republic of Korea were based on careful analysis of the Treaty, of the facts and of statements made by representatives of the signatory Governments. It therefore maintained them in full and regretted that the representative of Japan had tried so hard to reassure world public opinion, and particularly opinion in the Asian countries, which were justifiably concerned about the purposes of the Treaty.

49. Mr. Yong Shik KIM (Republic of Korea) expressed his profound gratitude to the Committee, which was giving all possible support to efforts to bring about the unification of Korea under the auspices of the United Nations. By adopting draft resolution A/C.1/L.355 and Add.1 by an overwhelming majority, the Committee had once again supported the only procedure that could lead to a solution of the Korean problem, namely, that proposed by the United Nations. He wished to take the opportunity to thank the United Nations forces which were still defending his country.

Completion of the Committee's work

50. Mr. GEBRE-EGZY (Ethiopia), on behalf of the delegations of the African and Asian countries and Yugoslavia, Mr. RICHARDSON (Jamaica), Mr. PACHACHI (Iraq), on behalf of the delegations of the Arab countries and Japan, Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America), Mr. DEMETROPOULOS (Greece), Mr. ILLANES (Chile), on behalf of the delegations of the Latin American countries and Trinidad and Tobago, Mr. HILMY DIDI (Maldivé Islands), on behalf of the delegations of the Asian

countries, Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria), on behalf of the delegations of the African countries, Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia), Mr. RAFAEL (Israel), Mr. Bohdan LEWANDOWSKI (Poland), on behalf of the delegations of the socialist countries, and Mr. WURTH (Luxembourg), on behalf of the delegations of the European countries, thanked the Chairman for the impartiality, patience and courtesy he had shown throughout the session. They also thanked the Vice-Chairman, the Rapporteur, the Secretary and the Secretariat for contributing to the success of the Committee's work.

51. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador), Vice-Chairman, and Mr. FAHMY (United Arab Republic), Rapporteur, thanked the members of the Committee for their kind words.

52. The CHAIRMAN, summing up the achievements of the Committee, pointed out that, despite the aggravated tension in the international situation, the heavy agenda had been dealt with in a substantial manner. It was significant to note that the resolutions on entirely new and very important items—non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the convening of a world disarmament conference, the declaration on the denuclearization of Africa, the inadmissibility of intervention in the internal affairs of States, measures for the furtherance of good neighbourly relations among European States having different social and political systems—had all been adopted either unanimously or by an overwhelming majority. He appreciated the efforts made by all the Members of the Committee, and he emphasized the importance of the contributions made by the delegations of the newly independent countries to the successes achieved by the Committee during the session.

53. Finally, he thanked the members of the Committee for their co-operation with the Chair and for their tributes. Associating himself with the expressions of gratitude to the other officers of the Committee and to the Secretariat, he declared that the Committee's work for the session was completed, and adjourned the meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.40 p.m.