



CONTENTS

Agenda item 99:

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;
- (d) Need to put an end to the discussion in the United Nations on the unification of Korea 1

Chairman: Mr. Agha SHAHI (Pakistan).

AGENDA ITEM 99

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/7642 and Add.1-5; A/C.1/982, A/C.1/985 and Corr.1, 986, 987, A/C.1/990, A/C.1/L.470 and Add.1 and 2);
- (b) Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/7643 and Add.1-3; A/C.1/982, A/C.1/985 and Corr.1, 986, 987, A/C.1/990, A/C.1/L.472 and Add.1);
- (c) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/7553, A/7629, A/7653; A/C.1/982, A/C.1/985 and Corr.1, 986, 987, A/C.1/990, A/C.1/L.471 and Add.1 and 2);
- (d) Need to put an end to the discussion in the United Nations on the unification of Korea (A/7658; A/C.1/L.483)

1. Mr. STACHOWIAK (Poland): The Polish delegation has followed with great attention the debate in this Committee on the invitation aspects of the question of Korea. Like many other delegations we would have been interested to hear in this Committee the voices of the representatives of Korea—of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of South Korea. Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/L.469 and Add.1-3, adopted by a majority vote of this Committee, has closed the door to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, thus depriving us of the right and opportunity to listen to the authentic representatives of the Korean people.

2. That resolution is, in our opinion, contrary to the United Nations Charter. It was adopted on the ground of ideological prejudices. It can serve only those who are

interested in the continued occupation of South Korea by United States forces and those who oppose the just cause of the unification of Korea.

3. Some statements made here were based on distorted facts and one-sided information. It appears that their only aim was to blame the Democratic People's Republic of Korea; their spirit and tone strongly reminded us of the views pronounced in this body in past years, during the period of the cold war.

4. But putting aside all these pronouncements, is it not a fact that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has achieved major successes in an all-round development of the country? Its international role has been growing steadily. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea maintains friendly relations with many countries of the world, including my own. It enjoys sympathy and support from progressive countries and political forces all over the world.

5. Apart from twisted data, both historical and concerning the present situation, the South Korean letter published as document A/C.1/985 and Corr.1 seeks to present the South Korean régime as the only sovereign Government in Korea—a posture which, to say the least, is nonsensical. The régime in Seoul gives us an example of pure fantasy in its attempts to present itself as a "democratic" and "free" Government. In doing so it seems to forget that, while it calls for the continuation of the occupation of South Korea by United States forces, it agrees to send South Korean troops to Viet-Nam to fight against the freedom and independence of an heroic Asian nation. Is that to be accepted as proof of being "democratic" and "free"? This so-called mission of freedom by South Korea in Viet-Nam is not even mentioned in the South Korean letter. Perhaps that omission can be considered symptomatic. But these activities of the South Korean régime are well known and they put the Seoul régime in the proper light.

6. No one in this Committee is surprised that the South Korean views should be so strongly endorsed by the United States representatives. The United States position is supported by some countries which are engaged on the American side in the aggressive war against the Viet-Nameese people. It is no wonder, nor is it merely by accident, that the policies of the United States and of the Seoul régime find unqualified endorsement on the part of those countries which have not supported the resolutions designed to eliminate the remnants of colonialism in Africa.

7. One can indeed regret that the United States and some other countries are still continuing such a policy on the Korean question, a policy that is conducted from a position of force and that serves the narrow interests of one big

Power. We are convinced that sooner or later these countries will have to abandon that policy.

8. The Polish delegation does not wish to enter into detailed polemics similar to the unproductive discussions of the cold war period. Neither do we want to reiterate here what we said last year about the historic development and the present situation in Korea. We are of the opinion that this Committee should not be transformed, as some delegations would evidently wish it to be, into a forum for such useless discussions.

9. What we need and what we expect from this Committee is a realistic approach to the question before us. We are discussing the proposals concerning the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

10. Today no one has any illusion about the real nature of the so-called United Nations forces, United Nations Command and United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK). All orders and instructions to the so-called United Nations forces and United Nations Command are given by the Pentagon or the State Department. That should be a matter of concern to all those countries that believe in the United Nations Charter and respect it. They should voice a strong protest against such an abuse of the name of the United Nations.

11. The continued occupation of South Korea by United States forces and the existence of UNCURK are the main obstacles on the way to the unification of Korea. The experience of many years has confirmed that truth. For the unification of Korea is, and must be, first of all, a matter for the Koreans themselves.

12. As far as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is concerned, it has put forward a clear-cut and positive programme aimed at opening the way to the unification of the country. In the letter of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of that country published as document A/C.1/987 we can read the following:

“The most reasonable solution to the question of Korean unification is to establish a unified central government by holding North-South general elections on a democratic basis without any interference of outside forces after forcing the United States imperialists out of South Korea.”

13. In the opinion of the Polish delegation the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces from South Korea and the dissolution of UNCURK are the very first conditions for opening the way towards the unification of that country. At the same time, the withdrawal of these forces would eliminate an important source of tension in that area and would strengthen security in the world.

14. Particularly in view of the fact that there are no foreign troops in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the continued occupation of South Korea by United States forces cannot be justified by any motives. It serves only United States interests, it has nothing to do with the

real needs and aspirations of the Korean people and it undermines the prestige of the United Nations.

15. The latest report of UNCURK [A/7629], like former ones, maintains the fictitious existence of the United Nations Command in Korea. The report fully endorses United States activities in Korea. Even a reader with no knowledge of the historical background of UNCURK will easily discover that there are no differences between the evaluation of the situation by the United States and that by UNCURK. That report proves that UNCURK is an instrument of United States policies in Korea, an instrument being used to continue the occupation of South Korea by United States forces. In spite of that, there are still some delegations which are trying again to find justification for this illegal and harmful abuse of the United Nations name, flag and authority.

16. The Polish delegation is convinced that the United Nations must first of all disentangle itself from past and present involvement in and identification with United States policies in Korea. We believe that there are more than enough reasons to demand the termination, long overdue, of this discrediting of the name and authority of the United Nations. That is particularly important on the eve of the United Nations twenty-fifth anniversary. Many speakers have expressed the view that the role and authority of the United Nations should be consolidated. We share that view and we should indeed see the dissolution of UNCURK as a very important step in that direction.

17. A decision on the withdrawal of United States forces from South Korea and on the dissolution of UNCURK would be of great importance for commencing a process aimed at the unification of Korea, for a relaxation of the tension existing in that area and for the strengthening of the United Nations position, particularly in the eyes of the peoples who are fighting for freedom and independence or who have won their independence in recent years. They would be convinced that the United Nations cannot be used as an instrument for the egoistic policies of a great Power.

18. In conclusion, the Polish delegation would like to point out that without the termination of the occupation of South Korea by United States forces and without the dissolution of UNCURK we do not see any reason for discussing questions connected with Korea, the more so as we do not have the possibility of hearing the voices of the representatives of the Korean people.

19. We should always remember that the questions connected with Korea, and particularly that of the unification of Korea, are matters first of all for the Korean people themselves. And we believe that the Korean people can find a solution to their problems, a solution which would correspond to their national interests and to the cause of peace and security. The Polish delegation will therefore cast its vote in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/L.470 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.1/L.472 and Add.1 and A/C.1/L.483.

20. The CHAIRMAN: Since none of the representatives who are listed to speak today is present, I shall suspend the meeting briefly.

The meeting was suspended at 10.45 a.m. and resumed at 11.5 a.m.

21. Mr. SLINGENBERG (Netherlands): It is the fate of some, mostly smaller, nations to be situated geographically in the vicinity of more powerful neighbours. These neighbours are sometimes inclined to feel that they have the right to mingle in the affairs of those smaller nations.

22. One of the victims of that regrettable attitude is undoubtedly Korea. No digging in the archives of history is necessary to illustrate what happened in Korea. We are all aware of the most recent history of that country. After the wanton aggression from the North in 1950—which may well have been inspired by some great Power—and after years of untold misery and bloodshed, an armistice was concluded in 1953. Following that, there existed reasonable hope and faith among peace-loving nations that early elections in the whole of Korea under the auspices of the United Nations would become possible in order to achieve the veritable unification of that unhappy peninsula.

23. Since 1953 prospects for early unification have not improved. That is due, firstly, to the increase in infiltrations and subversive activities committed against the Republic of Korea and, secondly, to the unwillingness of the North to make any acceptable move of rapprochement. In paragraph 8 of its last report the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea expresses its belief that the Republic of Korea is still willing to bring about conditions conducive to the unification of Korea by democratic methods in accordance with General Assembly resolutions. My delegation shares that belief. We regret, however, the total absence of reason on the other side. It is regrettable that some nations which profess to adhere to the principles and subscribe to the resolutions of the United Nations are stiffening Kim Il Sung's régime in its unreasonable demands, and in so doing continue to maintain tension and unrest in the Far East.

24. I should now like to say a few words about the economic and social situation of the Republic of Korea. Having served as Netherlands delegate to UNCURK during and after the fighting in Korea, I revisited Korea, especially the city of Pusan, during the summer of 1968. Hardly ever have I been more surprised. In 1953 Pusan was one vast slum area and when it rained mud was knee deep in its streets. Refugees from the North were leading a life of misery in flimsy huts without any hope of improvement.

25. In 1968 there were no more slums, no poor refugees. Instead, one noticed clean houses, happy, smiling faces, new factories and shops, modern wide roads—all of them proof of the rapid improvement of conditions in South Korea.

26. Having served on UNCURK, I have no difficulty in seeing where the letter of 8 October of the North Korean Minister of Foreign Affairs—document A/C.1/987 of 17 October—contains untruthful and often slanderous statements.

27. All these reasons lead my delegation to oppose draft resolutions A/C.1/L.470 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.1/L.472 and Add.1 and A/C.1/L.483. The Netherlands delegation is a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/L.471 and Add.1 and 2 because it feels that the presence of the United Nations in Korea remains essential for reaching our objec-

tive, that is, the unfettered expression of the will of the people of a really democratic, united and independent Korea.

28. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan): Before beginning my statement, I should like to express the sadness felt by the Japanese delegation when we learned of the tragic and most untimely death of His Excellency Sir David Rose, Governor-General of Guyana. We offer to the delegation of Guyana our very sincere condolences.

29. The Korean question involves, among others, two essential factors. One is the reunification of Korea in the interest of all the Korean people. The other is the preservation of peace and security in Asia. Having had close relationships with the Korean people for many centuries, Japan naturally maintains a very great interest in the present and the future welfare of that people as a whole. And because of its very close geographical proximity to Korea, and indeed to the Asian mainland, Japan has a vital interest in the peace and security of that area. Anything that might adversely affect the welfare of the Korean people or the peace and the security of the area is bound to be a matter of great concern to it. Japan believes that all that is possible should be done to enhance the welfare of the Korean people and the peace and security of the area.

30. My delegation is firmly convinced that the United Nations has a great deal to contribute to a positive solution of the Korean question in this sense, through continuing responsible and collective efforts. The United Nations rightly took up the Korean question as long ago as 1947, for realization of the unification of a Korea divided against the will of the Korean people. Ever since then, despite the obstructionist tactics of some Members, as well as the terrible experiences suffered by the peaceful people of the Republic of Korea during the Korean war, the Organization has consistently tried to find a positive solution. The United Nations has not succeeded in doing so in spite of its efforts for twenty years, due to the fact that North Korea has consistently rejected United Nations resolutions. Thus the original commitments of our Organization are still valid and we must remain concerned with the Korean question until the problem is solved.

31. What is the United Nations formula for a solution of the Korean question? The objectives of the United Nations have been consistently reaffirmed in a series of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, most recently in 1968 at the twenty-third session in resolution 2466 (XXIII). Those objectives are again found in the draft resolution which is contained in document A/C.1/L.471 and Add.1 and 2, which has been submitted by a number of delegations including my own, and which states that:

“... the 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”.

32. Some delegations assert that the Korean question should not be dealt with in our Organization. But I am sure that these delegations cannot possibly find anything to stand against in the objectives set forth in draft resolution

A/C.1/L.471 and Add.1 and 2. It is impossible to believe that they are opposed to the solution of the Korean question by peaceful means; it is impossible to believe that they are opposed to the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of government; it is impossible to believe that they are opposed to full restoration of international peace and security in the area.

33. Why, then, do some delegations oppose a discussion of the Korean question in the United Nations? They contend that this is a matter which concerns the internal affairs of the Korean people. Thus, the explanatory memorandum on the need to put an end to the discussion in the United Nations on the unification of Korea alleges the following:

“Not only has the discussion of the unification of Korea complicated the solution of the problem and created new obstacles, but its annual repetition is damaging to the prestige of the United Nations, especially in view of the fact that the United Nations Charter itself, in Article 2 (7), expressly prohibits intervention in the internal affairs of States.” [A/7658, para. 2.]

34. To be sure, the unification and the restoration of peace and security of Korea are matters of vital concern to the Korean people. But the contention that the question of Korea is of no concern to anyone else is obviously false and cannot convince anyone. It is common knowledge that the United Nations had been entrusted with the task of the unification of Korea even before any Government came to be created in Korea. Thus the very question of the unification of Korea was born within the United Nations and has since been kept within the competence of the United Nations. Especially since the atrocious act of aggression from North Korea was launched upon the Republic of Korea in 1950, the question of peace and security in Korea has legitimately been the primary concern of the United Nations. In the light of this historical background it is idle to pretend that the question of Korea falls within the prohibition stipulated by Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

35. Indeed, the situation in Korea is such that it involves the peace and the security of the area and, by the same token, of the world. This is obviously a situation in which the highest responsibility of the United Nations is involved for bringing about the solution of the problem by peaceful means. To prove this point we have only to examine the report of UNCURK in document A/7553 and the report of the United Nations Command contained in document S/9493.¹ Those reports testify to the fact that the North Korean authorities have been engaged in intensive guerrilla and commando operations against the Republic of Korea.

36. Those belligerent activities of North Korea obviously compromise the peace and security of the area and should convince anybody that the Korean question is not at all a mere matter of internal concern for Korea. It will affect, very clearly and most seriously, the very basis of international peace and security. It is surely a matter which the United Nations must consider in accordance with the Charter.

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1969.*

37. Concerning the question of the United Nations forces in Korea, I should like to invite the attention of the members of our Committee to the fact that the United Nations forces have already been withdrawn in the greater part, and that the sole objective of the United Nations forces at present in Korea is to preserve the peace and security of the area. Even those remaining forces will be withdrawn whenever such withdrawal is requested by the Republic of Korea or whenever the conditions for a lasting settlement formulated by the General Assembly have been fulfilled. The draft resolution A/C.1/L.471 and Add.1 and 2 sets forth these facts in its operative paragraph 6.

38. It is important to point out in this connexion that the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Korea, in his statement of 11 November 1969 [1684th meeting], specifically declared that his Government requested the United Nations to maintain its political and military arms in Korea for the sake of peace in Korea and the area surrounding it.

39. Turning now to the other draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.470 and Add.1 and 2, this draft resolution calls for the withdrawal of all American and other foreign forces now in Korea under the title of the “United Nations forces”. I wish to point out that the only forces stationed in the Republic of Korea are United Nations forces, sent by Member States in compliance with Security Council resolution 83 (1950) in order to repulse the armed attack from North Korea and to restore peace and security in Korea. They have been maintained there in accordance with United Nations resolutions and in response to the request of the Republic of Korea. It hardly needs recalling that it was only through the intervention of the United Nations, faithful to its highest duty under the Charter, that we succeeded in preventing the conflict resulting from the North Korean aggression from spreading and engulfing the world in flames. Everyone knows that only the continued presence of the United Nations in Korea has so far prevented the persistent tension from bursting out into another open conflict.

40. It would be easy to imagine the unhappy consequences that would result if the United Nations forces were to be withdrawn without any prospect in sight for the creation of conditions for a lasting settlement in Korea. For these reasons my delegation categorically rejects draft resolution A/C.1/L.470 and Add.1 and 2.

41. From all that I have said it should be clear that the only proper course for us to take is to request the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea to continue to carry on the tasks assigned to it by the General Assembly. Thus my delegation is also strongly opposed to draft resolution A/C.1/L.472 and Add.1, which calls for the dissolution of UNCURK.

42. It should also be hardly necessary to add that for the reasons that I have expounded, my delegation cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/L.483, which calls for putting an end to the discussion in the United Nations on the unification of Korea.

43. In the light of recent serious violations of the Armistice Agreement² and the repeated declarations of the

² *Ibid.*, Eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1953, document S/3079, appendix A.

North Korean Premier, Kim Il Sung—which I do not think it necessary to quote, because many previous speakers have already done so—let us not be mistaken about the real but concealed intentions of North Korea.

44. Japan adheres to the Charter. We wish to seek the reunification of Korea by peaceful means. We want everything possible done, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, to maintain the peace and security of the area.

45. Before concluding, I should like to make a few observations concerning some of the points raised in the course of our debate in this Committee. First, I wish to express my deep regret that at the time when the Committee adopted the draft resolution [*A/C.1/L.469 and Add.1-3*] on the invitation of the parties concerned, a certain delegation saw fit to defy the validity of that resolution which had been adopted by this Committee. Furthermore, at the morning meeting of 11 November 1969, some delegations, on the same excuse, chose to withdraw from the Committee just as the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Korea was about to make a statement. I regret this, because a small group of delegations have no right to defy the validity of a resolution that has legally been adopted by our Committee after due deliberation and in a democratic way.

46. Second, the distinguished representative of the Soviet Union, in his statement at the morning meeting of 11 November 1969 referred to the Asian and Pacific Council and said “. . . certain circles in the United States and Japan, together with the South Korean puppets, have not ceased their efforts to put together a new military-political bloc in Asia under the cover of that organization” [*1684th meeting, para. 33*].

47. My delegation does not know how such a distorted notion of ASPAC has strayed into the thinking of the Soviet delegation. If this is not an intentional distortion of the true picture on their part, I should like to remind the representative of the Soviet Union that ASPAC is an organ for constructive co-operation towards peace and progress. As stressed by the Prime Minister of Japan, Eisaku Sato, at the Fourth Ministerial Meeting of the ASPAC held recently in Japan, and later endorsed in its joint communiqué, the essential common factor uniting the ASPAC countries is the ardent desire to pursue their social and economic development without being disturbed by external pressure and interference. There is no other hidden purpose behind it.

48. As for the remarks made by the representative of the Soviet Union concerning the position of my country and my delegation on the Korean question, I should like to confine myself to stating that those remarks are nothing else than self-degrading in character and that my delegation does not consider them to be worthy of our comment and thus of taking up our precious time.

49. Japan has in many different ways demonstrated its devotion to the peace and security of Asia and the Far East and, indeed, of the entire world. Because the peace and security of Asia are of such immediate and vital concern to my country, Japan has every desire to contribute as much

as it can to the unification of Korea and the peace and security of the area. My delegation earnestly hopes that an overwhelming majority of this Committee will join with us in voting in favour of draft resolution *A/C.1/L.471 and Add.1 and 2*, and conversely, in rejecting decisively draft resolutions *A/C.1/L.470 and Add.1 and 2*, and *A/C.1/L.472 and Add.1 and A/C.1/L.483*.

50. Mr. FAKHREDDINE (Sudan): My delegation wishes to take this opportunity of reiterating the genuine sympathy that we feel in the Sudan for the hapless and divided people of Korea. The Korean people had lived as one nation, undivided, from ancient times. The history of the Koreans living on the territory that is now North and South Korea could be traced back five thousand years. The Koreans have had the same language, the same culture, the same customs and traditions, until they were divided in the aftermath of the war. If this brutal and arbitrary division continues the gulf between the northern and southern half of the country is bound to grow still wider with consequent repercussions which cannot but be harmful to the culture of the people and to their very being as a nation. The people themselves certainly do not wish to be divided, since this division has not only hampered the rational utilization of the economic resources of the country, but has affected even individual and family life, as there has been no communication between those who inhabit the northern part of the country with those who live in the southern part.

51. How is this situation to be remedied? The so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, in the concluding chapter of its report [*A/7629, para. 88*] expresses the belief that:

“. . . the Republic of Korea is willing to bring about conditions conducive to the unification of Korea by democratic methods and in accordance with the General Assembly resolutions”.

It adds the rider, however, that:

“It observes, however, no similar willingness on the part of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea to admit the competence and authority of the United Nations, although it professes to desire the attainment of peaceful unification through democratic procedures.”

52. This paragraph just quoted reflects the doubtful judgement and undoubted partiality of this much vaunted Commission. For we cannot fail to notice that the Commission expresses its belief in the willingness of the Republic of Korea to bring about conditions conducive to the unification of the country by democratic methods without evidence and without specifying what those conditions would be or what kind of democratic methods would be resorted to in order to achieve the unification of the country.

53. The Commission is satisfied, however, and would persuade the Members of this Assembly to be similarly satisfied. But we are not persuaded that the mere reiteration of the acknowledgement of United Nations competence is proof of goodwill or even of genuine desire to bring about the unity of the country. Nor are we satisfied

that rejection by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of the competence and authority of the United Nations to bring about the unification of Korea signifies a lack of desire on the part of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to achieve the unity of the country. We share the view that the competence assumed by the Commission that purports to represent the United Nations is inadmissible because it was based on an act of illegality.

54. The United Nations has no authority to intervene on the question of unification except by the express consent of both parties. That consent has been withheld by one of the parties mainly because the United Nations has allowed itself to be used as a shield for an army of occupation on Korean soil. Thus, while the lack of consent of one section of the country deprives the United Nations of legal authority to intervene on the unification of Korea, the unconcealed and unabashed identification of the supposed representatives of the United Nations with the Government of the Republic of Korea that seeks to destroy the régime of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea deprives this Organization of any moral authority to intervene on that question.

55. The Commission has no right or justification for the imputation of bad faith to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In paragraph 9 of its report the Commission states:

“The position of the Government of the Republic of Korea was reiterated in a statement issued on 31 May 1969 by Mr. Choi Kyu Hah, Foreign Minister of the Republic of Korea, as follows:

“ ‘Convinced that the reunification of Korea by peaceful means along the line of the United Nations principle would be possible through co-operation with the efforts of the United Nations . . .’ ”

56. It will be readily noticed that there are no suggestions here as to how unification is to be brought about. There are no specific proposals. There is not a single positive element except the acknowledgement of the authority of the United Nations and the reference to non-existent “United Nations efforts”. The Commission by its own admission in paragraph 88 of the same report stated that it “remains unable to make any progress whatever in achieving the principal objective of the United Nations in Korea”. Where, then, are those efforts? The Commission is, however, happy to continue as usual in its new headquarters, for which it pays a touching tribute, making absolutely no progress in achieving the principal objective of the United Nations in Korea while the Foreign Minister of the Republic of Korea promises continuing co-operation.

57. At the risk of labouring the point on top of being considered subversive, my delegation would ask what efforts are there for the Foreign Minister to co-operate with, if the Commission confesses “that it has not been able to make any progress towards the realization of the unification of the country”? Is it not then sensible to ask what the Commission has been doing and why it should continue? Is it not logical to demand that it should be disbanded?

58. We consider that UNCURK is not only incapable of making any practical contribution to the solution of the Korean question but is itself one of the main obstacles in the course of finding a solution. We consider that the question of the unification of Korea should be settled by the Korean people itself, in conformity with the right of self-determination.

59. Time and again, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has put forward varied and practical proposals for the unification of the country, but it has always made the necessary stipulation that there can be no referendum, no free elections, under the bayonets of a foreign army of occupation. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea proposed, first of all, a programme of gradually easing the tension and achieving some measure of communication between the two parts of the country. It has suggested that the representatives of political parties and public organizations from the south should visit the northern part, that there should be an interchange of press correspondents, that relatives residing in the two halves of the country should be allowed to visit each other, and that there should be some economic exchange between North and South Korea.

60. Those proposals were dismissed by the authorities in South Korea as “propaganda”. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea further proposed negotiations between the representatives of the North and the South to discuss the question of unification. It suggested the setting up of a confederation of North and South Korea as a step towards unification. There has been no response from the Republic of Korea except to wave the usurped flag of the United Nations and to ask its compatriots in the North to renounce their independence and to crawl under the umbrella of the army of occupation.

61. The Korean Armistice Agreement³ clearly stipulates that all foreign armies should withdraw and that the question of unification should be solved peacefully. There are no foreign troops on the soil of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. But, according to some late estimates, there are 60,000 American troops in South Korea. This army of the United States in the South is supported by formidable air power. There have been recent reports of the shipment of F-4 Phantom fighters to reinforce the United States Air Command in Korea, in addition to a number of helicopters given to the South Korean forces. There have also been reports of further additions of Phantom F-4D fighter bombers and various types of transport planes.

62. The staging last March of the “Focus Retina” air-lift operation has already been mentioned in this debate, as has the celebrated case of the illegal incursion of the *Pueblo*. All these frenzied activities are clearly in contravention of the Korean Armistice Agreement. They have been undertaken to deter, it is said, an alleged intent of aggression on the part of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Yet, from the end of January until July 1969 the Democratic People's Republic of Korea reported, and protested against, not less than 2,870 separate cases of violation of the Korean Armistice Agreement.

63. Under these circumstances, can there be any doubt that the presence of United States forces on Korean soil is

³ *Ibid.*

the most important factor in creating the state of tension that has racked that country for two decades? Can it be doubted that the continued occupation of South Korea by United States forces in violation of the Armistice Agreement is a serious obstacle to unification?

64. The proposal sometimes put forward by the authorities of the Republic of Korea for elections under United Nations supervision is tantamount to holding elections under conditions of occupation. We consider that the acknowledgement of the need for supervision is contrary to the independent status of the Korean people. In fact, my delegation is at a loss to understand why the Republic of Korea should wish to negate its independence and proclaim its immaturity. There were such supervised elections before in South Korea, but the outcome was discouraging. One would recall here Mr. Syngman Rhee and his "representative Government". They were elected under United Nations supervision. It is well known how the results of that election were rectified in April 1960.

65. In the course of this statement I have referred to the report of the United Nations Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea with the sole purpose of pointing out the contradictions contained in that report. I should like it to be noted that my delegation does not base its statement on the report, nor does it consider our discussion of the Korean question as in any way arising from the report or occasioned by it. We consider that any discussion of the Korean question on the basis of the report of UNCURK is illegitimate and inadmissible and we hope to persuade the other members of the Committee so to decide.

66. The United Nations had not been called upon to act in any way in Korea. Its resolutions establishing the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea [112 (II)] and later the United Nations Commission on Korea [293 (IV)] and eventually UNCURK [376 (V)] were adopted against the wishes of a substantial part of the Korean people.

67. There are curious similarities, as well as some crucial differences, one would note in passing, between action undertaken in the name of the United Nations in Korea and United Nations action in Palestine. For example, the decisions that were taken to intervene in Korea, whether peaceful or belligerent, did not come as a result of consulting the Korean people or ascertaining their wishes. In fact, a substantial number of them were convinced that those decisions were high-handed and unjust. They strongly opposed the United Nations claim of trusteeship and fought the armies that intervened in its name. The decision to partition the land of Palestine was also taken without consulting the people of Palestine, without regard to their interests; and in the face of strong and adamant opposition to the usurpation of their land. Their struggle goes on.

68. Both decisions taken by the United Nations, in Palestine and in Korea, perpetrated an injustice, and for both actions, as well as for the inevitable consequences of those actions, the United Nations bears a grave responsibility. The presence of foreign troops not under the command of the United Nations but operating under its name should no longer be tolerated. This is a situation which cannot be conducive to the unification of Korea.

69. The unification of Korea, let me say again, is a matter that concerns the Koreans themselves. It concerns them not only primarily but entirely. No other nation or group of nations, or any international organization, should arrogate to itself this right of the Korean people.

70. If the United Nations should continue to maintain the question of the reunification of Korea on its agenda, it would only underline the implication—already present in every action that this Organization has undertaken on this issue—that the Korean people are not considered responsible for their own affairs, nor considered sovereign in their own land. That attitude is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and should be rejected by the Members of this Organization, as it is rejected in no uncertain terms by at least one section of the country that the United Nations seeks to unite.

71. Instead of dissipating its energies, let the United Nations attend to situations where peace is in real jeopardy, where its intervention to enforce its decisions is essential—as it is indeed essential in the Middle East.

72. Mr. CERNIK (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from Russian*): Our Committee is once again considering questions which directly affect the vital interests of the Korean people and their future. It is, therefore, fitting to deplore the fact that, due to repeated obstructions, we have been unable this year to hear the views of the representatives of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, while the delegation of South Korea has been given the opportunity to state its own views. This in itself already evidences an abnormal and biased approach to the consideration of this problem. In this connexion we should like to point out again that this attitude cannot be useful to our debates and it results in undermining the authority of our Organization and the confidence of States in its impartiality.

73. Allow me to state my delegation's position of principle on this problem. The Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia, as is known, is one of the co-sponsors of the proposal for withdrawal of United States and all other foreign troops occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations, and we are also co-sponsors of the proposals for dissolution of the United Nations Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and for putting an end to the discussion in the United Nations of the question of the unification of Korea.

74. This time too we have gone over the substance of that whole problem which for many years has been a subject of discussion in the forum of the United Nations. We have come to the conclusion that the situation in the Korean peninsula can never be consolidated as long as the Korean people themselves will not have the opportunity to decide, without outside interference, on the future destiny of their country.

75. The facts are incontrovertible. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in its many official statements—even though it is constantly subject to provocations and the threat of aggression from South Korea—has once again affirmed its willingness to seek a peaceful unification of Korea on a democratic basis. This is also

borne out by the most recent memorandum of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea contained in document A/C.1/987, from which I should like to quote the following passage:

“The most reasonable solution to the question of Korean unification is to establish a unified central government by holding North-South general elections on a democratic basis without any interference of outside forces after forcing the United States imperialists out of South Korea.

“The Korean people can never leave the question of the unification of their country at the disposal of outside forces and no foreigners can solve the internal affairs of the Korean nation. The Korean people are fully capable of solving their national problem by themselves.”

76. At the same time we are witnesses to the fact that, sixteen years after the conclusion of the Armistice Agreement in Korea,⁴ in the territory of South Korea there are still foreign troops which, moreover, abuse the flag of the United Nations and constantly organize provocative acts on the borders and in the territorial waters of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

77. Each year the General Assembly is obliged to listen to the report of an illegally created body—the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea—the aim of which is, precisely, to conceal the *de facto* status of the occupation of South Korea by United States troops under the flag of the United Nations.

78. This year we are once again obliged to note that the United States continues to impose its will unilaterally on the United Nations, which is contrary to the basic principles and spirit of the Charter.

79. It is fitting to deplore that our Organization continues to be used for the frustration of efforts to achieve a just and peaceful settlement of the problem of the unification of Korea. The most glaring confirmation of this is the previously mentioned refusal to invite a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of this question in our Committee. This fact, besides everything else, is one of the reasons why talks on the whole Korean problem were unable in the past and are unable now to produce any positive results.

80. The delegation of the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia, which has always firmly supported the Korean people and their inalienable rights, is convinced that the only effective measures the United Nations should adopt in the interests of a just solution of the Korean problem are as follows: securing the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea, dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, and putting an end to the discussion in the United Nations of the question of the unification of Korea. The rest will then be the affair of the Korean people who are capable of settling the question of the peaceful unification of their country themselves.

⁴ *Ibid.*

81. It is also essential that the United Nations adopt the correct attitude, in keeping with the spirit of the Charter, to the Korean problem in order to restore the prestige of the Organization, since it is precisely in Korea that the good name of the Organization was and is being abused. In fact, the United Nations has been dragged into situations in which it has become just a screen for the unlawful occupation of South Korea, and this constitutes an obstacle to the peaceful unification of the country. The so-called United Nations Forces in Korea, as is well known, are actually the force of the United States and its allies over whose activities the United Nations has no influence whatever.

82. Czechoslovakia, which from the outset has regarded the military activities under the flag of the United Nations in Korea as illegal and a gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations considers it indispensable to put a speedy end to the false myth of the so-called United Nations forces in Korea. Why should the Member States of the United Nations continue to bear the responsibility for the activities of the United States military authorities in Korea, who in the southern part of the country have created their own military system—not controlled by our Organization—starting with the regular army and ending with security and intelligence services? By what decision of the United Nations, and with what aim are the United States armed forces in Korea perfecting and increasing their weaponry and building new bases and other military installations of a strategic nature? What United Nations organ can responsibly state that there are no weapons of mass destruction on those bases? Where is the border line between the activities of the United States troops, illegally operating under the United Nations flag, and American units carrying out tasks under secret bilateral military agreements between the United States and South Korea? What are the units, strictly speaking, participating in such joint manoeuvres with South Korean troops and “Operation Flying Tiger”, “Operation Focus Retina”, “Operation Tiger” and others? What are we talking about here—the regular army of the United States, or United States troops acting under the flag of the United Nations?

83. It is no secret to anyone today that the United States has turned South Korea into a large-scale military base in the Far East, which is one of the strongholds of the aggressive blocs created by the United States in that region.

84. There are also facts which show that units of the South Korean régime too, like United States and other foreign troops, are illegally hiding under the flag of the United Nations, and that they are even being used in Viet-Nam. We are once again obliged to protest most resolutely against this and to demand that an immediate end be put to this state of affairs.

85. There are no grounds whatever for the presence of United States and other foreign troops on the territory of South Korea. American imperialism tries to justify this state of affairs by asserting that the role of United States troops in that country consists in averting the danger of so-called communist aggression from the North. We think that by now such an argument can no longer convince anyone. In this connexion allow me once again to mention the memorandum of the Government of the Democratic

People's Republic of Korea [A/C.1/987] which, in the opinion of the Czechoslovakian delegation, contains a clear-cut reply to allegations of this kind. The "threat of Communism from the North" does not and cannot exist. The memorandum states:

"The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has been consistent in its efforts for the peaceful solution of the Korean question and has unequivocally elucidated more than once that it has no intention to march south or settle the question of Korean unification by force of arms."

86. If we take into account the various practical proposals contained in this memorandum and in other documents of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, including the proposals concerning a mutual reduction in the armed forces of both parts of Korea and the conclusion of a peace treaty between them, as constituting steps towards the unification of Korea, then there can be no doubt as to who stands for a peaceful settlement of the Korean question and who is against it.

87. It is significant that in the United States itself these facts can no longer be concealed, although, of course, they are presented to the public in a form that never emerges from the framework of a biased assessment of the situation. In this connexion I should like to refer, for example, to an article published on 11 November 1969 in *The New York Times*, which states, and I quote in English:

"Analysts here (in Washington) believe that the North Korean Government of Premier Kim Il Sung has shifted emphasis from military back to political tactics in its continuing attempt to undermine the South Korean Government and gain control of the entire peninsula.

"These United States sources, who specialize in the study of North Korean affairs, said that the North Korean shift appeared to be an effort to persuade the United States that it is no longer necessary to maintain American forces in South Korea . . ."

88. This irritated reaction to the peaceful efforts of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is typical. It shows that it is manifestly not in the interests of the United States and the South Korean Government to call for an easing of tension and a search for a peaceful political settlement, but rather indicates a desire to maintain an acute situation by which the presence of United States troops in South Korea could be justified.

89. Moreover, there are a number of convincing arguments demonstrating that the source of all the tension in the Korean peninsula has been and is the presence of United States and other foreign troops in the southern part of that country. It suffices to mention the wholly self-evident incidents involving the "EC-121" spy plane and the ship *Pueblo*. These incidents occurred not because North Korean aircraft and ships were in the territorial waters of the United States, but because United States troops violated the sovereign territorial waters and air space of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. This fact was even recognized by the Government of the United States in its letter containing official apologies to the Government of

the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Were we to turn back a few years we would find dozens of similar examples. However, I assume that there is no need to talk about them again since such acts have been condemned repeatedly at previous sessions of the General Assembly. Speaking of the withdrawal of United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations, we cannot fail to note the existence of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, which serves as a tool and camouflage for American policy in Korea. This Commission, illegal from its inception, is directly contrary to the vital interests of the Korean people. Its last report [A/7629] just like all the previous ones, is a new confirmation of the failure of that policy which claims to be a policy of unification of Korea but which from the start has been at cross purposes with this objective as well as with the principles and purposes of the United Nations. This Commission and its reports have nothing in common with genuine efforts to achieve the unification of Korea. Apart from one-sided praise of the South Korean régime, presented as the only lawful government in Korea, except for stirring up slander against the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and a portrayal of United States imperialist policy in South Korea as a policy of "protection and assistance", no symptoms are to be found in the Commission's reports evidencing a desire to contribute to the unification of Korea. The existence of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea is just as anachronistic as the entrenched idea that the United Nations can presumably impose a decision on the Korean people concerning the unification of the country. This problem must be settled by the Korean people in the North and the South, by themselves, without any foreign interference, which also means without any interference on the part of the United Nations.

90. But if the United Nations really wants to help the Korean people, it must first of all remove the obstacles which have been created by fallacious and unjust decisions and which are still artificially maintained. At the same time, it must take such measures as would lead to the speedy withdrawal of American and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and to the immediate dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

91. In view of the fact that the question of the unification of Korea is exclusively an internal affair of the Korean people, foreign forces, including those of the United Nations, have not the slightest right to intervene in this process. Therefore we consider that the proposal to put an end to the discussion in the United Nations of the question of the unification of Korea is a valuable contribution which may create a favourable climate for the solution of this problem by the Korean people themselves.

92. The delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, aware of its responsibility to the Korean people, and having a view to a successful, peaceful development of a united Korea, will vote in favour of those draft resolutions which meet the previously mentioned requirements. We are convinced that the adoption of such decisions would not

only be a most important step towards a peaceful settlement in Korea, but also a step which would considerably raise the prestige of our Organization on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of its creation.

93. The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the next speaker I wish to inform the Committee that Mauritania has joined as a sponsor of the eighteen-Power draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.483.

94. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Rwanda) (*translated from French*): Some days ago, when I was speaking in this Committee [1671st meeting] on a procedural question regarding the addressing of invitations to the representatives of the two parties in Korea, I did not conceal the profound concern of my country at the perpetuation of the division of a people for whom unification would, beyond doubt, offer the best conditions for its development. Nor did I fail to take note of the wish—and this is somewhat reassuring—expressed by the two parties concerned that this situation should come to an end.

95. But on hearing both the official statements of the communist régime in North Korea and the position defended in the international Organization by those who support that régime, my country feels that its concern will not be dispelled overnight, for the road to unification in Korea still seems to be strewn with obstacles.

96. Everyone knows that the United Nations was called upon to consider the question of Korea in 1947 only after all efforts for the creation of a unified and democratic Korea has proved to be vain. It was in those circumstances that the General Assembly adopted resolution 112 (II), of 14 November 1947, providing for free elections throughout Korea.

97. But we all know what the turn of events has been since then: the North Koreans, prompted by communist forces, did not wish to co-operate with the United Nations Temporary Commission and even went so far as to forbid it to set foot in that part of Korea. Consequently free and democratic elections as recommended by the resolution of 14 November 1947 could be held only in the southern part of Korea. On 12 December 1948 the General Assembly, on the basis of those democratic elections, adopted resolution 195 (III), which recognized the Government of the Republic of Korea as the only legitimate Government.

98. But at the same time a communist régime was set up in North Korea, by what the United Nations Commission itself described as a foreign “military power” in Korea.

99. Events did not stop there. On 25 June 1950 the northern part of Korea declared war on the Republic of Korea. The efforts of the Security Council to put an end to the hostilities and to have the armed forces of North Korea withdrawn north of the 38th parallel were in vain; that is why the Security Council on the basis of Articles 42 and 43 of the Charter, was compelled to appeal to all Member States to furnish all the necessary aid to the Republic of Korea so as to remove the aggressors. That is why we see in Korea troops made available by a certain number of States to our Organization and to the legitimate Government of Korea.

100. This brief historical outline therefore shows to what extent any comparison of these troops with colonial occupation troops is not only contrary to the truth, but insulting to the decisions taken by our Organization.

101. It is true that if the situation which led to and justified the sending of those troops had subsequently been restored to normal, it would have been reasonable to withdraw them. But what do we see today? The facts prove that the intentions of the communist régime of North Korea are just as aggressive as they were in 1950.

102. One proof is the fact that on 1 July 1969 the Prime Minister of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea declared quite openly that, in order to bring about the unification of Korea, the Government of the Republic of Korea must first be overthrown and the forces of the United States and of other States withdrawn [A/7629, para. 10]. Yet we know full well that those forces are there because that is the will of the United Nations, which has repeatedly expressed itself in relevant decisions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, and because that is the will of the legitimate Government of the Republic of Korea.

103. What is more, the régime of North Korea translates its words into deeds: the striking number of incidents regularly occurring in the demilitarized zone and within the Republic of Korea, in violation of the Armistice Agreement of 1953,⁵ is proof of that. All such infiltrations obviously have only one purpose, namely to sow subversion and to overthrow the legitimate Government.

104. Since we know that the sole purpose of the United Nations in Korea is “to bring about by peaceful means the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea . . . and the restoration of international peace and security in the area” [*ibid.*, para. 1], how can we envisage total withdrawal of the United Nations forces before the said peace and security are satisfactorily established in the area?

105. We know, furthermore, that the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea has as its task “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” [*ibid.*, para. 5].

106. Should the Commission be dissolved then, at a time when, instead of such restraint and easing of tension, we see the northern part waging a permanent war against the Republic of Korea? The time would obviously be ill chosen. What seems necessary is that we should all pledge our full support to the Commission and encourage it to bring its task to a successful conclusion.

107. Some representatives even believe that the question of the unification of Korea should not be discussed any further in the United Nations, in view of the ineffectiveness of the debates that were held on it each year. My delegation perfectly realizes their feeling of weariness, since the

⁵ *Ibid.*

problem of Korea has been debated here for more than twenty years. But, the very fact that this debate has lasted so long demonstrates once again the importance of the question, and it is because of this importance that our Organization must not shirk its responsibilities.

108. The circumstances prevailing in Korea constitute the premises leading inevitably to the following logical conclusion: the United Nations must confirm its previous decisions. We must discuss this question every year so as to assess the situation and see what has been achieved, and how many stages must still be traversed before we reach the day when hatred and violence will be gone and peace will once again prevail among the Korean people.

Mr. Kolo (Nigeria), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

109. Mr. JOUEJATI (Syria): A solution to the Korean question in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter can be sought only on the following bases: first, the unity of Korea, which has been arbitrarily divided; secondly, the achievement of the process of unification under the sole jurisdiction of the Korean people themselves; and thirdly, the inadmissibility of outside interference.

110. These bases entail the need for removing any obstacle standing in the way of the unification of the people of Korea and in the way of its freedom to embark on that process in the manner which it chooses. Now, to remove the illegal element of foreign interference, the foreign forces in the southern part of Korea must withdraw. The claim that they are United Nations Forces suffers from a fundamental contradiction with factual and legal premises. The manner in which foreign troops first entered the scene and only later invoked the United Nations and extracted a resolution therefrom is well known.

111. Yet the subsequent resolution of the Security Council did not have the concurrence of all the permanent members. It follows that the prerequisite for the normalization of the situation lies in putting an end to that original illicit act. The withdrawal of foreign troops is also essential in order to ensure that the situation in Korea, if it continues as it is, does not become a threat to international peace and security. It is with that in mind that many socialist and Afro-Asian delegations have sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/L.470 and Add.1 and 2.

112. Once unification is reckoned to be a problem falling solely within the Korean people's jurisdiction, the mandate of the existing United Nations Commission becomes irrelevant. Otherwise, infringement of the sovereignty of the Korean people remains, and with it division and tension. To remove both, draft resolution A/C.1/L.472 and Add.1 calls for the dissolution of the United Nations Commission.

113. Indeed, removal of that infringement of the sovereignty of the Korean people would pave the way to conciliation. The United Nations would then do well to promote that conciliation rather than to exercise a tutelage over the Korean people. If it persists in doing that, the result will be futile, as it has been so far. There will be division and no unification. Surely the Democratic People's Republic of Korea takes legitimate and strong exception to

such an encroachment on the independence and sovereignty of the Korean people.

114. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.483 embodies a sincere attempt to end this futile course. How is it possible for the United Nations to promote the process of conciliation? First and foremost, by hearing representatives of both parts of Korea without prior conditions. That is what the sponsors of the draft resolution proposing unconditional invitations to representatives of both parts of Korea endeavoured to do. But their draft was again voted down in the First Committee. That is regrettable inasmuch as the question of Korea remained, as a result, immobilized in its routine, sterile course.

115. Along with the removal of the abnormal elements involving the question of Korea, the myth that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is illegal must be abandoned. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is viable, coherent and dynamic. It has transformed a people ravaged by a colonial war into a vital society based on socialism, progress and equality. It has restored dignity to the Korean people, enhanced their independence and promoted their faith in the future. It has made a number of constructive approaches to start the process of conciliation, without having received any response. Its recognition by the United Nations, with all the implications involved, would be a gain for the United Nations, an Organization which should be universal.

116. It is high time that dynamic principles of international law prevailed over power politics. It is high time that meddling in the internal affairs of the people of Korea stopped. It is to nobody's advantage that Koreans from the southern part are lured into participating in the devastation wrought upon their brothers, the heroic people of Vietnam. The errors of such a policy are clearer every day. It is the welfare of the Korean people that is at stake. Indeed, it is the security of South-East Asia, the stability of Asia, and the peace of the world.

117. Mr. BELOKOLOS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): Analysing the situation in Korea and the history of the "Korean question" and thinking of the future, the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the United Nations can contribute to the unification of Korea and consolidation of peace in the Far East only if it abandons the line imposed on it for over twenty years by the United States and its allies. We are convinced that there is but one path to the settlement of the Korean problem in keeping with the interests of the Korean people and of the United Nations—the withdrawal of the foreign forces from Korea, dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, and cessation of the discussion in this Organization on the question of the unification of the Korean nation. This position, established by us as co-sponsors of the three respective draft resolutions [A/C.1/L.470 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.1/L.472 and Add.1, and A/C.1/L.483] is, we are deeply convinced, the only fruitful and promising alternative to those still-born resolutions which, under the pressure of the imperialist forces, have been adopted up to now.

118. The pointlessness of the discussion of the "Korean question", as it is called in our Organization by those who

inscribed it on the agenda in 1947, becomes all the more obvious in the light of the fact that one of the parties concerned—the Democratic People's Republic of Korea—has not been allowed to take part in the discussion now taking place here.

119. First of all, we consider it necessary to dwell at some length on an evaluation of that situation which has arisen in the Korean peninsula as a result of the presence of foreign forces there.

120. For almost a quarter of a century now, since the end of the Second World War, South Korea has been completely subject to the United States. It has been turned into a bastion of imperialism in the Far East, a breeding ground of aggression and provocation against the Asian peoples fighting for the strengthening of their national independence.

121. In Seoul the rulers are pro-American-minded military men who remain just that, whatever the "civilian" label under which they may hide. They are maintained in power by American bayonets and by their own 600,000-man army.

122. From year to year military expenditures increase. This year they amount to 81,149 million won, which is more than double the 1966 level and almost one-third higher than in 1968. These resources go for the upkeep of the puppet régime's enormous army, its modernization, the upkeep of the South Korean troops participating in the criminal adventure of American imperialism in Viet-Nam. Considerable sums are spent on the upkeep of a huge repressive machinery—a central intelligence administration, police and similar institutions—numbering a total of about 1 million men.

123. South Korea, following the lead of the United States, is its most important military and strategic beachhead in the fight against the forces of socialism and the national liberation movements in Asia. At present about 60,000 American soldiers are stationed there on dozens of American military bases.

124. The transformation of South Korea into a military base of American imperialism seriously complicates the situation in the Far East region. Despite the fact that the Armistice Agreement was concluded fifteen years ago, military provocations against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea have not ceased. American and Seoul troops conduct manoeuvres on the borders of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, fire on its territory, and their military ships and planes violate the sovereignty of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. This state of affairs further complicates the situation along the demarcation line.

125. The powerful blows of the Viet-Nameese patriots and world public opinion movements have compelled the United States to call a halt to bombing of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and to agree to four-Power negotiations in Paris. At the same time, in keeping with its so-called "global strategy", the American military clique tries to consolidate itself even more firmly in South Korea and to intensify the role of South Korea as

one of its main strongholds in the Far East. Over 200 American military aircraft have been transferred from Okinawa to South Korea. At the end of last year the United States completed delivery of rockets for protection of South Korean war ships. The South Korean air force received a squadron of "Phantom" type jet-fighter planes.

126. The United States are dragging South Korea even more deeply into the aggressive military political system established by it in the Far East. Seoul has become a place for encounters, meetings and conferences aimed at forging Washington's Asian satellites into new military-political blocs.

127. The Seoul leaders also take initiatives of their own to this end. According to the report of the Japanese press agency, Kyodo-Tsushin, they put forward the idea of the creation of a new military bloc in South-East Asia, the Asian and Pacific Council (ASPAC). According to the originators of this idea, the existing pacts in this part of the world—the South-East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) and the Tripartite Security Treaty (ANZUS) between Australia, New Zealand and the United States—represent "weak and ineffective organizations", while after the withdrawal of British troops from east of Suez in 1971 they will be even further weakened. That is why in Seoul they are clamouring for the creation of ASPAC, which is to unite the United States, South Korea and the other countries participating in the war in Viet-Nam.

128. The Seoul régime strives to bind its country as tightly as possible to the war chariot. It is driven to this by fear of being overthrown by its own people who are increasingly actively involved in the struggle of the patriotic forces.

129. Trying to mislead world public opinion, the Washington leaders and their Seoul puppets miss no opportunity to hold forth on their love of peace and to declare that all their measures to increase the war potential of South Korea are nothing but a response to "the threat of aggression from the North". This well-worn record can scarcely convince anyone by now, especially since the whole world knows the peace-loving policy of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on whose territory there are no foreign troops or military bases of any kind. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has repeatedly proposed the conclusion of a peaceful agreement between the North and the South to renounce recourse to arms against one another; it has made a proposal for a mutual reduction of armies to 100,000 men on each side and the convening of a conference of the countries concerned for a peaceful settlement of the Korean question.

130. Is it not clear that the basic condition for preventing a new armed conflict in Korea and achieving a peaceful settlement of the question of unification of that country is the withdrawal of American and other foreign forces from South Korea?

131. The memorandum of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which has been circulated as an official document of the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly [A/C.1/987] states:

"In order to tide over this critical situation being created in Korea today and prevent another total war

from breaking out, it is essential, first of all, to force the U.S. imperialist aggression army out of South Korea and put an end to their hostile provocations against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Since the source of war in Korea lies precisely in the occupation of South Korea by the U.S. imperialists and their policy of aggression against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, peace in Korea can be preserved only by removing that source."

132. In October of this year the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea confirmed all the proposals it had put forward so far for the peaceful unification of Korea. It stressed that the basic line of its policy remained unchanged, that is:

"... to accomplish the country's unification by way of setting up a unified central government through North-South general elections on a democratic basis without any interference from outside forces ...".

133. This way of solving the Korean question is most realistic and fair. It is based on the principles of respect for the sovereign rights of peoples and States and non-interference in their internal affairs, that is to say, on the principles laid down in the United Nations Charter.

134. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is deeply convinced that if the United Nations really wishes to assist the Korean people in the settlement of their national problems and to contribute to the establishment of lasting peace in the Korean peninsula, it must act in conformity with those principles.

135. The Korean question has never been absent from the agenda of the United Nations since 1947, that is to say, almost since the creation of this Organization. And the various activities and so-called United Nations Commissions on Korea which have succeeded each other go back almost as far. Yet Korea remains divided. It is not only the Korean people who suffer from this, but also the prestige and authority of the United Nations.

136. It is high time to decisively cut the Gordian knot of Korea. Now, on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, when all of us are striving to confirm our allegiance to the principles of our Organization and indicate ways to heighten its role and effectiveness, we must first of all clear away all the accumulated obstacles which hamper peoples in the exercise of their right to self-determination, security and a peaceful existence. One of those obstacles is the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea whose creation and activities have faithfully reflected all that undermines the very foundations of the United Nations. That Commission is a deadweight hanging over the Organization. For nineteen years it has convincingly demonstrated that it is a tool of imperialism and above all of the policy of the United States of America, directed against the vital interests of the Korean people, against their national liberation movement, against a socialist State—the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and against the true objectives and tasks of the United Nations.

137. In 1947, on the initiative and under the pressure of the United States, the United Nations had imposed upon it

functions which run counter to the spirit and the letter of the Charter of our Organization. In connexion with the situation created at that time in Korea—a situation whose basic features, due to the presence of American troops in the southern part of that country, remain to this day—there is only one problem of an international nature: the creation of conditions that would enable the Korean people themselves, without any outside interference, to unite their country and independently choose their political, social and economic system. That is why even at that time the Soviet Union proposed the simultaneous withdrawal of American and Soviet troops, and that it be left to the Koreans themselves to establish their own State and their national government. But the United States, taking advantage of its position in the United Nations at the time, rejected that proposal and, endeavouring to create a government that suited it, but not the Korean people, succeeded in having a resolution adopted which imposed on the United Nations and the Temporary Commission on Korea, formed at the time, the function of setting up a Korean State through so-called elections held under conditions of American occupation.

138. Since then, and to this day, it has constantly been declared that the objectives of the United Nations in Korea, in the words of the last report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, and I quote:

"... are to bring about by peaceful means the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of government ..." [A/7629, para. 1].

Thus it is not the Korean people, but the United Nations Commission or, to be more accurate, the United States under the flag of the United Nations, which is trying to set up a "State" for a people who had their own statehood even before the discovery of America. As though this were not enough, they are even deciding precisely what kind of a State it should be.

139. The South Korean ruling circles, showing that they completely ignore the right of the Korean people to settle their own affairs, have submitted to this session of the General Assembly a memorandum which in its opening lines states:

"The Republic of Korea came into being twenty-one years ago as the result of resolutions of the United Nations, which assumed primary responsibility for bringing about by peaceful means a unified, independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of government." [A/C.1/985 and Corr. 1, para. 1.]

140. Thus it appears that it is not the Korean people but the United Nations which bears the primary responsibility for the kind of social system and type of Government that exist, must exist and will exist on Korean soil. Moreover, as is stated below, and this was stressed here by the representative of the United States:

"In 1948, the General Assembly declared the Republic of Korea ... to be the only lawful Government in all Korea." [Ibid.]

From that point of view, therefore, so long as there exists a Democratic People's Republic of Korea whose socialist system is not in keeping with the provisions of a resolution adopted by the United Nations in the years of the cold war, the objectives of the Organization cannot be considered achieved. It follows that according to the reasoning of those who like to interfere in the internal affairs of peoples, it is necessary to maintain the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea which would

“... represent the United Nations in bringing about the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government of all Korea” [*resolution 376 (V)*].

However, in order that the management of public affairs in Korea should be in keeping with the United Nations resolutions—in this case with the imperialist interests of the United States—the United Nations Forces—that is to say, the United States occupation forces—are maintained there.

141. Where, may we ask, is it stated in the United Nations Charter that this Organization is called upon to set up States and bear responsibility for their development; discuss reports such as the last report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea which describes and evaluates political events in the Republic of Korea, including constitutional amendments, supplementary elections, changes of ministers in the Cabinet, economic procedures and policy, as well as foreign affairs, etc.? Here we have an official recognition of the fact that the Korean Republic is not a sovereign State, but a kind of trust or mandate territory. Now, all these are questions which come within the exclusive competence of sovereign States. And is it remotely likely that the Governments of those States whose representatives signed that report of the Commission would agree to have the United Nations discuss problems of this kind concerning their own countries?

142. We may further ask, where does the United Nations Charter say that the unification of a country and nation into a single State is a function of that Organization? It is the inalienable right of every people to exercise the right of self-determination, the right to settle its own problems by itself, without outside interference. This is the basis of the United Nations Charter, the very foundation of our Organization. Therefore there cannot be the slightest doubt that if, at the time when consideration of the Korean question began, the fundamental principles of the United Nations had been observed, it would never have been drawn into this shameful business and the Commission for Korea would never have been set up.

143. Fortunately, the development of international relations and of our Organization did not take the course which the imperialist States desired and tried to achieve. The growth of the power of the socialist countries, the impetuous upsurge of the national liberation movements of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the increase of workers and democratic movements and the struggle of peoples for peace have led to a change in world power relationships which has had a positive effect on the activities of the United Nations. Dozens of States pursuing anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist policies have become members of the United Nations. Declarations have been

adopted concerning the final liquidation of the colonial system and the prohibition of interference in the internal affairs of States, as have other important decisions.

144. In these circumstances, the very existence and activities of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea appear as an absurd anachronism. Indeed, that Commission, as shown by its objectives, its composition and its work, is fundamentally contrary to the democratic principles of our Organization.

145. The very introduction of the Korean question into the United Nations was aimed at preventing the victory of socialist revolution on Korean soil and the consolidation of a socialist system there. It was precisely in order to maintain the military presence of the United States in Korea and a colonial system in the South, and to extend the South Korean régime to the North, that the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea was established and is operating. Is it not clear that this commission is of no use for anything other than perpetuating the division of the country?

146. How can anyone speak of contributing to the peaceful unification of Korea if the refusal to recognize the principle of the right of self-determination of the Korean people, non-recognition of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, lies at the very basis of the activities of that worthless Commission? Such a Commission cannot—and moreover it does not wish to—contribute to a rapprochement between North and South Korea, that is to say, to the strengthening of peace in the Far East.

147. The tendentious nature of the Commission is fully revealed upon an acquaintance with its annual reports. Without the slightest qualms of conscience it justifies all and anything that is done in South Korea—all the activities of the occupation forces, all actions of the South Korean puppet régime, its constant provocations along the demarcation line, etc.—without saying anything at all about the true, genuine aspirations of the population of South Korea which its reports either do not mention or distort. With regard to the situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, its position and the initiatives it has taken, this Commission frankly chooses the course of silence, or of distortion and slander. It does not inform, but misinforms our Organization.

148. In the light of the preceding statements, the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that, in the interests of the Korean people, of peace and security in the Far East, and in the interests of the United Nations, the Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea should be dissolved and an end should be put to the discussion of this question in the United Nations.

149. There are those who say that this position of ours is “rigid”, and call on us to make concessions and compromise. Generally speaking, we are not against concessions or compromises. But in the present case it is a matter of basic, fundamental principles. Any departure from or betrayal of them is fraught with extremely grave, irremediable consequences for international relations.

150. Korea remains divided. The threat to peace in that part of the world has not been eliminated because the ways and means through which attempts have been made up to now to settle the Korean question are inappropriate on principle, and the further they are pursued the more obvious their uselessness will become. There is, however, another position of principle, another way to proceed, and that is to withdraw all foreign forces from Korea, and to enable the Korean people themselves to settle their own internal affairs. Let there be a rapprochement between North and South Korea, let elections be organized there and so on and so forth, and the international community will indeed help to create propitious foreign policy conditions for that. If such an alternative to the present course in Korea, which has already failed, is recognized and adopted then, and only then, the way will be open to concessions in conditions of equality and reciprocity. The Ukrainian delegation is convinced that there is no other way out of the Korean impasse. That is why we call on the members of our Committee to come out in favour of the draft resolution contained in documents A/C.1/L.470 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.1/L.472 and Add.1, and A/C.1/L.483.

151. Mr. MASHOLOGU (Lesotho): Since this is the first intervention of my delegation, allow me, first of all and very briefly, to express the satisfaction and appreciation of my delegation at the way in which you, Mr. Chairman, and your distinguished colleagues on the Bureau have handled the affairs of this Committee since your election.

152. It is not the intention of the Lesotho delegation to deal in detail with the various arguments which have been stated by previous speakers on the question of Korea. My delegation wishes rather to underline a few principles which seem to be basic in the consideration of the various subitems currently under discussion.

153. First of all, my delegation agrees fully with the view that the reunification of Korea is a matter which must ultimately be settled by the Korean people themselves. We do not believe that any one Power or group of Powers, or even this entire Organization for that matter, could impose a settlement of the problems of Korea which was not acceptable to the Korean people. Any attempt to do so would be an exercise in futility and it is to the credit of all members that no one has ever seriously proposed such an approach. Therefore, to that extent we, like all other delegations, have always believed that at some stage or other there should be negotiations between the representatives of the Republic of Korea and of North Korea to chart the way to the reunification of their country. We cannot help noting, however, that even as recently as over the past year some of the statements which have been made by the North Koreans continue to reveal tragic evidence of the ideological split which is responsible for the division of Korea and which bars the immediate possibility of negotiations.

154. The difficulty of bridging the gulf between the two sides is further intensified by the acts of hostility, provocation and infiltration which, as other delegations have shown, have actually increased during the past year. My delegation is aware that if those incidents were allowed to go unchecked they could seriously undermine not only the peace and security of Korea itself but that of the entire region as well.

155. Therefore, while my delegation wishes to make it clear that it attaches the highest importance to the wishes of the people of Korea and fully understands their expressed desire for the reunification of their country, we are at the same time convinced that necessary conditions for reunification must be actively sought and maintained. No negotiations, especially in a situation fraught with such deep ideological differences, could take place in a vacuum. It is in the light of this consideration that my delegation views the continued role of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and the need for a United Nations presence in the area.

156. It would be unrealistic and, indeed, regrettable if in our debate of this item we were to forget that any negotiated settlement in Korea must surely depend on the maintenance of favourable conditions for such a settlement. In our view the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea should continue with its efforts to bring about those conditions. It has been repeatedly said that in the circumstances of Korea the role of the United Nations is a limited one and that the main aims of the United Nations presence in the area are to assist in bringing about by peaceful means the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of government and full restoration of international peace in the area.

157. My delegation has no quarrel with those aims and we would, in fact, urge the effective co-operation of all the parties concerned to bring about the desired settlement. We would definitely hope that the channels of communication and exchange between North and South might be opened. Furthermore, we think that it would be immensely helpful if the main parties in the conflict could take into account the fact that the over-all world situation has changed in many ways from what it was in 1950, and that it may well be possible now to obtain some flexibility of approach as opposed to the rigid positions adopted by the major Powers and by the other parties at the beginning. In this connexion, it might be helpful if this Committee would hold itself ready to review previous resolutions in the light of changing relations in the world rather than to refer to the past as if the world situation had remained static over the past twenty years.

158. There is no doubt that the attitude displayed by the Republic of Korea towards the United Nations is a step in the right direction. We 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, can best be found within the framework of the United Nations and the principles of the Charter, and we urge all parties to recognize the legitimate role of the United Nations in this peace-keeping and arbitration effort in order that the door towards a solution may be opened.

159. In the light of our approach, the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea is indispensable for the purpose of fostering a peaceful negotiated settlement. And we consider that the United Nations should also allow itself an opportunity to review this situation which touches on the security and future of the area. Therefore we share the views of the

representative of Australia when in his intervention he stated that it would be unconstitutional for the General Assembly to pass a resolution purporting to prevent future Assemblies from discussing an international question which they thought should be discussed.

160. In conclusion, on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, this Committee could do no better than to reaffirm the positive role of the United Nations in the Korean situation and to renew the mandate

given to the United Nations Commission in Korea while at the same time appealing to all the parties to co-operate in the search for a permanent settlement in the interests of the people of Korea.

161. In its voting on the draft resolutions before us, my delegation will be guided by the principles I have just outlined.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.