

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1769th
MEETING

Monday, 23 November 1970,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 98:

Question of Korea (*continued*):

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

Page

1

Chairman: Mr. Andrés AGUILAR M. (Venezuela).

AGENDA ITEM 98

Question of Korea (*continued*):

- (a) Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations (A/8044 and Add.1-3, A/C.1/999, 1000, 1002, 1007-1009, 1011, A/C.1/L.524);
- (b) Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/8045 and Add.1-3, A/C.1/999, 1000, 1002, 1007-1009, 1011, A/C.1/L.525);
- (c) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/8026, A/8046, A/8168, A/C.1/999, 1000, 1002, 1007-1009, 1011, A/C.1/L.531)

1. Mr. TRAORE (Mali) (*interpretation from French*): In my intervention of 12 October 1970 [1737th meeting], on the question of the maintenance of international peace and security, I pointed out, on behalf of the delegation of Mali, that nothing could be more prejudicial to international peace and security than the disregard for the right of peoples to shape their own destinies.

2. The question of Korea, apart from its nature which stems from the sequels of the Second World War, should be considered essentially in terms of that reality. For certain members of the Security Council the provisions of Article 107 of the Charter of the United Nations, unfortunately, did not appear to have sufficient restraining power at the proper time to prevent the United Nations from becoming involved after the Second World War in actions in Korea that could be liable to criticism. Those deadly actions have led us where we know, with that difference compared with other countries of the world, namely, that it is our Organization which is in conflict with a State, whereas it is essentially an Organization devoted to peace.

3. Questionable from the legal point of view, the action of the United Nations is questionable also in regard to the

facts. Fifteen years after the United Nations committed itself in Korea, peace has in no way come to that part of the world, and the distressing question which comes to our lips is whether we are not embarking on a situation of conflict which would most regrettably recall the interminable wars of mediaeval times, the consequences of which, taking into account the present nature of things, would be eminently prejudicial to the dignity of our Organization.

4. We would have been the first to applaud the actions of the United Nations in Korea if those actions, strictly in accordance with the Charter, had aimed only at leading the parties to the conflict to a more reasonable evaluation of the international situation and if our Organization, placing itself, as it should have, over and above the dispute, had brought to bear its immense moral and political prestige rather than the precariousness of its weapons. The Korean problem is a national problem. We have recognized this, since the basic element in all the resolutions adopted by the United Nations since 1950 relates to the reunification of the Korean territory.

5. The fact is that that reunification has not been possible for reasons that we all know. Logically, the United Nations should have acted merely as a mediator in order to remain faithful to the purposes and principles of the Charter. That is what we are told when invoking the existence of the Commission which has just submitted its report.

6. However, neither law nor practice teaches us that mediation is possible when one of the parties questions the mediator—when his approach to solutions to the conflict appears to that party unilateral and partisan. We might point out that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has never questioned the purposes and principles of the Charter; it has respected them and has solemnly pledged to respect them. I had occasion to refer to that statement when I spoke on 30 October 1970 [1746th meeting] on the question of inviting Korea to participate in our debates.

7. A clear fact emerges from the remarks I have just made: so long as the United Nations does not come before the Korean parties as a true mediator, none of its commissions will achieve the objective of unification and peace which we seek in that part of the world. In other words, we would only be maintaining a body whose reports over the years will be approximately the same and the content of which will reflect the conviction only of those whose unavowed concern is to keep Korea in a state of tension and thus prevent it from carrying out its political and social revolution.

8. This is all the more true since the report before us [A/8026] is far too rigid in character, as if there had been a lack of political imagination at the time of its drafting.

9. True, South Korea is presented to us as an essentially peaceful country based on a democratic form of government and having in part succeeded in its economic development. True, no opportunity is lost to recall to us that that part of Korea accepts the authority of our Organization in regard to the Korean problem. But what does that democracy mean which, we are told, is based on free elections but which finds the necessary means to set aside the opposition in certain discussions in the National Assembly, and which no doubt believes that the seizure of the press is also part of the purposes and principles of the United Nations?

10. The Commission points to what in its view could be no more than incidents. However, it draws no conclusions. South Korea is supposed to be essentially peaceful. But then, I must confess, I do not understand the true meaning of this sentence spoken by its President, mentioned in paragraph 9 of the report, that South Korea: "should maintain an absolute superiority over North Korea in all aspects in order to cope with any type of approach for unification—peaceful or otherwise".

11. It is nice to see that the unification of that country falls within the political programme of the leaders of South Korea, which they envisage should take place peacefully or by any other means. The United Nations is asked to assist them in such action. The Government of Mali cannot condone such ambitions.

12. Moreover, if we are to believe the leaders in Seoul, the reasons for the non-unification of Korea are in fact neither political nor social. Indeed, in paragraph 18 of document A/C.1/1007, we read that: "the unification of Korea has not been realized to date . . . for one reason and one reason only: the North Korean communists have been adamant in their refusal to accept the competence and authority of the United Nations to deal with the Korean question".

13. But what does that authority say? Does Article 33 of the Charter not provide that the parties to a dispute must, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation? Is recognition of the authority of the United Nations a prior condition for the search for solutions? The peace proposals of the South Korean authorities should, in our view, first and foremost be addressed—to use an expression in the Charter—to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and not to the United Nations. Peace is to be established with that Government and not with our Organization. It is that Government which is chiefly concerned with the fate of 50 million Koreans. The United Nations can help them; but the United Nations cannot speak for them or instead of them without their consent.

14. Apart from the authorities in Seoul, and having regard to my earlier observations, we have not yet been given proof of "their sincerity through their acts"—I use their own expression—my delegation would have liked to know what the Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea thinks of this attitude of a government which, protected by the United Nations umbrella, systematically rejects any peace proposal. We should like to know the conclusions which the Commission in question may have drawn from the disquieting silence of an authority which is asked to take measures to restore between the

parties in the same country possibilities for exchanges through trade and communications.

15. It is true that North Korea is not forgiven for maintaining that the Korean problem is a national problem whose solution should be left in the first place to the Koreans themselves. In this world of bourgeois satisfaction it is obviously not a good thing in certain circles to speak of political and social revolution.

16. We, who come from developing countries, know that our progress depends upon such a premise. More than in the force of words, these expressions should be sought in facts. Mali is a non-aligned country and, as such, it attempts to diversify its sources of information as far as possible. We know that North Korea, engaged in the socialist path of development—a right that no one can deny that country—has given back to its people that national pride without which a country can only follow the lead of other States with unlimited ambitions, and that from the point of view of development, it has achieved successes that are in keeping with certain provisions of the Charter.

17. It has also been said that peace cannot come back to Korea unless North Korea bows to constitutional forms of government to be dictated from the outside. Unless we have misunderstood the Charter, it does not appear to us that this is in keeping with its provisions, especially Article 2 (1) and (7).

18. The sovereignty of North Korea is inalienable; our peace proposals should stem from this simple reality. We would have wished to find in the report of the Commission indications of efforts deployed in this sense. Any attitude that runs counter to this demand appears to us to be negative. Moreover, we have proof of this after 15 years of sterile debates. The so-called Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea should be the first to draw the obvious conclusions and to recognize that it will never attain the objectives of peace which we cherish without the participation of North Korea.

19. The report of the Commission is full of indications of alleged attacks against peace in Korea by the North Korean forces. I am not a military specialist, nor am I well versed in the science of weapons of destruction. Some delegations, quoting passages from the report of the Commission, have mentioned that North Korean bodies were found after acts of sabotage or attempts at infiltrations in South Korea. The North Koreans would apparently be the only saboteurs in the world to sign their death certificates or to carry documents with them which would facilitate their identification. I believe that, throughout these long debates, some will attempt to enlighten us on the possibility of recognizing a North Korean when he was blown up with the bomb destined, we are told, for the authorities in Seoul.

20. But to come back to peace, the delegation of Mali believes that the North Korean proposals contained in document A/C.1/999 should be studied with less passion and more political responsibility. The authority of the United Nations should lead those who are loyal to it to accept those proposals that are easily practicable. I am referring, I repeat, to the establishment of trade and communications throughout Korea.

21. Moreover, apart from setting up the Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, the United Nations has committed troops to that part of the world. But if we are to believe the South Korean Government in its memorandum of 7 October 1970 [see A/C.1/1007], all the North Korean attacks have been repelled by its security forces, its national police, its territorial reserve and its navy. What other kind of military assistance can it, then, expect from the United Nations? Since the security of its territory can be ensured by its own means and capabilities, what other security could the United Nations troops ensure?

22. It is in the light of these facts that my delegation has considered draft resolution A/C.1/L.531, submitted by Australia and other States.

23. Not only do we recognize that the division of Korea is not in accordance with the wishes of the Korean population and constitutes a threat to peace, but we deplore the fact that this division should be prejudicial to peace as such. We have pointed out that it is not up to the United Nations to impose constitutional forms of government on any State. We hope, however, that all the sponsors of this draft resolution, when the time comes, will become the champions of free elections when we deal with the question of territories under colonial domination and in South Africa. The North Korean reality is too glaring for anyone to try to ignore it. Any appeal for co-operation should be addressed essentially to the parties concerned—in other words, as we see it, to the Government of North Korea. Finally, we wish to recall our criticism of the methods of work of the Commission so that it may be understood that we cannot accept the draft resolution that I have mentioned.

24. On the other hand, draft resolutions A/C.1/L.524 and 525 sufficiently reflect the concern of the Government of Mali, and I warmly recommend their adoption by the Committee. It is our wish that the two parties to the Korean conflict will finally accept to engage, without outside interference, in a dialogue without which no real political solution appears to us to be possible. Once it recovers its impartiality, our Organization will be able to bring all its political and moral force to bear towards the re-establishment of peace in Korea.

25. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): It is recognized that our Organization is bedevilled by a number of anomalies. The lack of universality remains, of course, the greatest impediment to its effective functioning as a truly international organization serving the interests of mankind.

26. Last week a ray of hope emerged. For the first time in the history of our Organization's tackling its serious anomalies, the voice of reason, common sense and justice seemed to have ascended again. The vote in the Assembly [1913th plenary meeting] on the draft resolution calling for the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China constituted a serious step forward in the efforts to redém the prestige and the power of our Organization. In saying this I am not in any way underestimating the obstacles before us; I am only too conscious of the fact that those who have sought to ostracize that vast humanity may consider the positive voice of the majority on this question as a personal affront to their prestige and

may, therefore, attempt to redouble their efforts in making it difficult for justice to prevail conclusively in this question. Yet, whatever happens, the fact remains that last Friday, when the Assembly by a simple majority voted in favour of the People's Republic of China, it gave hope and encouragement to all those throughout the world who consider our august Organization as mankind's only true and genuine hope for peace and progress. It was felt, and rightly so, that at last the United Nations had come of age.

27. How much my delegation hoped that the same maturity could start asserting itself in this Committee when discussing the so-called Korean question. Yet one must be bold enough to differentiate between hope and reality and between fact and fiction. And the reality of this problem is that, painful as it may seem, this Committee—and for that matter, the United Nations—continues to act in an unjust and ridiculous manner in dealing with the serious question of Korea.

28. Once again this year the Committee has found it fitting to discuss a problem while completely failing to take into consideration the wishes and aspirations of the parties directly involved in the problem. By arbitrarily debarring the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from participation in the discussion of this item, the Committee has put itself in the position of a partial and ineffective arbitrator, with the obvious gloomy consequences of failure. And yet those who are responsible for the Committee's state of helplessness would have us believe that they uphold the principles of justice and fair play. Is it not an established principle of international relations and, in fact, of common sense, that "negotiation" implies the full participation of all parties as a prerequisite?

29. How much longer does this Committee intend to bear the label of lack of seriousness in its discussions on this important matter? How much longer is the international community going to tolerate a deliberate and absurd discrimination against the authentic representatives of the Korean people? And for how long are members of this Committee to be subjected to the ordeal of listening to one-sided propagandistic declarations of the representatives of the authorities in Seoul, as if the reading of the annual reports of the so-called UNCURK was not a sufficient ordeal imposed on the members of this Committee? My delegation deems it essential at the very outset, therefore, to reiterate its condemnation of this anomaly and to reaffirm its unequivocal support for the rights of the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate fully in the discussion of the items related to Korea. Their continued exclusion is a great disservice to the cause of Korean unification and a blow to the prestige to our Organization. Article 27 (3) of the United Nations Charter stipulates that "Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members". The decision to send troops into Korea—taken by the Security Council in 1950—was not a procedural matter; on the contrary, it was a matter which fell within the purview of Article 27 (3) of the Charter. Yet, when that decision was taken one of the permanent members of the Security Council was absent. No member of this Committee is unaware of the dire consequences of that action which was taken by the United

Nations. Among the consequences of that action are the setting up of a United Nations interim committee on Korea, the division of Korea into two parts and the pitting of the parts against each other. The Organization, by working on the basis of a report of the United Nations Commission on Korea that had alleged that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had violated the Armistice Agreement and had attacked the Republic of Korea, endorsed a United States proposal to send troops into Korea.

30. If the United Nations had any reason to intervene at that stage, it might have considered the provisions of Article 33 of the Charter before taking action which could have been viewed as deliberate interference in the internal affairs of the Korean nation. But having taken the course it did, our Organization is today—as it has done for the past 17 years—discussing this question without much hope of achieving a solution. It may not be surprising, therefore, that those in our midst who are responsible for the present conditions in Korea should be less than enthusiastic to support reverse measures; on the contrary they even employ more arguments to maintain the *status quo*.

31. If we want to be honest with ourselves, we must not fail to realize that today we have a force in Korea flying the flag of the United Nations. But how much is that force really “United Nations” in its manifestations? That so-called United Nations force in Korea has among its total forces United States troops to the tune of some 60,000 and there are a few remaining troops from States which are allied militarily and strategically with the United States. The United Nations no longer—at least to the knowledge of my delegation—appropriates any funds for the maintenance of that “United Nations Force”. The whole maintenance and general administration, including all the deployment, positioning and operation of the force, have reverted to being the sole concern of the United States Pentagon. If that were a mere generosity, no State Member of the United Nations would be more grateful to the United States Government than my own country. But nothing is more painfully clear to my delegation than that every year this august world body and this Committee in particular must spend many days and sometimes weeks discussing a problem that is, if not provoked, at least unnecessarily maintained because of the policies and actions of a Member of this world body which is also a great Power.

32. It is no secret that the so-called United Nations force in Korea is nothing but a manipulated tool in the national interest of one United Nations Member. That is why I and many other members of this Committee believe that there should be an end to this artificial state of affairs and we have endorsed the proposal for inscription of the sub-item entitled “Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations”. Imperialism is, of course, not new in that part of the world and, much as we abhor it, it has manifested itself in many situations and forms. But it is unthinkable that the United Nations should be made a party to such imperialist schemes. My delegation, representing a Member of the United Nations which upholds the principles enshrined in the Charter, finds it difficult to countenance United Nations activities helping the cause of imperialism. If the force in Korea is a United Nations force, then it means that the United Nations has made itself a partisan rather than a

helper or a mediator in this Korean crisis. Short of that, one naturally wonders whether it any longer deserves the title and the mandate thrust upon it.

33. General MacArthur, once a Commander of the United Nations Force in Korea, was more frank and realistic when, in addressing the United States Senate in 1951, he said: “... my relationship with the United Nations was only quite nominal. . . . In short, I had nothing to do with the U.N. in whatever form.” That was in 1951 when the Force had just been sent. What about today?

34. Members of this Committee might have read a report in *The New York Times* of 5 November 1970 on the proposed United States troop movements involving well over 20,000 troops from the front zone at the 38th parallel and their proposed replacement by South Korean troops. As a matter of interest, my delegation would appreciate knowing whether the Secretary-General was consulted prior to taking such a decision or whether there was any consultation with the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

35. Today, the military strategy of imperialist circles needs South Korea more than ever. The aggression in Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia calls for a hold on South Korea. Whilst the United Nations force is maintained in South Korea the latter is able to send over 50,000 troops to fight on the United States side in Viet-Nam. The report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea quotes Mr. Park Chung Hee as saying, in regard to a suggestion for reducing the United States forces: “With regard to the suggested reduction of United States forces . . . he was opposed to any reduction which would result in weakening the deterrent effect of the presence of those forces or the defence of the Republic” [A/8026, para. 56]. In paragraph 9 of the same report the ruler of South Korea is reported to have said that his nation: “should maintain an absolute superiority over North Korea in all aspects in order to cope with any type of approach for unification—peaceful or otherwise . . .”. My delegation would have thought that the 50,000 South Koreans fighting in Viet-Nam would have made Mr. Park Chung Hee's wishes more realistic if they were maintained in South Korea.

36. Again, paragraph 19 of the Commission's report quotes a resolution passed by the South Korean Parliament: “calling on the United States Government to adhere to its commitments under the United States–Republic of Korea Mutual Defense Treaty”. The resolution opposed any reduction of US forces “until the modernization of the national armed forces could be achieved”.

37. Further, in paragraph 20 of the same report it is stated that at a meeting of the Defence Ministers of South Korea and the United States at Honolulu on 21 and 22 July 1970, a joint communiqué was issued expressing: “the readiness and the determination of the United States to render prompt and effective assistance to the Republic of Korea in accordance with the Mutual Defence Treaty in the event of an armed attack against the Republic of Korea”. Also that: “redispositions of air forces would be made and that further discussions would be held on the modernization of the armed services of the Republic of Korea and the

establishment of defence industries." My delegation would have thought the proper purpose of any United Nations force in Korea would be not to set one part against the other but, on the contrary, to bring the two parts together. What conclusions should be drawn from such a relationship as at present exists with the United States having over 60,000 "United Nations" troops in Korea and at the same time with all its bilateral obligations and defence pacts with South Korea?

38. We have heard it argued during the course of the current debate on this item in this Committee that the withdrawal of United States and other foreign forces currently occupying South Korea under the United Nations flag would strip South Korea of the protection of the United Nations. My delegation finds it very difficult to understand the logic and seriousness of this contention. Is it really serious to believe that a country which is in any way threatened could afford to send a large expeditionary force to a foreign land? What sort of protection does the South Korean régime need when they have sent 50,000 of their troops as mercenaries to South Viet-Nam to participate in the cruel killing and maiming of innocent civilians? A régime which can participate with such a massive deployment of its troops in aggression against another country can hardly pretend to be living in constant fear of an imaginary aggression. For the authorities in Seoul to allow themselves to be used in mounting aggression against the innocent and valiant people of Viet-Nam, and then to shout that they need protection for their own security, is a combination of nonsense and hypocrisy. Indeed, if such claims are repeated too often only one appropriate conclusion can be drawn, namely, that the protection that is so badly needed is for internal rather than any imaginary external reasons.

39. My delegation, and I believe all the delegations here, had the opportunity of reading the extract referring to North Korea in the report of the Commission. This report holds out no hope of success in any efforts being made by it to achieve unification in Korea. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, on the other hand, in several memoranda sent to the Secretary-General of this Organization, has made very viable suggestions on how to achieve the unification of the Korean nation. In a recent memorandum the Democratic People's Republic of Korea suggested that as a preliminary measure to achieve unification some common services could be established in trade and economic co-operation, natural exchange programmes in the field of science, culture, art and sport, and common postal services and personal visits could be established. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea has even proposed that an international conference should be convened to discuss the question of unification. The only answer to all these proposals by the authorities in South Korea is a repetition of the allegation of North Korean disrespect of United Nations authority to deal with the Korean question. The Commission did not even report these proposals. Unfortunately, instead, it elected to highlight the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's refusal to acknowledge the authority of the United Nations. My delegation does not find it difficult to understand the refusal of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to allow the Commission to enter the country. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not deny the competence of the United Nations to deal with conflicts

and disputes among States. However, like any other State, it denies the United Nations any right or competence to interfere in the internal affairs of States as this would be contrary to the letter and spirit of the Charter.

40. If one were to study very seriously the concrete proposals of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the question of unification of its fatherland, one would certainly come to one conclusion, namely, that the proposals demonstrate the real and genuine desire of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to achieve peaceful unification of the Korean nation. The withdrawal of United States and other foreign troops must logically be a prerequisite for the attainment of this lofty goal of the Korean people, for how can the Korean people freely decide their destiny when one part of the country is occupied by foreign forces? Foreign military occupation cannot be compatible with the rights of a people to exercise their destiny freely. Notwithstanding all the rhetoric uttered by the apologists of foreign military domination in South Korea, the fact remains that the presence of these troops on Korean soil constitutes a serious impediment to the unification of Korea. Thus it is only natural that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which has as one of the fundamental pillars of its foreign policy the national reunification of its fatherland, should unambiguously demand the evacuation of foreign troops in South Korea. To dub this just and legitimate demand of the Korean people as unreasonable is to fail to appreciate the lofty principles that guide free men. To allege, as has been alleged in this Committee, that support for the sensible demand of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for such withdrawal which, in the opinion of my delegation, is long overdue, implies subjecting the course of events in Korea to an unpredictable and presumably shaky course is, to say the least, a cheap apologia for perpetual foreign occupation.

41. I have myself had the opportunity of visiting the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Indeed, I have had the privilege of serving as my country's ambassador to that heroic country. If there is one thing which has struck me most during my stay in that country, as well as in all my contacts with a cross-section of the population, it is the burning desire of the Korean people for peace and national reunification.

42. Led by the Korean Workers' Party, and its Secretary-General Marshall Kim Il Sung, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea stands today as one of the most inspiring examples of a nation which has been transformed dramatically from utter ruin and misery to progress and prosperity. Thanks to its talented, hard-working and industrious people and the dedication of its leadership, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has made gigantic strides in all aspects of development. In heavy and light industry, in agriculture, in education and social amenities, indeed in all fields of human endeavour, the progress which the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has achieved is as conspicuous as it is real. With all these achievements the Korean people need peace to enjoy the fruits of their efforts. Hence, it is only natural that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is an ardent fighter for peace, notwithstanding the baseless allegations of its detractors. Nothing, I repeat, would be further from the truth than to

accuse the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of harbouring aggressive designs.

43. My delegation has noted with amusement the fact that one of the allegations made against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is that it maintains a high degree of military preparedness. Statistics have been supplied to magnify the seriousness of this additional "crime" on the part of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In all fairness, my delegation would readily agree that the funds at the disposal of the small countries of the world are so limited that it would be best to utilize them for economic development rather than indulge in the expensive business of military hardware and equipment. But do the small countries really have that alternative? The current barbaric aggression by the Portuguese and other mercenary forces against the fraternal Republic of Guinea is a harsh reminder of the realities facing the countries of the third world. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is no exception. When its territorial waters are subject to continuous encroachment, when its air space is systematically violated and when its entire security and territorial integrity are put in question by those who have given themselves the role of international policemen, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea can only take a lackadaisical approach to its defence needs at its own peril.

44. While we note the burning desire of the Korean people for national reunification, we equally take note of the useless and, more often than not, obstructive role of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea in this field. Because of its attitude and manner of operation and because of every indication that they will remain as they are now, my delegation believes it is quite appropriate for this Organization to order the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. Indeed, if anything, its dissolution has never been more overdue. For these reasons, my delegation considers it a privilege to be one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.525, submitted by the Afro-Asian and socialist countries and eloquently introduced on 19 November [1766th meeting] by the representative of the People's Republic of the Congo.

45. Our co-sponsorship of draft resolution A/C.1/L.524, calling for the immediate withdrawal of United States and other foreign forces from Korea, is not only motivated by our strong and uncompromising opposition to the continued military occupation of an Asian territory. Here there is something more fundamental involved. The prestige and dignity of our Organization are involved; for let it be clearly understood that every single day the United States and other forces continue to stay in South Korea under the name and flag of the United Nations witnesses a further deterioration of the prestige and respect of our Organization. In the interests of international peace and security, in the best interests of our own Organization, we must not allow our Organization to be used to satisfy the political aggrandizement of one Power, however powerful.

46. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Rwanda) (*interpretation from French*): The Korean question which this Committee is called upon to debate each year is almost as old as the United Nations itself. For its part, Rwanda regrets that in

the year 1970 the solution to this painful problem is no closer than it was 20 years ago.

47. Just as the historical circumstances in which the United Nations was led to concern itself with this question are sufficient justification for its presence in Korea, so does the present situation there dictate that it maintain its presence in the country.

48. In 1947, the efforts to establish a unified Korea on a democratic basis having failed, the question of Korea was brought before the Organization. In its resolution 112 (II) of 14 November 1947, the General Assembly decided that free elections would be held throughout Korea under the impartial supervision of the United Nations.

49. The United Nations Interim Commission, severely handicapped in its task by the authorities of North Korea, who denied it access to that part of the Territory, was able to supervise only the elections which took place in South Korea, and on 12 December 1948 the General Assembly, in resolution 195 (III), declared that the Government of the Republic of Korea, established on 15 August 1948 following those elections, was the only legitimate government of Korea.

50. This negative attitude on the part of the North Korean authorities towards the United Nations Interim Commission was part of a carefully laid plan to seize power throughout Korea by means of war, and the aggression that they unleashed on 25 June 1950 against the Republic of Korea is the most striking proof of that. Security Council resolution 82 (1950), calling for an immediate cessation of hostilities and withdrawal of the North Korean armed forces to north of the 38th parallel, did nothing to moderate the belligerence of the North Korean régime.

51. Confronted with such a challenge, the Security Council, concerned to restore international peace and security, acted on the basis both of the Charter and of the request by the Government of the Republic of Korea and invited the Member States to afford the Republic of Korea all assistance necessary to repulse the attackers and restore peace and security in the region. The 16 Member States, including the United States, that placed troops at the disposal of the United Nations to intervene in Korea thus in no way undertook any kind of war of colonial conquest.

52. The United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, which replaced the Interim Commission on Korea, was itself appointed by resolution 376 (V) of the General Assembly, dated 7 October 1950, and its terms of reference were very precise: it was to strive to bring about the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government for the whole of Korea, on the basis of free elections organized under United Nations supervision.

53. This brief historical review not only unmasks the fallaciousness of the view that the United Nations forces in Korea are occupation forces; it also clearly demonstrates the legal basis for the presence of those forces in Korea.

54. In my delegation's view, the most alarming factor is the shameless challenge that the North Korean régime

continues to hurl at the United Nations by denying it all authority and competence to concern itself with the question of Korea.

55. The North Korean authorities undoubtedly want unification too, but in their fashion, that is to say, by the sword. All material and human resources are mobilized for that purpose: more than 35 per cent of the budget is allotted to war preparations; a regular army of 410,000, equipped with ultra-modern military equipment, is kept on a constant war footing. Little wonder this régime calls for the immediate departure of the United Nations forces and the Commission, when its intentions are so transparent.

56. On the other hand, we must recognize that the Government of the Republic of Korea, the only legitimate government of the Korean nation, has always co-operated loyally, not only with the United Nations but with 90 States in all continents, with which it maintains normal diplomatic relations, accompanied by co-operation in various fields.

57. The Government of the Republic of Korea advocates the unification of the country through peaceful and democratic means. President Park Chung Hee himself emphasized this when he said that his Government would "never resort to the use of arms in order to achieve unification" [A/8026, para. 10].

58. My delegation would like once again to put the question recently put by the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Korea in his statement before this Committee [1766th meeting]: would it be in the interests of those representatives who support draft resolutions calling for the withdrawal of the United Nations force and dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea if hostilities were to resume in Korea? Would they like to see the Korean people once again involved in devastating civil war?

59. For its part, Rwanda, which prides itself on defending law against tyranny and which is concerned for the fate of over 40 million Koreans, will vote against draft resolutions A/C.1/L.524 and A/C.1/L.525 which recommend the dissolution of the Commission and the withdrawal of the United Nations forces from Korea. It is convinced that draft resolution A/C.1/L.531, of which it is a sponsor and for which it will vote, can help the United Nations to honour its commitments towards the whole Korean people and towards mankind by more effectively preserving international peace and security in that part of the world.

60. Mr. BEAULNE (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Singapore has been for many years Ambassador of that friendly country to Canada, where he has earned the affection and esteem of my fellow-citizens. In their name and in my own I convey to him my condolences on this day of mourning for Singapore.

61. Once again we are obliged to undergo a debate in the General Assembly on the question of Korea, which none of us here believes will contribute to advancing a just and peaceful settlement of the matter. Once again we owe this dubious privilege to those responsible for draft resolutions

A/C.1/L.524 and A/C.1/L.525. It is they who must bear the responsibility not only for the fact that we have this sterile debate inflicted upon us but also for the fact that the debate is doomed to failure before it begins.

62. These are heavy responsibilities. At this session, when, with a heavy agenda, we have very little time, it is no trivial matter to have to devote 10 or more meetings to various aspects of this subject, knowing in advance that nothing will come of it. It is a still more serious matter that nothing will in fact come of it.

63. In effect, we are told by the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/L.524 and A/C.1/L.525 not only that the United Nations cannot do anything to contribute to a settlement in Korea, but that it is incompetent to do so and that any attempt in that direction is illegal. In short, they claim that the actions of the majority of the Security Council and of the General Assembly over more than 20 years are illegal and without effect.

64. What does "illegal" mean in this usage? Indeed, what meaning can it have? Used in this context by countries that on other occasions are insistent on the observance and implementation of resolutions of the United Nations and which argue that many of the shortcomings of the Organization can be attributed to the failure of States to respect them, the word "illegal" is a curious one. The only possible conclusion, in reason and in logic, is that to those who use this argument "illegal" means that with which they disagree. It matters nothing to them that substantial majorities of the General Assembly over a long period of time have reaffirmed not only the legality of actions taken in the past but the authority and competence of the United Nations to deal with the question of Korea.

65. In this debate every year we hear the same series of contradictory propositions. Clearly it cannot be true at the same time both that the Republic of Korea waged a "war of intervention" in North Korea in 1950 and that North Korea invaded the Republic of Korea. It cannot be true simultaneously that the North Korean régime is the only one in the peninsula which represents the secular desire of the Korean people for freedom and development and that the Republic of Korea has a freely-elected Government and an economically dynamic and successful society. It cannot be true both that, as some in this debate have alleged, it is illegal in the Republic of Korea to speak of reunification and that the President of the Republic himself has recently made a major speech on the subject.

66. It is obvious that the truth is not made clearer by our annual debate. Certainly delegations adduce evidence, or what purports to be evidence. We are even treated to quotations from newspapers, for example, presented as conclusive, as if simply because words appear in print they must be believed. In fact, we are not given any reason to think so. We are left with the unavoidable conclusion that those who resort to this transparent device are interested only in that particular "truth", like that "legality", which supports their objectives. The "evidence" they give us is presented as credible because it supports their cause; their cause is to be supported because the evidence is said to be credible.

67. In such circumstances there is only one reasonable course: that is to rely upon our own means, our own judgement on the facts of the matter and to decide on the wisest course to pursue. We have such means, a means created by the United Nations and responsible to this Assembly—the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. This is the means through which we can form a balanced and coherent view. This is the means which the supporters of draft resolution A/C.1/L.525 wish to destroy.

68. Just as they have sought from the beginning to deny the competence of the United Nations in an area which is its first and overriding responsibility, the area of international peace and security, so they wish to deprive us of the instrument the United Nations has set up to discharge that responsibility in Korea.

69. Simultaneously, what has happened in Korea itself? Armed incursions and raids continue to be launched from the North against the South, precisely at the time when Pyongyang declares its “respect for the Charter”—an act we are asked to believe confers on it some particular virtue. Despite the tension which such assaults create, the remarkable achievements of the Republic of Korea in economic and social development continue. All these events are observed and reported by the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. We are told that similar achievements are taking place in the North, but since the Commission is refused admission there, this Organization has no means of its own to know of them.

70. The delegation of Canada finds it difficult to believe that Members of the General Assembly are prepared to rely on what is said in this debate to learn what is really taking place. In draft resolutions A/C.1/L.524 and A/C.1/L.525 we are being asked not only to do that, but to abdicate the entire responsibility of the General Assembly in Korea.

71. Let us turn instead to draft resolution A/C.1/L.531, of which Canada is a sponsor. It is as well to look at the text. Presumably because, like all else we say here, it is not new, some delegations may not have given its actual content close attention. What does it purport to do? It aims to reaffirm the United Nations objective of achieving a reunified, independent and democratic Korea; to express the belief that that objective should be achieved through genuinely free elections; to ease tensions in the area; and to approve the efforts of the Commission in that direction and request it to pursue its efforts. Finally, it looks forward to the withdrawal of United Nations forces still in Korea whenever the Republic of Korea—where they are located—requests it, or when a durable settlement is achieved.

72. Which of those propositions is objectionable to the opponents of the resolution? Do they object to a peaceful, reunified, independent and democratic Korea? Do they object to genuinely free elections? Do they object to measures to reduce tension and deter aggression? Presumably not. Yet they demand the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. We may legitimately ask ourselves, to what end?

73. In the light of those considerations, the Canadian delegation will vote against draft resolutions A/C.1/L.524

and A/C.1/L.525, and urges other delegations to join in supporting draft resolution A/C.1/L.531.

74. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Bulgaria) (*translated from Russian*): The position of the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria on the so-called Korean question is well known. We are in favour of the strict observance of all the terms of the Armistice concluded 17 years ago following the blatant aggression by the United States of America in that part of the Far East. We are in favour of the unconditional observance of one of the fundamental and important principles of the United Nations, namely, the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of individual States.

75. In violation of a fundamental principle of the United Nations and the terms of the Armistice between the two Korean States, imperialist circles and the rulers of the United States of America have created a threat to international peace and security by turning South Korea into a military base, which they use, together with their other military bases in Japan, Thailand, Formosa, the Philippines and other places, to help them maintain continual tension in eastern Asia, which is a dangerous and smouldering hotbed of further military conflicts on the Asian continent.

76. The reason why the socialist and other progressive States systematically insist, year after year, on the withdrawal of the United States occupation forces from the territory of South Korea, where they still remain under the cover of the United Nations, which is advantageous and convenient for them, is not only because these forces have nothing whatever to do with the United Nations and because they are there illegally and are a disgrace to the name and prestige of the world Organization, but also because these forces, which are really a part of the regular United States army—the most aggressive army in the world—together with the accumulated military arsenal in South Korea, pose a real and daily threat to peace in yet another part of Asia not unlike the United States aggression in Viet-Nam. This is why we insist that these questions be resolved.

77. The socialist States, whose foreign policy is based on the struggle to preserve peace, to prevent international conflicts and to promote peaceful co-operation between the peoples, cannot be calm or indifferent about this constant hotbed of military conflicts and cannot but be deeply alarmed and concerned about the artificially created and exacerbated tension on the Korean peninsula.

78. This is why we raise these questions year after year and why we constantly insist and will continue to insist on and to strive for the elimination of all factors which prevent a peaceful settlement of the relations between the two Korean States, the restoration of the independence of the South Korean people through the elimination of the foreign imperialist occupation, and the withdrawal of all United States and other predatory forces from the territory of South Korea, in order to restore peace and security in that troubled part of the world.

79. Our concern for the preservation of international peace and security and our feeling of solidarity with the struggle of the peoples to defend their sacred rights to a

peaceful and independent existence seem, however, to be incomprehensible to certain representatives in our Organization. They are indignant with us for insisting that this question be considered in our Committee. This is probably why, the day before yesterday [1766th meeting], the representative of the United States of America in our Committee, and, today, the representatives of other States too, attacked the socialist States so vehemently and expressed with such annoyance their unhappiness at the fact that our socialist and other progressive States, year after year at every session of the United Nations General Assembly, have raised the question of the imperative need to put an end to the United States occupation of South Korea and to the dangerous precedent of using the name and the blue flag of peace of this international Organization for actions which are fundamentally contrary to its purpose and objectives in order to further the interests of the imperialist States.

80. I speak on behalf of my delegation. It seems to me, however, that the violent attacks made here by the representatives of the United States of America and other States will intimidate neither us nor the other socialist States; we will not relinquish our efforts to bring about the restoration of peace and justice in that part of the world, to ensure respect for the dignity of the Korean people and the State sovereignty of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and to put an end to this gross violation of the principles of the United Nations until a just settlement of these questions has been achieved.

81. The position of the United States of America and certain other Western States on the Korean question invites some comparisons. Have not the representatives of those States, particularly the United States, scoffed at the persistence of the socialist and other progressive States who have striven for 20 years for the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations? Have they not called this question, too, hopeless and "sterile", as the representative of the United States said in our Committee the day before yesterday and as other representatives of Western countries have said today?

82. Is it not time that these representatives learned the historical lesson that they and their followers should have learned from the recent vote in the United Nations General Assembly on the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China and to reflect in time on their own completely hopeless and senseless stubbornness on the Korean question? To try to resist and oppose the laws of social development, the logic of contemporary international relations and the natural aspirations of the peoples for liberation from foreign tutelage is indeed senseless and hopeless. We are confident that the just cause of the Korean people will triumph, too, just as the People's Republic of China will soon triumph in obtaining their rights in the United Nations.

83. All States which are sincerely interested in restoring and strengthening peace in the eastern Asian region and in giving the Korean people the opportunity to settle their internal affairs for themselves and to follow the path of peaceful, democratic reunification will, once again this year, insist on the termination of the United States occupation of South Korea, on the withdrawal of all United

States forces from its territory and on the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, which has compromised itself in the eyes of the entire international community.

84. Facts and evidence are adduced every year to prove that the forces in the territory of South Korea have nothing whatever to do with the United Nations. An abundance of such facts and evidence has once again been adduced this year by many of the delegations which have spoken before me. It is interesting to note that the Command of the so-called United Nations forces in South Korea, once again this year, has issued its annual report [S/9982] through the representative of its sole lord and master, the representative of the United States of America in the United Nations. This fact speaks for itself and further comment is hardly necessary.

85. But what does this document actually contain? The authors of this United States document are evidently trying to prove with all their so-called "data" that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is preparing to carry out an organized invasion of the southern part of Korea. It is completely obvious from the document, Mr. Chairman, that these fabricated data—even if they were true—are so trifling and insignificant that they themselves defeat the purpose of the authors of the document. These so-called "data" have only one explanation—to justify the attempt by imperialists to perpetuate the division of the Korean people and to perpetuate South Korea's status as a colony for imperialist exploitation and as a military base for the realization of the over-all aggressive plans of the imperialists for the whole Asian continent, and, indeed, not for the Asian continent alone.

86. It is evident that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has no intention of invading other States—and least of all the fraternal people living in the southern part of the country—not only because it is a socialist State, whose class and social system and official attitude repudiate war as a means of resolving international conflicts, but because all the State practice of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, both its domestic and its foreign policy, is directed towards peaceful constructive work and towards co-operation with other peace-loving peoples. Everyone knows that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has never occupied one single inch of foreign soil or encroached upon foreign territories. It is not that State's troops which are to be found thousands and thousands of miles beyond its State's borders. It is not that State's aircraft and ships which violate the sovereignty of other States through subversive military reconnaissance activities. And it is not that State which was forced to make an apology exposing its illegal invasion of foreign territorial waters, such as was made—as we all know—in the case of the notorious spy pirate ship *Pueblo*. On the contrary, as we all well know, these activities have been and still are being carried out not by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, but by those who make accusations against that State, namely, the United States of America. It is the United States which is continually organizing such subversive acts against the State sovereignty of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

87. And when the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea declares repeatedly, as it did again this

year in its official memorandum of 16 September [see A/C.1/1008], that—and I quote: “it has no intention to march south and has no intention to solve by force of arms the question of Korean unification”, it can be fully believed, because these are not empty words. This statement springs from the very nature and content of the State policy of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, and reflects its socialist system.

88. That is why my delegation, with a feeling of responsibility and duty towards our Organization and towards the people of the whole world, and with a firm conviction in the rightness and justice of the cause for which the Korean people and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea are fighting, has, together with 23 other delegations, submitted draft resolutions A/C.1/L.524 and A/C.1/L.525. We hope that all other delegations which are sincerely interested in the restoration of peace and justice in the region of the Korean peninsula will support these resolutions and will vote in favour of their adoption.

89. With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/L.531, concerning the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, my delegation wishes to state once again this year that the Government of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria does not recognize and has never recognized the legality of this Commission, which serves as a cover for United States aggression in Korea. We consider that the report submitted at the present session of the General Assembly, allegedly on behalf of the United Nations, is an affront to our Organization, as is the draft resolution on this question submitted by the United States of America, unfortunately joined by a number of other States, some of which until recently were themselves under the colonial yoke of the imperialists. We will, of course, vote against the latter resolution.

90. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): In its interim report of 14 September 1970, the United States President’s Commission for the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations expressed the opinion that one of the major shortcomings of this Organization was its misuse as both an unwieldy and ineffective debating society and a propaganda platform.

91. A group of Member nations, by requesting the inscription of two tendentiously-worded items on this subject entitled “Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations” and, secondly, “Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea”, has done nothing to dispel the impression that the capacity of the United Nations to make a positive and constructive contribution towards re-establishing security and peace in the Korean peninsula continues to be compromised by irresponsible initiatives. Furthermore, the intemperately-worded statements made by several delegates, who have shown more respect for fiction than fact and for illogic than reason, can only confirm the impression that their intention is to use this Organization as a captive audience for propaganda purposes.

92. The Australian delegation was, of course, not amongst those whose actions have been instrumental in having this Committee discuss once again the substantive aspects of the

Korean question. In fact we would not have been likely to seek the re-opening of this debate if the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/L.524 and 525 had not been determined to press ahead with their wish to inflict their polemical rhetoric on this Organization.

93. Having said this, my delegation would not wish it thought that we in any way consider this an inappropriate forum or an untimely occasion on which to review the progress which has been achieved by the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea in carrying out the mandate legally and justly entrusted to it by the General Assembly. Nevertheless, we cannot suppress the doubt that little useful purpose is being served by engaging at this stage in another wide-ranging consideration of the item, since the persistent refusal of the North Korean régime and its supporters to co-operate with the Commission and the General Assembly in discharging their obligations to the international community give faint hope that the fulfilment of United Nations objectives is in sight.

94. What are the aims of this Organization through its duly established presence in Korea? They are set out in the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and they read as follows:

“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. These objectives have been repeatedly affirmed by the General Assembly in a number of resolutions, the latest of which, resolution 2516 (XXIV), was adopted on 25 November 1969.” [A/8026, para. 1.]

95. The legitimacy of the functions exercised by the Commission in Korea and the efforts it has made faithfully to carry out its duties in the face of considerable odds cannot be denied by the General Assembly, which has repeatedly rejected attempts to terminate the existence of the Commission and to secure the premature withdrawal of United Nations forces from the Korean peninsula. Yet we are once again faced this year with two proposals, contained in documents A/C.1/L.524 and A/C.1/L.525, which would have the General Assembly withdraw United Nations forces from Korea and dissolve the Commission.

96. Developments in the Korean peninsula during the last 12 months have given no grounds for arguing that the measures recommended in documents A/C.1/L.524 and A/C.1/L.525 should be approved at this General Assembly. Indeed, those recommendations are, by their very nature, unconstitutional, since they would have this Organization abandon its responsibilities to the Korean people before a solution has been found to the very issues that make up the Commission’s terms of reference. If anything, the attitudes and the conduct of the North Korean régime, as recounted in the Commission’s report, would make it no less essential than before to preserve, unimpaired, the authority of the United Nations to continue to take an active interest and an active part in the affairs of the Korean people as a whole. Not only does the Commission conclude that “in the light of the statements made by the Government of the

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, there seems to be no indication on its part to accept the established United Nations objectives in Korea, or indeed to accept the competence of the United Nations in the Korean question" [*ibid.*, para. 17], but the North Korean régime itself, by its provocative and hostile acts, has shown its contempt for United Nations goals in Korea and for the recognized norms of international conduct and law. I would refer members who are in any doubt concerning the real motives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to chapter III of the Commission's report, which deals with a "Review of security problems in the area". It lists not only incidents in the demilitarized zone and infiltrations by sea perpetrated by North Korea in violation of the Armistice Agreement, but also such occurrences as the hijacking to North Korea of a Korean Airlines aircraft en route to Seoul and other terrorist acts, as well as espionage activities organized and run by North Korean personnel.

97. In those circumstances, approval by the General Assembly of draft resolution A/C.1/L.524, which calls for the immediate withdrawal of United Nations forces from Korea, would remove the legally authorized presence of United Nations troops from the Republic of Korea and would doubtless have the effect of inciting the North Korean authorities to further acts of aggression and subversion against the people of the Republic of Korea.

98. Not only has North Korea repudiated the competence and authority of the United Nations, but it has also taken no meaningful step to enter into consultations with South Korea on the question of reunification, and thereby to facilitate the task of the United Nations Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. The belligerent and uncompromising position taken by the North Korean régime on this issue is all the more regrettable in the light of the relatively more forthcoming attitude expressed by the President of the Republic of Korea in his commemorative address on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the National Liberation Day on 15 August 1970.

99. President Park Chung Hee's statement on that occasion has already been quoted more than once in the course of this debate—it was quoted this morning [1768th meeting] by the representative of New Zealand—and I do not propose to quote it again.

100. If words mean what they are supposed to mean, however, the President's statement can only be interpreted as a clear offer to move towards rational and meaningful discussions with North Korea, with the ultimate purpose of unification, if only the North Koreans will desist from warlike provocations and acts of subversion and accept unequivocally the competence and the authority of the United Nations in its efforts to achieve a unified, democratic and independent Korea.

101. What was the response of the North Korean authorities to that offer? On 22 August the *Rodong Shinmun*, the official organ of the Korean Communist Party, rejected President Park Chung Hee's proposals in the following—I submit—grossly intemperate language:

"The word-juggling of traitor Park Chung Hee, full of falsehood and swindle and devoid of any practical ways

for the solution of the unification question, is, in a nutshell, the old words of 'march northward to unify' wrapped up in the kerchief of 'peaceful unification'."

102. It will be clear that the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea still has a long way to go in accomplishing the mandate it was given by the Assembly. To attempt to dissolve the Commission before it has carried out its duties would amount to a grave dereliction of this Organization's responsibilities, since it would destroy the only internationally recognized machinery in existence for negotiating an eventual settlement to the Korean problem in accordance with the decisions and recommendations of the United Nations. For that reason my delegation has joined in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/L.531, which notes with approval the efforts made by the Commission, in pursuit of its mandate, to encourage the exercise of restraint and the easing of tensions in the area and to secure maximum support, assistance and co-operation in the realization of the peaceful unification of Korea. It further requests the Commission to pursue these and other efforts to achieve the objectives of the United Nations in Korea and to carry out the tasks previously assigned to it by the General Assembly.

103. My delegation would therefore urge all members of this Committee who wish to uphold the constitutional authority of this Organization and the legitimate objectives it has set itself in Korea, in accordance with the principles of the Charter and the wish of a substantial majority of Member States, to vote against draft resolutions A/C.1/L.524 and A/C.1/L.525 and to support draft resolution A/C.1/L.531.

104. Mr. HARBI (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): In the course of the debate on the aspects relating to the invitation question, the Algerian delegation emphasized [1741st meeting], basing itself on the principles of the Charter and on United Nations practice, the need for the simultaneous and unconditional presence in our debate of the parties concerned. The ritual decision of our Committee, by flouting the rights of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, has divested our debate of the objectivity and serenity that the consideration of such a question requires. Once again recourse to a pre-established majority to maintain a flagrant anomaly and to raise a serious obstacle in the way of co-operation between nations and the defence of international peace and security has been preferred. Whereas the presence of the two parties concerned should from the outset have imposed itself as a prerequisite to any discussion on the future of the Korean nation, it was felt that it was easier not to leave the well-trodden path and to follow a simple routine. That means that a free discussion of the substance of the problem is refused or, rather, that it is sought to be avoided. But the aspirations of a people for unity are indubitably stronger than obstructive resolutions, because the latter will not prevent the Korean people from following the course that will lead it to unity and independence.

105. Everything leads us to believe that a peaceful solution to the problem is not impossible; that the reunification of Korea is possible and feasible as soon as that country is freed of the constraints that weigh over its

future. It is those constraining realities which the Algerian delegation, together with other delegations, brings today before this Committee.

106. No one is unaware of the fact that for years the United Nations has served as a convenient tool in the hands of the imperialists in the Korean peninsula. It is precisely in South Korea, under cover of the United Nations flag, that foreign troops occupy that part of Korea for the obvious purpose of perpetuating territorial division, particularly through the installation of a vast complex of military bases.

107. The United Nations would only stand to lose in stature or be reduced to the sad role of a belligerent if it were used for imperialist political ends. The principal objective of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security, not to undermine it. The role of the United Nations is to encourage and facilitate a political settlement of the problems, not to maintain them at an *impasse*. The role of the United Nations is to remove the obstacles standing in the way of peace, not perpetuate them.

108. It is for this reason that my delegation believes that it is high time to put an end to the illegal and abusive use of the United Nations flag and to actions that tarnish the reputation of our Organization. The solution to the Korean problem resides, as we see it, above all, in the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops stationed in South Korea, and in allowing the Korean people to settle its own affairs freely.

109. The maintenance of those troops continues to be a permanent source of tension in the Korean peninsula. A deliberately fostered tension designed to justify the maintenance of those troops goes hand in hand with a slanderous campaign designed to present the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as a warmonger. Thus there is talk of infiltrations and penetrations by agents coming from the North to sow trouble in South Korea and possibly to seize power by force. We are quite familiar with such expressions, which have a choice place in colonial jargon. They have often served as pretexts for unleashing aggressive operations; and experience, in the last analysis, shows the premeditated nature of the aggression and of the aims pursued. The example of Viet-Nam is eloquent enough without our having to recall it.

110. The absurdity of the division of Korea, if it is prolonged, would not fail to give birth to a vast nationalist and popular movement that will itself impose unity. It is that movement that will rally Koreans around the ideal of unity. It will certainly not be the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea—which, incidentally, comes before Member States only through the presentation of a fallacious document—that will be able to bring about the unification of that country. It can only boast of one accomplishment to its credit: the perpetual division of Korea, which, incidentally, is contrary to what it claims to seek. It is for this reason that its death might perhaps be the first positive act in its life.

111. We will thus vote against its maintenance, and in favour of the draft resolution calling for the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea.

112. Mr. MASHOLOGU (Lesotho): In its approach to the Korean question, the Lesotho delegation is guided by the central concern that a just and lasting peace should be established once and for all in that country. We have no interest in the mere preservation of the *status quo*. If it is the true and real wish of the people of Korea to achieve the unification of their country by peaceful means, we consider that the world community owes it to the people of Korea to assist in creating the necessary conditions for the achievement of that objective. In our view, the main contribution that the United Nations can make is to work towards a lessening of tensions so that the Koreans can proceed with the difficult task of unifying their country after so many years of division.

113. On the other hand, if the Koreans wish the division of their country to continue, the final decision is up to them. Yet, at the same time, the United Nations has an abiding interest in a peaceful solution, because any threat to peace by any section of the divided Korea would in a very real sense also constitute a threat to the peace and security of the international community, which the United Nations could ill afford to ignore. Already, the countries of the Far East, including Korea, have had more than their fair share of suffering caused by political misunderstandings. In so far as the tensions of that area have had effects which have been felt in other parts of the world, there is a universal interest in the achievement of peace. For my delegation, this interest finds expression in the positive role which the United Nations has played in the past and which it can continue to play, provided there is political will on all sides to achieve a peaceful solution.

114. It is customary for speakers on the Korean question to refer to the past history of the area. We believe that these historical references are useful and relevant if they are needed as a basis for a renewed positive commitment to seek a lasting solution. However, we do not see that it is useful to refer to the past history of the area merely as a basis for endless recriminations and counter-accusations. To indulge in this exercise only results in all parties merely becoming the prisoners of their own version of what happened, and in the meantime the Korean people are unable to achieve any meaningful progress in solving the problem of their divided country. It would be particularly unfortunate if the perennial discussion of the Korean question merely provided a forum for the propagation of partisan positions which cannot ever be reconciled.

115. The United Nations is the main Organization which the peoples of the world, and especially the peoples of the third world, have for the pursuit of peace and justice. It was only natural and logical that the people of Korea, confronted by their problems, should have turned to the United Nations. Fellow representatives will recall that even as recently as last Thursday, 19 November, when he addressed our Committee, the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Korea once again renewed his Government's appeal for continued assistance when he said: "Therefore, on behalf of the Government and people of the Republic of Korea, I respectfully request the United Nations to continue to station the Commission and United Nations forces in Korea" [1766th meeting, para. 135]. From the very beginning of the Korean question which we are debating today, the United Nations could not have abdicated its

responsibility by failing to respond to the situation in Korea.

116. Today my delegation has no difficulty in lending its support to the proposal for the continuation of a United Nations presence in the interests of promoting a peaceful solution. Indeed, we fail to understand how any peace forces, acting under the authorization of the United Nations to create the necessary conditions whereby justice and security may be sought, can seriously be accused of defiling or soiling the United Nations flag by their mere presence in that country. In fact, there would be no worse disgrace to the United Nations flag and to the Organization itself than to withdraw the presence of the troops of the United Nations in the absence of a lasting guarantee that armed hostilities would not be initiated the moment they left the country.

117. The failure to utilize effectively the facilities provided by the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea over the years is, in the view of my delegation, not so much a reflection on the Commission itself as a sad demonstration of the lack of necessary political will to achieve a settlement and the basic lack of co-operation evinced by some parties to the conflict. The full range of possibilities within the framework of the Commission has never been explored simply because this would require a certain amount of co-operation among all. Yet, to propose that the Commission should be disbanded without proposing any constructive alternative seems to us to be palpably dangerous.

118. One of the main conclusions that flow from a serious consideration of the Korean question is that all the interested parties, including the United Nations, should move away from a negative to a decidedly positive approach. No lasting solution will be found in the endless recriminations which have marked the debates on this item over the years. It is highly doubtful if any progress could result from the negative proposals to withdraw peace forces or disband peace machinery. What is needed is a reaffirmation of the basic objectives and a serious commitment to pursue those goals through the machinery that is available. These are the factors which will guide the vote of my delegation on the three draft resolutions already before the Committee in documents A/C.1/L.524, A/C.1/L.525 and A/C.1/L.531.

119. There is no doubt that the attitude already displayed by the Republic of Korea towards the United Nations role is a step in the right direction. We particularly believe that a lasting and just solution to a problem of this nature, which historically came to involve the relations of the major Powers as well as their allies, thereby affecting international security as a whole, can best be found within the framework of the United Nations and the principles of the Charter. We therefore urge all parties to recognize the legitimate role of the United Nations in this peace-keeping and arbitration effort and to keep the door to a solution open.

120. Finally, it is just as well that it should be borne in mind that the over-all world situation, in terms of both economic and political change, is not identical with what it was in 1950. That being so, my delegation would wish to

propose to all the interested parties that they consider seriously whether the rigidity of their positions cannot be modified in the light of changing circumstances.

121. Mr. POLYANICHKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, together with other socialist States and a number of Asian and African States, has proposed that at its current session the General Assembly should discuss the question of the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations [A/8044 and Add. 1-3] and the question of the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea [A/8045 and Add. 1-3]. In proposing the inclusion of these two questions in the agenda of the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session, we have been guided by our deep conviction that a favourable decision on them would help to bring about the realization of the national aspirations of the Korean people and to satisfy their yearning for the peaceful unification of their country and would help to establish a durable peace in the Far East and to strengthen international security.

122. We are also convinced that questions relating to Korea must be discussed with the participation of the representatives of the parties directly concerned, namely, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea.

123. Unfortunately, a "conditional invitation" has been forced upon the First Committee, in complete violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter, a condition to which only the Seoul puppet régime could agree. This unjust, discriminatory decision has, with good reason, been completely rejected by the Government of the sovereign and independent State of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of 3 November, issued as document A/C.1/1011, referring to the adoption of resolution [A/C.1/L.521] of 30 October regarding the so-called "conditional invitation", states:

"This is an act of infringement upon and insult to the sovereignty of the Korean people and of flagrant violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter.

"The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea resolutely condemns and rejects this illegal 'resolution' framed up by the U.S. imperialists.

"It goes without saying that as long as the question of Korea is discussed at the United Nations, the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the party directly concerned, should participate in it."

Inasmuch as the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has, to all intents and purposes, been denied an opportunity to take part in the discussion of the question we are now considering, the presence here of the representative of the Seoul régime makes no sense whatsoever and not only does not contribute to, but is, indeed, a hindrance to the fruitful consideration and settlement of the question relating to Korea.

124. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR has repeatedly stated its views on the Korean question, which has been

discussed in the United Nations for more than two decades to no avail. We firmly believe that the unification of Korea is a domestic matter for the Korean people themselves and that they alone can accomplish the task of unifying their homeland, without any outside interference.

125. The repeated discussion year after year of the reports of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea constitutes illegal interference in the affairs of the Korean people. If the United Nations really wants to put an end to the unjust division of Korea, it must desist from its interference in the domestic affairs of the Korean people and observe the principles laid down in its Charter, namely, the principle of equality of rights of all peoples, non-interference in the domestic affairs of any State and the right of peoples to self-determination. By observing these rights and principles strictly, the United Nations could help to create the conditions necessary for a solution of the Korean question. The people of Korea must be given the opportunity freely to decide their own destiny.

126. The so-called "United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" was established in violation of the Charter of this Organization. It has become one of the obstacles to the unification of the temporarily divided Korean people. The dissolution of the Commission would be in the interests not only of the Korean people but of the United Nations itself, since it would help to free the latter from the mistakes of the past when the imperialist States were able to impose upon the General Assembly any decisions they chose. The uselessness of the Commission is proved by its own fruitless existence.

127. Guided by this deep conviction, the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR has co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/L.525 on the "Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea". In that connexion, we should like to take this opportunity to welcome the reasonable and realistic decision of the Government of Chile to withdraw from the Commission.

128. The essence of the Korean question is that the Korean nation, despite the clearly expressed wish of the Korean people to unify their homeland, remains divided as a result of gross outside interference.

129. An objective analysis of the political situation in Korea inevitably leads to the conclusion that the main obstacles to the unification of that country are the occupation of South Korea by the United States under cover of the United Nations flag, and the imperialist policies of the United States towards the Korean people and its sovereign State, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

130. It is a well-known fact that the Armistice Agreement provided for the compulsory withdrawal of all foreign forces from the Korean peninsula. There are no foreign forces in the territory of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, whereas in South Korea the United States has, for many years now, maintained armed forces on a large scale, a considerable part of them being stationed in the immediate vicinity of the Demilitarized Zone.

131. The illegal presence of the United States forces in South Korea is a dangerous source of international tension. The memorandum of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of 22 June 1970 [see A/C.1/999] draws attention to the fact that the occupation of South Korea by United States forces is fraught with the danger of an outbreak of war in Korea and is a threat to peace and security in the area. As the memorandum states, "today peace in Korea is preserved only thanks to the utmost patience and staunch struggle of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Korean people and the struggle of the world peace-loving people".

132. In gross violation of the Armistice Agreement, the United States imperialists and their South Korean puppets are committing all kinds of crimes against the independent State of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. They systematically violate the sovereignty of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea by violating its territorial waters and air space, and committing dangerous acts of provocation in the Demilitarized Zone. All this threatens to create a conflict in the area that would have dangerous consequences.

133. The United States of America, having turned South Korea into a military base, is drawing South Korea into its plans to create new aggressive military blocs in Asia and is involving the southern part of Korea in obligations which make the possibility of unifying the country on a peaceful and democratic basis more remote. The Seoul régime, disregarding the interests of the population in the southern part of the country and obediently carrying out the will of its United States patrons, has sent tens of thousands of Korean soldiers to Viet-Nam. South Korean troops are taking an active part in the criminal war against the Viet-Nameese people which has been condemned by the entire international community. This is clear evidence of the fact that the continued military occupation of South Korea and the imperialist aggression against the Viet-Nameese people are part of a general policy of international imperialism which is directed against the peoples that have won their political independence or that are struggling for their national liberation.

134. The United Nations, particularly now that a considerable part of its membership consists of nations which have recently achieved national independence, must not allow its authority, its name and its flag to be used to mask the military occupation of South Korea, an occupation which has become an integral part of the imperialist policy against the liberation movement of the peoples of Asia.

135. In the light of developments in South-East Asia in recent years, it is becoming ever clearer in the Far East that if the dangerous military activities of the United States and all other foreign troops in South Korea carried on under the cover of the United Nations do not cease, peace in the Korean peninsula and in the Far East may be seriously jeopardized. The withdrawal of all such troops from South Korea will help to normalize the situation in the area and to bring about the peaceful unification of Korea, in accordance with the will of the people of both the North and the South. The efforts of the Korean people in this direction should meet with understanding and support from the United Nations. That is the attitude that draft resolution

A/AC.1/L.524, of which the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR is a sponsor, urges Members of the United Nations to take.

136. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which is the true spokesman for the will and aspirations of the Korean people, in pursuit of their goal of the peaceful unification of the temporarily divided country, in the interests of peace and the relaxation of tension, has, for a number of years, been making realistic proposals which, if carried out, would ensure a solution to the problem of the reunification of Korea. In the aforementioned memorandum of 22 June 1970, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea repeated these proposals, which are aimed at normalizing relations between the two parts of Korea and paving the way for peaceful unification. It stated:

"The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has consistently held and still holds that Korea's unification should be achieved by peaceful means and independently by the Korean people themselves on democratic principles without interference of any outside forces after the withdrawal of the United States imperialist aggressor troops from South Korea."

137. The withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the United Nations flag is a prerequisite for a solution to the question of the peaceful unification of Korea. As long as foreign forces remain in South Korea, the Korean people will be denied the opportunity to exercise their lawful right to the unification of their homeland, which is the focus of their aspirations and wishes.

138. In order to create favourable conditions for the unification of Korea through peaceful democratic means and to ease tension and remove the danger of military conflicts in the area, the General Assembly must take a decision calling for the withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea. The withdrawal of these forces would be in the interests not only of the Korean people but of all other peoples too. Such a decision would be wholly in keeping with the lofty purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

139. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

140. Mr. KIM (Republic of Korea): I have asked to speak in order to bring out the truth regarding the statements made before this Committee by supporters of the North Korean communist régime and to clarify the Republic of Korea's stand that the United Nations presence in our country is essential to the preservation of our own and world peace and security.

141. First of all, it is not the presence and activities of United Nations forces in Korea that threaten to unleash a full military conflict upon the land, as the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics contends; rather it is the continuous and ruthless programme of infiltration and provocation carried on by the North Korean com-

munist in violation of the armistice that looms as the great menace to peace in Korea.

142. Among the so-called reliable facts cited by the Soviet representative [1766th meeting] were "5,100 cases of attack" in the first half of 1970 by United Nations and Republic of Korea forces against the North Korean communists. Another North Korean-attributed figure was "6,500 cases" in seven months. These figures might as well have been 100,000 or a million for all the resemblance they bear to truth and reality. There is no truth in them, of course. The Republic of Korea is not violating the armistice by launching provocations; it is the North Korean communist clique that is guilty, and United Nations records contain proof of their many, many violations. I completely deny this allegation.

143. Again, the Soviet representative talks of "large-scale measures . . . taken to transform South Korea into an imperialist military and strategic stronghold". He finds the situation in the Republic of Korea a menace not only to North Korea but to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Communist China. Does he expect us to accept his charge that United Nations and Republic of Korea defences really menace two massive communist and nuclear Powers, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and mainland China? This will be a revelation to many people who have heard that these two communist giants regard each other as menace number one.

144. One of the wildest accusations made against the legal Government of the Republic of Korea is the statement that it is maintained in power only by the bayonets of its "occupiers", by which is obviously meant the United Nations forces. This is patently untrue. The entire history of the United Nations and Republic of Korea relationship, dating from the late 1940s, demonstrates that it is almost unnecessary to dignify the falsehood with a denial. The whole-hearted support which the Government of the Republic of Korea has always enjoyed from its millions of citizens can be proved at the polls and in their magnificent defence of their country against aggression. One has only to witness life in the Republic of Korea to realize how much its citizens cherish their freedom. If this is not proof enough, millions of our people fled from communist North Korea and any number of these can offer easily verifiable accounts contrasting their own experiences.

145. Attempts by the Soviet representative to misrepresent the record of our Republic of Korea troops in Viet-Nam will be easily detected as malice and falsehood.

146. I am certain that many in this room share my deep and sincere interest in seeing a Soviet Union that would devote its talents, energy and resources to assuring the blessings of peace rather than encouraging the evils of provocation and aggression. This whole attitude of negativism toward what should be a constructive and fruitful effort for peace pervades the oratory of the Soviet representatives in this Committee and even that of some of the verbal supporters of the North Korean régime. Vilification and slander are used recklessly in all references to the Republic of Korea and almost laughable euphemisms are employed by the Soviet representative to describe the North Korean régime.

147. "Puppet" is the most frequent of the slanderous terms flung at us, and I submit that seldom, if ever, has it been used with greater malice, less accuracy and less justice. The Republic of Korea has never been and never will be a puppet. However, free resort to that term to discredit a strong people that dares oppose the communists' will is a habit of the communists.

148. Again, the weird lexicon of communism contains terms—and these are used *ad nauseam*—to describe not only any who refuse to bend to their will but especially those who are allied with the Republic of Korea. These nations or forces are described unremittingly as "occupiers" or "imperialists". In truth, one need only have the most casual knowledge of communist régimes to know where this shoe fits best. The worst characteristics of all groups in these categories may be found in certain actual puppet régimes. In this case one need look no further than North Korea, and it is more enlightening still to discuss the question with some of the more than four million Koreans who fled that régime into the Republic of Korea.

149. For firm official documentation pertaining to the defence and subsequent support rendered the Republic of Korea one need but refer to the General Assembly and Security Council proceedings from 1950 onwards.

150. Certain questions inevitably arise when one has had one's ears or eyes continuously assaulted by communist propaganda.

151. Who, for example, launched the assault across the 38th parallel on 25 June 1950 to invade a country at peace? Was it the United Nations? The United States? The Republic of Korea?

152. Who came to the aid of the invaded nation, when urgently and genuinely invited to do so; and could one honestly term those who fought by the side of a beleaguered Republic "occupiers" or "imperialists"?

153. That our United Nations allies were indeed invited urgently to come to the defence of freedom in Korea in accordance with a Security Council resolution and that they are there with the full concurrence and co-operation of the Republic of Korea is acknowledged by the United Nations. Furthermore, the Republic was created legally and justly with the help of the United Nations and is recognized by it as the only legal government in Korea. The United Nations and our allies in this world body joined the cause because they knew it to be one which affected far more than a single country's freedom and security.

154. Many other sources in the free world, as well as United Nations documents, may be consulted for facts. The North Korean communists continue to employ their familiar technique, combining exaggeration, deceit and distortion to label or describe virtually every development in the post-liberation history of Korea as well as the dedicated struggle of the Republic of Korea and the United Nations to bring freedom to my homeland. I might say that if the Soviet Union is seeking the approbation of the communist ruling clique in North Korea by that device I should remind its representatives that 75 per cent of Korea's more than 42 million people are loyal citizens of the Republic of Korea

and are far from likely to respond favourably to this outrageous distortion. They will not forget the lies and smears; they will not forget the source. Does the Soviet representative really believe that history can be so easily expunged and rewritten?

155. In the fantastic lexicon of communism, North Koreans under its iron régime are proudly described as a "people's democracy" and "peace-loving nation". They are neither, of course. Nor are their "votes" really votes, their "elections" really elections.

156. Such jargon is used to describe the many communist attempts to launder their sordid record of virtually continuous violation of the Demilitarized Zone and infiltration of the Republic of Korea by armed North Korean communist thugs. Whereas thousands of communist violations have been officially recorded, the North Korean communist bosses deny them but try to smear the Republic of Korea record of observance of the 1953 armistice by attributing fantastic numbers of violations to us. I deny those allegations categorically. They are totally untrue. The North Koreans dishonour the word "liberation" by attempting to cover some of their many violations by speaking of efforts to "liberate" the South.

157. The facts are fully available to members of this Committee. Some members have a first-hand knowledge of the history of the Korean question; many others, having attended these sessions, have a sound knowledge; but further facts are available in the documentary history as well as in secondary accounts. It is clear who were the aggressors and were condemned by the Security Council for their aggression. It is also clear who are the would-be aggressors today when the dangers of this highly explosive situation emanate from the North Korean communists themselves.

158. We of the Republic of Korea believe it is impossible to overstate the urgency of renewing the United Nations commitment in Korea now.

159. Two organizations—one military, one political—have kept the peace on the Korean peninsula for many years. We have thus far, together, ridden out the crises as they arose. The utmost credit is due the United Nations forces for their tremendously effective presence and the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea for its exemplary performance. Nothing resembling the awful events of 25 June 1950 has happened during their stay in Korea. That was the day when the North Korean communists, secure in the knowledge that forces friendly to the Republic had been pulled out the year before, anticipated a quick victory following upon their lightning invasion.

160. The signs are clearer today than at any time since the Armistice Agreement of July 1953 that peace is in dire peril because of the conviction of Kim Il Sung, the so-called Premier of North Korea, that the unification of Korea must be achieved by armed communist force.

161. It is all too true that North Korea has had ample time for a major build-up. It has made the most of this time by flouting the Armistice Agreement in assembling an abun-

dant arsenal of deadly, sophisticated weapons. It has also breached the peace and the armistice by mounting thousands upon thousands of armed infiltrations aimed at sabotaging and paralysing the Republic of Korea. The North Koreans have also been busy mobilizing their entire manpower and preparing their communist-dictated people psychologically, to the extent that Kim Il Sung's régime has boasted that North Korea is "an armed camp".

162. Let no one doubt—and the North Korean communists certainly do not—that the United Nations presence has definitely prevented the North Korean régime from launching another cruel war, a war that would inevitably involve more of the world than before.

163. In sharp contrast to North Korea's bitterly negative, belligerent, aggressive approach, the United Nations attitude and activity are still positive. It pursues through the United Nations forces its mission of keeping the peace. It pursues through the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea its mission of proceeding peacefully towards an orderly, just and peaceful reunification of Korea. For anyone to call the United Nations presence in Korea an "occupation", as the communists do, is a lie. There is no occupation in the Republic of Korea, nothing resembling an occupation.

164. The Republic of Korea itself is peaceful and has no aggressive intentions or designs; rather, it is prepared for defence. I can say proudly and honestly that my country is "doing beautifully" in a free society, working hard, prospering, respecting itself, respecting its neighbours. Truly we of the Republic of Korea envy no one.

165. Once again the members of this Committee have heard the negative charges and claims of certain of its members, and all of us have heard as well the facts of the Korean question from those, including the representative of the Republic of Korea, who advocate a peaceful solution

through the presence of the United Nations in Korea. Coming from a nation which whole-heartedly supports the United Nations philosophy and method, I am fully confident that the truth is known to all, that the facts give eloquent assurance of justice being done and security being served best by the stand which the United Nations has taken up to this time. I trust, therefore, that an overwhelming majority of this Committee will reassert its just and wise support by the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/L.531 and the rejection of those contained in documents A/C.1/L.524 and A/C.1/L.525.

166. To act thus at this important moment will again have beneficial results for freedom, justice and security in Korea, the Far East and all the world, because of the universal importance of the problem.

167. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): We still have 14 speakers on the list in the general debate on this question. In order to have time to hear all speakers and to proceed to vote on the draft resolutions on this item, I ask all representatives to be punctual.

168. As I have said, if circumstances allow—and I hope they will—the vote on the draft resolutions on this item will be taken at the end of the general debate, possibly towards the end of the afternoon meeting tomorrow. If we are able to complete our consideration of this item early enough, as decided, we can revert to the question of disarmament and to the specific consideration of the draft resolutions which we have not yet had time to examine. However, in view of the lengthy list of speakers in the general debate on the question before us, and the amount of time we shall have to devote to explanations of vote before and after the voting, as well as to the voting itself, it is not too likely that we shall be able to complete consideration of the question of disarmament.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.