



CONTENTS

	Page
Invitation aspects of the consideration of item 98: Question of Korea	1

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

Invitation aspects of the consideration of item 98: Question of Korea (A/8026, A/8044 and Add.1-3, A/8045 and Add.1-3, A/8046, A/C.1/999, 1000, 1002, 1007, 1008, A/C.1/L.520 and 521)

1. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Committee will now consider the invitation aspects of the question of Korea, agenda item 98. I should like to draw the attention of delegations to the two draft resolutions submitted on those aspects of the question: first, draft resolution A/C.1/L.520, sponsored by 25 countries, to which Yugoslavia has been added; secondly, draft resolution A/C.1/L.521, sponsored by 17 countries.

2. Mr. YAZID (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Each year for 20 years our Organization has considered the question of Korea. And each time, before dealing with the substance of this question, we come up against an anomaly that is at the same time unjust and shameful.

3. That unjust and shameful anomaly concerns the aspect of our discussion which relates to the invitation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Those who propose that we simultaneously and unconditionally invite the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the authorities of Seoul are confronted by an argumentation which is purported to be a defence of the Charter but is, in fact, merely an attempt to induce the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to accept a *diktat*. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is asked to renounce its sovereignty and to give up its correct position—one which we share—that the problem of Korea is primarily that of the evacuation of all foreign troops and the exercise of self-determination on the part of the people of Korea.

4. The position of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is in keeping with the terms of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. We witness in Korea the occupation of part of the territory by imperialist forces which have confiscated the United Nations flag and exhibit it in justification of their presence. In our Organization these same forces try to circumvent the Charter and to impose an interpretation of it that is in flagrant contradiction with the principles that have brought us together in this Organization.

5. We do not see why the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which has adopted the same position on the United Nations role and responsibility in Korea as that of my own country, and of many other countries present here should not be allowed to take part in our debates. The participation of one of the parties directly concerned in the question of Korea cannot be made subject to the acceptance of the role of the United Nations in this problem, as seen by some countries, including the imperialist countries, while Algeria and many other countries discuss the very same question of Korea while rejecting what is being imposed on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

6. My delegation considers that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has shown great patience and wisdom, and we believe that we should pay a tribute to this sense of international responsibility shown by the Government and the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Thus, for example, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, in a declaration of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of 29 August last [*see A/C.1/1000*], stated the following:

“The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has always respected and respects the Charter of the United Nations and its objectives.

“The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea strongly demands once again that if the United Nations wants to act in conformity with the principles and objectives laid down in its Charter, it must take measures to have the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea participate unconditionally when the question on Korea is discussed in the United Nations General Assembly.”

7. We owe it to ourselves to pay tribute to this sense of international responsibility shown by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and we should do so by responding to this appeal, which is repeated annually and which clearly stresses the fact that it respects and has always respected the Charter and its aims.

8. We cannot ask of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea more than we ask of those wanting to join our Organization.

9. Countries which have not recognized the competence of the United Nations to intervene in their domestic affairs have not only been heard but have also cast votes in plenary meetings and in committees. And yet that argument has never been raised as regards admission to the United Nations in the history of this Organization.

10. That is why my delegation, with 25 other delegations, representing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the socialist countries, have submitted the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/L.520. In that document, we present the question of the invitations to be issued to the two parties interested in the question of Korea in its right context, and we do so in such a manner as to appeal to reason without prejudging future positions or the substance of the matter.

11. As this draft resolution states, no question can be discussed equitably and effectively without the participation of the interested parties.

12. Furthermore, this draft resolution, in asking for the participation of the interested parties, does not deny the constructive aspects that might be attached to hearing not only the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea but also those of the authorities in Seoul.

13. My delegation is one of many which considers that a hearing offered to the authorities of Seoul can only contribute to a clarification of the views and opinions of this Committee, and we therefore appeal to the Committee to satisfy our desire to make the discussion of the Korean question more constructive, equitable and just than in the past.

14. Finally, our draft resolution presses for the invitations to be issued simultaneously and without condition to the two parties. It would allow us to create conditions leading to progress in the discussion of the Korean question in this Committee and bringing nearer the day when the people of Korea can exercise their right to self-determination, as they are the sole masters of their fate and it is they alone who can decide upon their future.

15. These are the views that the Algerian delegation wished to put before this Committee in considering the invitation aspect of the question of Korea. We shall, of course, have further views to express when we take up the substance of the question, especially that aspect raised by the delegations of Africa, Asia, the socialist countries and Latin America, concerning the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea and the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

16. Mr. JIMENEZ (Philippines): As I stated in the General Committee on 17 September of this year [*188th meeting*], it is most unfortunate that we are again confronted with the question of Korea, which will certainly give rise to an acrimonious exchange and a repetition of charges and countercharges, not quite appropriate to the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations when we are expected to unite in a serious effort to maintain peace not only between nations but also among ourselves. My delegation would have preferred that the question of Korea should not be considered this year, inasmuch as it would disrupt the atmosphere of hope and accommodation that we all should try to promote.

17. As in past sessions of our Committee, the question now before us is whether to invite the Governments of both the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in our discussion of the

question of Korea. I shall refrain from discussing at this time the substance of the question of Korea, which has three sub-items.

18. My Government's position on the invitation question is well known. We are for extending an invitation to both Governments concerned, if their participation in the discussion of the question of Korea would be helpful to the United Nations in the achievement of its objective for the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea. Thus, it is most important that both of them should recognize and accept the competence and authority of the United Nations to deal with the question. It cannot be denied that Korea remains the special responsibility of the United Nations. At Cairo and at Potsdam, the Allied Powers pledged that Korea would become free and independent; in 1947, the General Assembly resolved to re-establish the national independence of Korea and to unify it through the process of free elections; in 1948, the Assembly gave the seal of legitimacy to the Republic of Korea by declaring it to be the only lawful Government of Korea; in 1950, the United Nations rushed to the defence of South Korea when the North Korean armed forces launched their unprovoked invasion against the Republic of Korea. Korea is, therefore, a special child of the United Nations.

19. The documents before the Committee indicate categorically that the Republic of Korea has accepted and continues to accept unequivocally the competence and authority of the United Nations to deal with the question of Korea. On the other hand, my delegation regrets to say that there is no similar indication on the part of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

20. My delegation notes that while the Republic of Korea has whole-heartedly co-operated with the United Nations in the achievement of its objective, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has defied United Nations resolutions, describing them as illegal. The latter régime calls the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea "a United States imperialist tool of aggression", asks the United Nations to desist from the discussion of the question of Korea based on the report of UNCURK, and to abrogate all resolutions of the United Nations. And yet it claims that it has always respected and continues to respect the Charter of the United Nations and its objectives. The objectives of the United Nations in relation to Korea are clear-cut and specific. These are to give substance to the rights of the people to self-determination, to maintain international peace and security and to promote the economic and social well-being of the Korean people. These objectives, needless to say, are rooted in principles enshrined in the Charter. To say that one respects the objectives of the United Nations while at the same time denying the very pursuit of these objectives is, to say the least, an exercise in double-talk.

21. There is no need for us to delve into the historical background of how the United Nations became involved in Korea, how UNCURK came into existence, or how and why the United Nations has been involved in Korea these past 23 years. These are all matters which are reflected in the records of the United Nations and it is now rather late to deny the competence and authority of the United Nations to act on the Korean question. How can the United

Nations desist from the discussion of the question when certain delegations requested the inscription of items relating to that question? How can the United Nations abrogate its resolutions on the question when they were adopted after considerable debate and discussion? And how can we agree to the dissolution of UNCURK when in present circumstances that dissolution would lead to insecurity in the area?

22. And yet the statement from the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea [see A/C.1/1000] "strongly demands" that the United Nations: "take measures to have the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea participate unconditionally when the question of Korea is discussed in the United Nations General Assembly". Since when can a Government which has been the aggressor in Korea "strongly demand", as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea does, that it be allowed to participate in our discussion?

23. With the bellicose and arrogant attitude towards the United Nations taken by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, with its commitment to overthrow the Republic of Korea—the only legitimate Government in Korea recognized by the United Nations—by violence and force, and with its engagement in fanatic military expansion and war preparations which run counter to the efforts of the Republic of Korea to create peaceful conditions, how can its representative be invited to participate in our discussion without asking it to accept the competence and authority of the United Nations to deal with the question?

24. Those are the reasons why my delegation insists, as it has insisted in the past, that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea must first state unequivocally, and this has already been done by the Republic of Korea, that it accepts the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the question of Korea. Those are the reasons why my delegation did not find it difficult to co-sponsor the 17-Power draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.521 on the issue now before us. My delegation is privileged to introduce that draft formally on behalf of the 17 co-sponsors from Asia and the Pacific, from Africa, from Latin America and from Western Europe. We feel that our draft is not discriminatory.

25. The co-sponsors are of the view that participation of the interested parties would contribute to an equitable and effective discussion of the question. But before both Governments could participate in the discussion they would have to accept unequivocally the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the question. The Republic of Korea has accepted this competence and authority; hence the first operative paragraph in our draft, which would have the Committee decide to invite its representative. On the other hand, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea continues to hold the view that the United Nations has neither the competence nor the authority to concern itself in the question. In the second operative paragraph of our draft we would have the Committee reaffirm its willingness to invite a representative from that régime, provided it first unequivocally accepted the competence and authority of the United Nations. We feel that our draft is a well-balanced one and is based on justice and equity.

26. We trust that our draft, as in previous years, will again receive the widest support in the Committee.

27. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. Chairman, the First Committee has now begun consideration of the question of inviting Korean representatives. It is a step in the right direction that this question is now included in the Committee's agenda as an independent item which is being considered separately from the questions of substance relating to Korea and in good time, prior to the commencement of the debate on the questions of substance. This procedure for considering the question of invitations is both reasonable and valid. One of the parties to be invited, namely, the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, must be given enough time to prepare to take part in the discussion of the questions relating to Korea and to arrive in New York in good time. The South Korean observers, of course, are here permanently as a result of the practice imposed on the United Nations and the Secretariat of the United Nations by the Western Powers from the time of the cold war. As another consequence of this unjust practice, which is contrary to the principle of universality and contrary to the Charter, a capitalist country such as the Federal Republic of Germany, which is not a Member of the United Nations, has for many years now had an observer at the United Nations whereas a socialist State, the German Democratic Republic, has so far, through the efforts of those same States Members of the United Nations, been deprived of the opportunity to have an observer at the United Nations. Furthermore, the United States authorities have even denied any official representative of the German Democratic Republic access to the area in which the Headquarters of the international Organization is located, an Organization which is founded on the principles of universality and peaceful coexistence among States having different social systems. The United States authorities refused to allow the representatives of the German Democratic Republic to pass through United States territory, through the port of New York and Kennedy Airport or through the island of Manhattan, to reach the thirty-eighth floor of the United Nations building to visit the Secretary-General of the United Nations and talk with him. This is a crying injustice and a flagrant violation of the Charter.

28. The Soviet delegation, both in the General Committee and in a plenary meeting at this session of the General Assembly, has already drawn attention to the need to invite a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as a directly interested party, to participate in the discussion of the questions relating to Korea. There is every justification for inviting the Democratic People's Republic of Korea since the agenda for the current session of the General Assembly, on the proposal of a large group of socialist and Afro-Asian States, includes important items which should be considered in a constructive manner in order to direct the efforts of the United Nations towards helping the Korean people to attain peace and national unity. These items are "Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations" and "Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea". It is hard to imagine considering problems of such importance for the whole Korean people without the

participation of representatives of the parties directly concerned—the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea.

29. From the point of view of international law and from the practical point of view, it is fully justifiable and absolutely essential to invite Korean representatives to participate in the discussion on the questions to be considered.

30. For more than 20 years now, under pressure from a certain group of States Members of the United Nations, an obvious injustice has been permitted with regard to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. This State is denied the opportunity to participate in the consideration of a question of vital importance to it. Representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are denied the most elementary right, namely to put forward in the United Nations the views of that country on problems which directly involve the interests of the whole Korean people.

31. States Members of the United Nations who value the prestige of the Organization cannot and must not continue to allow the spectre of the cold war to be raised within the walls of our Organization or to allow the United States and its allies in military blocs to impose on the General Assembly a discriminatory attitude towards inviting representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

32. Everyone here is very well aware that in the various organs of the United Nations it is a long-established practice, which has become a tradition, to invite countries which are not Members of the United Nations to participate in the discussion on any questions if they are directly concerned with them.

33. This practice in the work of United Nations organs is based on the principles and provisions of the Charter, the rules of procedure and the democratic traditions of the United Nations. The Charter, in Article 32, explicitly stipulates that any State which is not a Member of the United Nations, if it is a party to a dispute, "shall be invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute".

34. The Charter of the United Nations and the rules of procedure are based on the assumption that the presence of States which are parties to a dispute is essential to the fair and objective consideration of important international questions, irrespective of whether the States are Members of the United Nations or not. In this connexion, attention should in particular be drawn to the fact that the Charter does not establish any pre-conditions for inviting States to participate at the United Nations in discussions on disputed questions to which those States are interested parties. The provisions of the Charter relating to such invitations are of general and universal significance and establish principles of international law. They are fully applicable to this case which involves the consideration of questions of the utmost importance for the future of Korea and for peace and international security.

35. In United Nations organs, as we know, it is the practice to invite not only representatives of States, but even individuals and representatives of private organiza-

tions, political groups and parties to participate in the discussion: for instance, on questions relating to the struggle against colonialism and racism.

36. In the past, in order to justify the discrimination regarding extending an invitation to representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, those who sought to stifle the voice of the Korean people have resorted to distorting the position of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea vis-à-vis the United Nations and have attempted to spread slander about the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, alleging "disrespect shown to the United Nations" and making other such absurd allegations.

37. The very same line was taken by the previous speaker, the representative of the Philippines, who called the Democratic People's Republic of Korea a State having "a bellicose attitude". For what reason? To hide the truth about South Korea. But can it be said that the régime of South Korea is peace-loving, when it has almost 60,000 United States troops, its own puppet army numbers almost 700,000 and it has already trained a military reserve of almost 2 million? For what purpose, and against whom? And it is this country, with its puppet régime, which the Philippine representative has tried to present here as peace-loving, while he spreads slander against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. But it was indeed the Government of that country which proposed that the armed forces in both parts of Korea should be reduced to 100,000 officers and other men on both sides of the armistice line, which unfortunately divides the country. This fact is known to the Philippine representative too, although he was silent about it. But those are indeed the facts. There has never been a similar proposal from the South Korean side. On the contrary, when the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea made that proposal, it was rejected by the South Korean puppet régime. The question naturally arises as to who has a bellicose attitude, who is the militarist and who is preparing for war? The answer is clearly South Korea with its puppet régime and not the Democratic People's Republic of Korea which is endeavouring to solve the Korean question solely by peaceful and democratic means.

38. The question of the position of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in regard to the United Nations is absolutely clear. In this connexion it would be sufficient if those who are spreading all kinds of fables about the position of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and those who are spellbound by imperialist propaganda on this question would study carefully the statement of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of 29 August 1970 [see *A/C.1/1000*]. This official document states clearly and definitely that:

"The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has always respected and respects the Charter of the United Nations and its objectives.

"The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea strongly demands . . . that if the United Nations wants to act in conformity with the principles and objectives laid down in its Charter, it must take measures

to have the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea participate unconditionally when the question on Korea is discussed in the United Nations General Assembly."

39. What more do you need, gentlemen, you who are against allowing the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion on the Korean question, what clearer and more definite statement by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea do you need about respect for the United Nations and its Charter? This lawful request addressed by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations to be allowed to participate in the discussion on the question of Korea at this session of the General Assembly is fully in accordance with the Charter and the practice of the United Nations and its organs, and it is a request which the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and many other delegations support most strongly.

40. It is quite obvious that questions relating to Korea cannot be considered in a normal manner in the absence of representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, behind doors closed to them, behind the back of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, for its part, takes the completely justifiable position that decisions of any kind whatsoever adopted on such questions without the participation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are illegal and that if such decisions are taken by the United Nations they will not help to strengthen the authority and prestige of the United Nations, but will, on the contrary, discredit the Organization.

41. Anyone who objectively and impartially strives to establish a lasting peace in the long-suffering land of Korea must take a different approach to the actual situation, a sound and realistic approach, and must reject the illegal practice of opposing extending an invitation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion on this question which is of vital importance to it. The hopelessness of attempting to settle the questions relating to Korea from a position of disrespect for the legitimate rights and interests of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as a sovereign socialist State on Korean soil, must surely be obvious. Only blind politicians and anti-communists with a hopelessly rigid "cold war" attitude cannot and do not want to see and understand this. It is essential to put an end at last to the intolerable discrimination in this matter and to stop the harmful practice, which is contrary to the Charter, of allowing only the representatives of one party to participate in the discussion on the question of Korea, namely, the representatives of the United States, which has in its time committed aggression against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and of the puppet régime in South Korea which it protects. This is a flagrant violation of the Charter. It is contrary to the logic and common sense of normal international relations. The other party, too, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, must be invited and given a hearing in the discussion on the question of Korea, an international dispute and conflict which has dragged on for 20 years. This is what the 26 States Members of the United Nations sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/L.520, which was so eloquently introduced to the Committee by the distinguished represen-

tative of Algeria, Ambassador Yazid, insist upon: this is what they propose and what they demand.

42. One cannot fail to be struck by the absurdity and unfairness of laying down conditions which have never been imposed on anyone throughout the existence of the United Nations. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a sovereign State which has extensive relations with other countries; it maintains diplomatic relations and trade, cultural and many other links with a large number of States Members of the United Nations. No self-respecting State in the same position would agree to the kind of demands and conditions advanced by those who are opposed to extending an invitation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion on the Korean question in the General Assembly.

43. The preconceived approach to the question of inviting representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has for many years now prevented objective consideration of the question of Korea in the United Nations and the adoption of the correct decisions. This sad experience must be borne in mind when the First Committee once again considers the question of extending such an invitation.

44. I should like to hope that at this anniversary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations justice will prevail on this matter.

45. Unfortunately, however, at this session of the Assembly, too, a well-known group of delegations, headed by the delegation of the United States, a country which, as I have already pointed out, has in its time committed aggression against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, is once again attempting to push the United Nations into following along the same old illegal path, contrary to the Charter, and into adopting a one-sided decision on the question of extending invitations which would be prejudicial to the rights and interests of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and in violation of the Charter of the United Nations. An attempt is once again being made to dictate to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea special conditions and special demands regarding its participation in the discussion on the question of Korea. This is an injustice and is contrary to the Charter and the practice of the United Nations, contrary to logic and common sense. We must, therefore, oppose that demand most strongly. It is precisely for this purpose, in order to prolong the policy of discrimination and the flagrant violation of the Charter, that draft resolution A/C.1/L.521 has been introduced by a group of countries headed by the United States, a draft resolution in which an invitation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is accompanied by deliberately unacceptable demands which have no basis in law. We can only express regret that the sponsors of this draft resolution include some countries which have themselves suffered from a policy of injustice and discrimination, including racial discrimination.

46. No sovereign State which is concerned for its dignity and prestige could of course agree to lay down such pre-conditions to an invitation. It is in fact the intention of the sponsors of the draft resolution to present an ultimatum to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea,

asking it to agree in advance to foreign intervention under the cover of the United Nations flag in questions which are entirely within the domestic jurisdiction of the Korean people themselves. The unlawfulness and illegality of imposing such conditions in respect of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is quite obvious. The Soviet delegation continues categorically to reject such an approach to the question of extending an invitation to representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

47. The question at issue is this: will justice be restored at the anniversary session of the Assembly; will a correct, just and wise decision be taken on the question of extending an invitation to representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea; or will those who in words proclaim observance of the Charter but in deed violate and disregard it once again succeed in pushing the United Nations along the path of arbitrary action, illegality and discrimination in international relations? Objectively, we have all the facts and all the principles for a correct decision in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations: the legal facts and principles, those pertaining to the Charter, the political facts and principles and, lastly, the elementary principles of justice, realism and common sense. We must also take into account the fact that only in this way will the States Members of the United Nations have an opportunity to receive first-hand information about the real position of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the question of the unification of Korea and on other important aspects of the Korean problem and also about the current situation in Korea.

48. For 20 years now such information has been received from a side which is hostile to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, namely the United States, from the South Korean puppet régime under its protection and from some military allies of the United States which also participated in the aggression in Korea. The United Nations cannot, of course, be fed such one-sided information only.

49. Everything points to the fact that at this session of the General Assembly the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should be given an opportunity to take part in the discussion and to state the position and proposals of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea concerning the way to a peaceful settlement of the Korean question. This is a matter of concern to the whole Korean people, both in the north and in the south of this temporarily divided country. It also concerns the peoples of the whole of eastern Asia, the whole of the Far East, and, in the last analysis, the peoples of the whole world, since a tense situation in that part of the world is fraught with danger for the whole world. The Soviet delegation is firmly convinced that on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, the Assembly must change its approach to a settlement of the question of inviting representatives of the parties concerned in the Korean question to participate in the discussion. At this very session the flotsam of old prejudices from the dark days of the cold war must be thrown overboard, and hardened positions and rigid approaches must be abandoned. We must put an end to the injustice.

50. A number of useful documents were adopted at the recent commemorative session. The Assembly now has the

task of adopting further important decisions, before the end of the current session, in particular decisions aimed at safeguarding peace and strengthening international security. In the statements of the overwhelming majority of representatives at this session commemorating the quarter century of the United Nations existence we have heard appeals to put an end to the shortcomings of the past in the work of the United Nations, to increase its effectiveness and to make it more viable and more universal. This legitimate and just aspiration of all peace-loving States can and should be translated into specific acts and decisions of United Nations organs. By adopting a decision to invite representatives of both parties concerned in the Korean question to participate in the discussions without any pre-conditions or ultimatums, the First Committee could make a useful contribution and add to the useful and constructive results which will mark the anniversary session of the General Assembly.

51. It is a well-known fact that all the socialist countries which are Members of the United Nations and a significant group of Asian and African States have constantly advocated a just settlement of this question through the simultaneous invitation of representatives of both parts of Korea, without any discrimination or pre-conditions. This group of delegations represents a large number of States Members of the United Nations, many of which, as has already been pointed out, know from their own experience what injustice and the policy of discrimination pursued by imperialism and colonialism are.

52. The just and only correct solution to the question of inviting representatives of both parts of Korea to participate in the Assembly's consideration of the questions relating to Korea is proposed in draft resolution A/C.1/L.520. There are now 26 sponsors of this draft resolution consisting of socialist and Afro-Asian States. The Soviet Union is among the sponsors of the draft resolution. The draft resolution provides for invitations to be extended to representatives of both interested parties, that is to say to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and to South Korea, to take part without right to vote in the forthcoming discussion in the Assembly of questions relating to Korea, on an equal basis, simultaneously and without any conditions. This is the only correct way, and the only way which is fully in accordance with the Charter, to a serious and businesslike discussion on the substance of the questions relating to Korea.

53. In view of all the foregoing, the delegation of the Soviet Union appeals to the delegations of all countries which value the principles of justice in international relations and respect for the dignity of sovereign States, especially those which have only recently gained their freedom and national independence, and to all delegations which value the high honour and prestige of the United Nations not to allow injustice to continue but at this anniversary session of the Assembly to take a realistic approach and show their goodwill and vote in favour of the only correct draft resolution on the question under consideration.

54. The Soviet delegation reserves the right to speak on the substance of the question under consideration when the Committee comes to discuss it.

55. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): The representative of the Philippines has ably and persuasively presented arguments supporting the 17-Power draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.521 and for opposing the 26-Power draft in document A/C.1/L.520. All delegations that have taken part in this debate over the years are familiar with the principal issues involved, and with the conflicting positions that have been adopted by the parties most directly affected and by the countries that have taken sides in the field as well as in the United Nations.

56. Nevertheless, discussion of this item has been marked more by a tendency to cold war propaganda and sterile repetitiveness than by any pronounced movement towards making impartial assessments and constructive proposals. This has sometimes had the effect of obscuring and distorting the basic elements of the situation and making it difficult for uncommitted Member States to understand fully the principles and the issues at stake.

57. The facts themselves are, in the view of my delegation, uncomplicated, clear and irrefutable. The United Nations has, since 1947, played a direct and significant part in attempting to create conditions in Korea which would enable the people of the peninsula as a whole to determine their future, free from the threat or use of force. In these efforts it has been constantly rebuffed and obstructed by the intransigence of the North Korean régime and its allies, who have used all means at their disposal, including open aggression, to bring about the reunification of Korea on their own terms, in defiance of the expressed will and the practical measures taken by this Organization.

58. What we are at present considering is not an academic proposition in which the merits of the case depend merely on the skills of advocacy, but historical events and an actual political situation for which the United Nations has borne, and continues to bear, a major responsibility.

59. We in Australia are particularly conscious of the reality of the conflict of interests that threatens peace and stability in Asia; and the unhappy position of Korea, a country divided against itself, epitomizes the current problems which the nations in Asia at present face in resisting the struggle for dominance by ideological motivated régimes and movements.

60. The assumption underlying our position on this question of invitations to the two parts of Korea is that the United Nations has the constitutional authority and the legal competence to make recommendations and take decisions on ways in which a solution might be found to the problems of this artificially divided land. This prerogative has been recognized by the Security Council and the General Assembly on numerous occasions, when the Secretary-General has been empowered to take action in Korea for settling breaches of the peace and re-establishing conditions of security and stability. The long involvement of the United Nations in the history of the struggle by the Korean people to win their sovereignty and independence, free from outside interference in any form, gives this Organization a particular interest and concern in striving to bring about, by peaceful measures, a political settlement which would enable the Korean people to be reunited in accordance with the decisions of this Organization and to

be guaranteed freedom from external intervention. When considering the Korean question, we can no more ignore the long association of the United Nations with the turbulent life of that country than we can deny that the principles which have guided this Assembly and the Security Council through the years are relevant to the proposals before this Committee, proposals to invite representatives of North and South Korea to take part in debate on the substantive aspects of this question.

61. We are all agreed in principle that, since neither part of Korea is a Member of this Organization, each part should be invited to present its case to the General Assembly when the item on Korea comes up for detailed discussion. Where we differ from the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.520 is on the terms under which North and South Korea should be extended invitations by the General Assembly. As I have already noted, it is a known fact, frequently and publicly acknowledged, that the United Nations has the authority and the competence to take action on the Korean question. If we are to be consistent with this established practice and if we are to abide by the United Nations own interpretation of its responsibility under this heading, then logic requires us to make acceptance of the Organization's role in the Korean question a pre-condition for inviting non-Members to join in the General Assembly's debate. Not to do so would be to disregard the provisions of Article 2 (6) of the Charter, which states:

“The Organization shall ensure that States which are not Members of the United Nations act in accordance with these Principles so far as may be necessary in the maintenance of peace and security”,

and to compromise the integrity of the United Nations in discharging its obligations.

62. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.520 would make the issue of invitations unconditional and thereby have the Assembly implicitly compromise, if not indeed deny, its competence to pursue discussion of the Korean question in its present form. In fact there is something inherently contradictory in that proposal, since it presupposes that the parties to be invited would be prepared to consider the United Nations a suitable forum in which to discuss the Korean question. Such is not necessarily the case. North Korea has made it perfectly clear since 1947 that it does not consider the United Nations competent to take action on this question. I would refer those who are in any doubt concerning North Korea's thinking with regard to the United Nations to the memorandum of 16 September 1970 [see A/C.1/1008], in which the North Korean régime asserts: “Originally the United Nations should not have interfered in the Korean question”, describes the United Nations resolutions on the subject as “illegal” and demands their instantaneous repeal. To grant North Korea the unconditional right to participate in the debate on this question would itself be an abnegation of the General Assembly's duty to maintain the integrity of this Organization.

63. For these reasons my delegation has joined with others in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/L.521, which reaffirms its willingness to invite a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take part in the discussion of the Korean question, without the right to vote, provided it

first unequivocally accepts the competence and authority of the United Nations, within the terms of the Charter, to take action on the Korean question. In contradistinction, there has never been any doubt surrounding the Republic of Korea's attitude towards the United Nations. Since 1947 the Republic of Korea has fully co-operated with the United Nations and abided by its decisions and recommendations. In his statement of 26 September 1970 [see A/C.1/1002], the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea declares:

“the Republic of Korea continues to accept unequivocally the competence and authority of the United Nations within the terms of the Charter to take action on the Korean question.”

and again, in a memorandum of 7 October 1970 [see A/C.1/1007], states:

“In unequivocal acceptance of the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the Korean Question the Republic of Korea has expressed its whole-hearted desire for the early and peaceful unification of Korea according to the United Nations formula.”

Surely no clear statement of policy could have been made. The representative of the Soviet Union has referred to the presence of United Nations troops in the Republic of Korea and has seen fit to describe the Republic of Korea as the “aggressive” and “militaristic” part of Korea but surely it is known to everybody that the people of the Republic of Korea and the United Nations troops that are stationed there live and operate in constant and daily fear of aggression from North Korea. To repeat, while South Korea has not wavered in its support for the action taken by the United Nations in dealing with the Korean question, North Korea has consistently and strenuously opposed United Nations intervention in any form in the Korean situation and has defied the Security Council and the General Assembly.

64. If the United Nations were to invite North Korea to take part in the General Assembly's debate without requiring the North Korean régime to recognize the Organization's authority in the same unreserved manner as the Republic of Korea has done, Member States would surely run the risk of casting doubt on their own competence to carry out their commitments under the terms of the Charter.

65. I would therefore urge all delegations, in the interests of preserving the integrity of this Organization and abiding by the principles of the Charter, to which lately we have all been reaffirming our adherence, to vote for draft resolution A/C.1/L.521 and against draft resolution A/C.1/L.520.

66. Mr. JAROSZEK (Poland): The Polish delegation would like to state at the very outset that the only just decision which may be taken on the aspects of agenda item 98 now under discussion is to invite simultaneously and without condition a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and a representative of the Republic of Korea to take part, without the right to vote, in the discussion of questions relating to Korea. Such a solution is provided for in draft resolution A/C.1/L.520 of

which Poland is a sponsor, which was so ably introduced in this Committee by the representative of Algeria and was further so forcefully elaborated in detail by the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Malik. Any other decision on this question would be unjust, illogical and ineffective.

67. The so-called Korean problem has been under discussion in the United Nations for more than 20 years now. Hundreds of speeches have been made, all available arguments have been advanced and decisions have been taken. These decisions, however, have not contributed to a settlement in keeping with the interests of the party most concerned in the debate—that is, the Korean people—which continues to be divided, with one part being occupied by foreign troops making illegal use of the flag of the Organization that should command the highest moral authority—that of the United Nations.

68. Over 20 years ago an aggressive war was unleashed—under the United Nations flag—on Korean soil against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The war brought vast destruction to that Republic: 8,700 factories and workshops, 600,000 houses and 5,000 schools were reduced to ruins; many cultural monuments and other national treasures were destroyed; and many thousands of people lost their lives, not only on the battlefield but also in mass murders perpetrated on an innocent population. During only 40 days of occupation of Sinchon county, Hwanghas province, the imperialist invaders murdered 35,000 people—one quarter of the population of that county. This is but one example. We Poles have the right to remind the Committee about these facts during this debate, not only from the point of view of the analysis of facts but also of the evaluation of the consequences the imperialists' activity has brought in its wake to the Korean people. We know what it means when one has to rebuild entire cities and towns which have been laid waste by air raids; we are aware of the toil and sacrifices involved in putting the economy back on its feet after it has been fully devastated. Despite the difficulties created by the permanent political and military tensions generated by the American imperialists, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has rebuilt its economy at a rapid rate. With the passage of years it has been raising its economy to an ever higher level, becoming a leading country in its region.

69. During two decades the gross national product of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has multiplied. A land once scourged by famine has become Asia's biggest food producer in *per capita* terms. It has developed its fisheries on a tremendous scale, making vast use of marine products. The housing construction rate of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is among the highest in the world. Electrification of the countryside, construction of schools and general progress of education have been very impressive. The efforts of the entire people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are boosting that country along the path of ever greater economic and social progress.

70. Here are some essential facts: first, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is an economically robust country making an ever bigger contribution to the world economy; secondly, through its reconstruction and tremendous capital construction effort it has proved its basic concept of peaceful development; thirdly, it has established

relations with scores of States with different social and political systems, proving in its foreign policy that it cherishes peace, coexistence and respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter; fourthly it does not send its troops to other countries to murder people fighting for their freedom, as does the other part. It does not station foreign troops on its soil. It does not engage in provocation and espionage along the United States sea-coast or that of any other State.

71. This is a Government's certificate of morals, a Government ignored by many Members of this Organization and not invited to participate in the work of the United Nations that is supposed to be inspired by peace, justice and progress.

72. The twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations offers a good opportunity to correct the past mistakes and to reassert the authority of the United Nations, which the Organization needs so much now and which will be even more necessary in the future.

73. In the Far East, where we are witnessing major transformations—both positive and negative—which are bound to confront us in the decades to come, the United Nations will be unable to fulfil its mission if it does not cut itself loose from the past and if it continues to support the policies imposed on it by the American imperialists in the cold war period.

74. As the history of the last 25 years has borne out, and as was also pointed out by numerous speakers in the general debate at this session of the General Assembly, certain countries are not harmed by the fact that the United Nations chooses to ignore them. It is precisely the authority of the United Nations that suffers. That should be borne in mind by those who are prepared to vote against the draft resolution which would invite, without conditions, the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of the Korean problem.

75. It would be unfortunate for the spirit of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations if the debate were to start all over again, with repetitions and a continuation of the well-known and worn-out charges and slander against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea—we have heard such slander again today from the representatives of the Philippines and Australia. It is ironical indeed that slander about the alleged aggressive policies of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should come from the representatives of States which supported and participated in the aggressive war against the Korean people, as well as in the aggressive war against the people of Viet-Nam. We cannot ignore the basic and simple juridical principle that both parties should be given the right to speak.

76. It is the conviction, therefore, of the Polish delegation that there is absolutely no ground for any discrimination whatsoever against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Both sides should be given an equal opportunity to be heard before the United Nations and to participate in the debate concerning Korea.

77. If this Organization is really desirous of making a contribution to positive solutions, it cannot afford to

ignore one part of the nation which it allegedly seeks to reunify. It is obvious, however, that some Powers abusing the name and the authority of the United Nations are interested in aggravating the whole issue further and in the perpetuation of the division of Korea. They are afraid of the true voice of the Korean people being heard in this forum. They would like to impose pre-conditions on the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea even though they know very well that the proud people and the Government of that country will not accept any such conditions. Perhaps they even expect that the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will stand as humble petitioners before this Organization, under whose flag most odious crimes were committed against the Korean people.

78. No, that will never be. The representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should be invited without any conditions simultaneously with the representatives of the other part of Korea. That is the solution provided for in draft resolution A/C.1/L.520 submitted by 26 States. It is the only unbiased and just solution. On the other hand, draft resolution A/C.1/L.521, submitted by the United States of America and certain other States, offers no such solution: on the contrary, it aims at preventing the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from appearing in the United Nations. That is a road going in the wrong direction which this Organization must not follow if it does not want to damage its prestige and authority further. That is why the Polish delegation calls on this Committee to reject the discriminatory draft resolution A/C.1/L.521 and to support the draft resolution of the 26 States, A/C.1/L.520.

79. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): It may be difficult for the representative of an Asian country not to be emotional about the problems of Asia. However, as a representative of a country that was a signatory of the United Nations Charter in 1945, and having participated in every session of the United Nations since it started dealing with substantive questions at Lake Success in 1947, I feel that I can talk as objectively and dispassionately as is humanly possible on this question of Korea.

80. I should like Members to bear in mind that I will desist from delving into the substance since the question before us is the invitation aspects of the question of Korea. We know that we will come to the substantive aspects of the question of Korea later in this session. But if we look at document A/C.1/1006 of 5 October 1970, we find that the allocation of working days to the various subjects—which was wisely arrived at after you, Mr. Chairman, had consulted the interested parties—will be upset because, indeed, we have not yet disposed of the first item on the agenda of this Committee.

81. It may be remembered that I suggested that a committee be formed in order to try to co-ordinate the various draft resolutions on the strengthening of international security. I have been informed that nothing has emerged as yet from the deliberations and the negotiations of that special committee. Why do I mention this? Because had there been a tangible result we would today be discussing the item of the strengthening of international security, which we are not doing. If we take into account

the fact that the disarmament item has been allocated 14 working days and the sea-bed item 11, to mention only those two items—and they may perhaps need many more than the days allocated to them—how are we going to dispose of our agenda during this twenty-fifth anniversary session of the General Assembly? It should not be a ceremonial session only, but a session which achieves something, especially on the subjects of disarmament and the sea-bed and ocean floor.

82. The other question, outer space, which has been allocated only three working days, and the substantive question of Korea, which depends on what we do today, have to be examined by this Committee and, as yet, we have not disposed of the first question on our agenda.

83. Having said that, I hope my colleagues will benefit from my experience on this question. It may be recalled that during the meeting about the organization of work [1724th meeting] I said that it would be futile to discuss the question of Korea so long as the situation in the Far East remained very complicated. I am not a military man, but I have lived long enough to know that there are strategic questions to be disposed of by the great Powers in the Far East—and for that matter in the Middle East, the region to which I belong—before we can make headway piecemeal on any item which is only a part of the general situation, whether it concerns the Far East, the Middle East or any other part of the world.

84. Also bearing in mind that I addressed myself very seriously to the work of this Committee about four years ago and submitted draft resolutions which could easily have resolved the problem, what do we find instead? We find that we are still engaged in a broken record of argument. The United Nations is divided into two camps, and evenly divided, which makes it more dangerous and more futile for us to dispose of the Korean question during this session.

85. I presume that the two draft resolutions before the Committee are procedural—either we invite or we do not invite North Korea. But in these two procedural draft resolutions before us every word implies the substance of the question which will be dealt with, I believe, from 17 to 19 November. Three days are allocated for the substantive discussion of the Korean question.

86. Why do I say that those draft resolutions are really substantive, although they should only revolve around the aspect of invitation? To begin with, I take draft resolution A/C.1/L.520 which is entitled “Invitation Aspects of the Question of Korea”. Three words in the third paragraph belie the substantive nature of that draft resolution: “and without condition”. Of course this phraseology was advisedly inserted because the sponsors of the draft resolution knew, not in any divine manner, but from past experience, that certain conditions would be included in the subsequent draft resolution. And needless to say, in draft resolution A/C.1/L.521 we find the conditions in the phrase “provided that that country first unequivocally accepts the competence and authority of the United Nations within the terms of the Charter to take action on the Korean question”. The phrase “and without condition” in draft resolution A/C.1/L.520 presupposed that conditions would be set. And here is the deadlock—the knot encountered by

the saw of the carpenter and the carpenter is this Committee. I submit that this phraseology will break the saw. The United Nations will break in trying to cut through this knot unless the situation in the Far East is resolved. The question of Korea, I submit, is only one aspect, if I may use the term, of that whole situation. Why? I shall be concrete.

87. On 15 August 1945 Korea was liberated from foreign invasion. The war had not yet finished. I happened to be in London. I was one of those who, with the royal delegation of Saudi Arabia, witnessed the signature of the Charter in San Francisco. We were invited by Mr. Churchill's Government—it did not last that long, although he won the war for the United Kingdom—to London, and I was one of those invited. To all intents and purposes we were beginning to expect the defeated to surrender. They were already defeated on 15 August.

88. On that same day—but it was not worked out on that same day—Korea was divided. Was the United Nations in session in August 1945? It could not have been in session without me. I have been here 25 years. Was it in session? Who partitioned Korea? Let us be frank. Mr. Churchill was no longer the Government. Incidentally, when we got to Southampton, Colonel de Gaury, with his big moustache, said, “I greet your Majesty and members of the royal delegation of Saudi Arabia in the name of the new Government, Mr. Attlee's Government”. Mr. Attlee had no time, the poor man, to partition anything. He was trying to bandage the wounds of his people after the Second World War.

89. Who partitioned Korea? The Soviet Union and the United States? No. This is mystifying. Who? Two persons: Mr. Stalin and Mr. Truman. Mr. Roosevelt had died in 1945. I do not know whether, of course, they had a secret agreement. They were close allies; there was no cold war. There was a hot war. I do not know what they did or did not do secretly. What I do know is that Mr. Stalin and Mr. Truman partitioned Korea when the United Nations was not in session. Bear this in mind. This point has not been brought out very clearly.

90. And then what do we find? Here sometimes my Asian blood boils, although I shall calm down and speak dispassionately. On what grounds was Korea partitioned? On ideological grounds? No, Sir. It was partitioned for strategic considerations, each Power trying to juggle for influence in that mother of continents. Of course, Korea also had been occupied, so the American troops and their allies moved into the south and the Russian troops moved into the north. And after every great war allies fall apart. I saw that take place in the Middle East in the 1920s. There were British mandates and French mandates in juxtaposition to one another. For example, Lebanon and Syria were under French mandate and Palestine and Iraq were under British mandate and they became rivals and were trying to subvert one another. I was involved in national movements and I know how their agents approached an insignificant national fighter like myself in those days. In fairness to those who did that after the Second World War, I must say that this happens to be the nature of allies when they are not united to fight their common enemy. The pressure is gone, so each one follows his own path. Do not let anyone

fool us. We are the United Nations and we should be frank and not talk in platitudes any more. We talked enough platitudes during the 10 days of the ceremonial celebration.

91. So we find out that ideology superseded ethnology, because of the strategic interests of the two Powers that emerged after the Second World War. They were the same people. One part became ideologically of one political persuasion, and the other part of another political persuasion. In 1948, as will be recalled from the records—I was a member of this Organization—the forces representing both ideologies began to skirmish. Finally—because I said I would preserve my objectivity—in 1950 there was the Korean war, and it was thrown into the lap of the United Nations, just as the United Kingdom, in 1947, threw the Palestine Mandate into the lap of the United Nations—although they were supposed to prepare the people of Palestine for independence—like Pilate, who, when they asked that Christ should be crucified, washed his hands and said “I do not see anything in that man that he should be crucified”. I represent a Moslem State; I do not believe Jesus was crucified.

92. I am giving you this as an analogy: the British washed their hands of the Mandate of Palestine and we have been engrossed with the problem of Palestine since then. In the same way, somebody washed his hands of the Korean question and put it in the lap of the United Nations, and since then we have been engrossed with that problem too. That is the objective and factual analysis, not what I would like to see done or undone.

93. Where am I leading to with all this preface? I submit that the Korean question is inextricably linked with the situation in the Far East. Both Powers want their presence, and not necessarily in the form of armies as they used to do. Some of them are cleverer than the others. I am not going to mention them; you know them. They do not send armies; they send arms. Others send arms and armies. But whatever the situation is, we know that the two major Powers are strategically positioned in that area, because the greatest prize for them is the peoples of Asia. They are the sleeping monster that they hope—or some of them hope, because they have allies—will remain dormant or engrossed with its own problems, with each State trying, from outside of Asia, to channel its own interests in certain areas.

94. Hence the spheres of influence and power politics. And we come here, as a small Power, year in and year out, expecting to resolve this question. Korea will not be reunified, it will not be reunified this year. Although I hope it will take place next year, or even tomorrow, actually it is not going to be reunified because the situation in South-East Asia is very precarious.

95. Then there is that big State of Communist China. Do not get me wrong. I represent a country which has not until now granted *de jure* recognition to the People's Republic of China, but far be it for me to close my eyes to what is happening there. Does anyone think that the two great Powers are going to leave Korea alone as long as the People's Republic of China is still a big question mark for each one of them? The answer is simply no. Even I do not have to answer it. Why should we, year in and year out, be confronted with such a debate? Only today we heard

representatives of Algeria, the Philippines, the USSR, Australia and Poland. One can see the division. Algeria is for one draft resolution; the Philippines is for another draft resolution, the USSR is for the first draft resolution; Australia is for the second draft resolution, and Poland is for one draft resolution. And I am with neither draft resolution. If I had a say, there would be neither one nor the other. They are alternating, as if there were a gentleman's agreement.

96. It could be coincidental. They are making a show of it here. Now we are the false witnesses. It is high time that we inject some sense, some seriousness, into our deliberations on this question and know that we are becoming a laughing-stock outside these walls because of our behaviour on this and on similar questions for that matter. Is it not high time for us to digress from that thorny path? Although we may wear boots and it may not hurt our feet, the thorns are growing higher and higher. Do we also have to wear gloves as many of us do, so that the thorns may not touch our hands? This is not an exercise in futility. This has been repeated exercises in futility. Shall we continue to deal with generalities, or is it not high time for us to do something drastic?

97. What does Baroody suggest? We are confronted with a situation here, not only in Korea, in the Middle East and in the Far East. We have a situation here that we have to resolve ourselves. I have some suggestions. I do not know whether they will be heeded. Three or four years ago I was begged—I will not say by whom—to suspend the consideration of a resolution that would have resolved the question. Both sides asked me to suspend it: how do you like that? Shall we remain in that state of affairs, or shall we have some innovation, something conceptual in approaching our problem?

98. Why do we not vote forthwith, without too much debate—we shall have time to debate the substance when we come to it—on this aspect of the invitations? Each one of us will follow the instructions of his Government and no argument will make anyone change his position. I am not going to tell you how I am going to vote either.

99. The best course would be for you, Sir, as Chairman—after all, the Chairman is usually a wise man, and you are a very wise man—to make an appeal, if you wished to, not to show the house divided. Let us talk on the substance only when we come to it, and if the substance is going to be the broken record that we have heard, let us dispose of it very quickly for the archives only.

100. Another procedure which I suggest—I am not proposing anything; I have had my fingers burned making proposals—would be to ask our illustrious Secretary-General himself, not his aides, as some of his aides are politicians, to study the question and make proposals to us with regard to a formula which would be acceptable to the sponsors of one side and the sponsors of the other side, and report to us at the twenty-sixth session. We are not using even his good offices, but merely seeing how the saw of the United Nations could cut the wood by bypassing that knot which, I say, might break the United Nations. There are many other knots.

101. The third suggestion would be to forget about the Korean situation in its invitation aspect and in its substantive aspect. That is the last suggestion—which will not be acted upon.

102. The United Nations is a platform on which we should sound out our ideas—nobody would believe it outside. We are here representing not only our Governments but, in conformity with our Charter, the peoples of the world and not insulated in a beleaguered fortress as we have been for the last ten days or so, insulated in a beleaguered fortress as if we had cholera and people wanting to get into the fortress had to have vaccination certificates so that they would not suffer from a cholera epidemic of words, so that their tongues wagging outside the walls would not be able to accomplish their tasks. *Let us face the facts; it amounts to that.*

103. May I submit that something could yet be done with both these draft resolutions. Perhaps both sides could have an understanding to see whether, by tomorrow, they could give us a consolidated text. But I think it is too much to expect that to happen. The next best thing would be for them to suspend their texts—as I suspended my draft resolution—and not to show before the world this house divided against itself, foundering on the rocks of dissent due to certain phrases that may or may not be acceptable.

104. There is still another way out if the sponsors of both these draft resolutions would wish to serve the cause of peace. It would be to ask you, Sir, as our Chairman—do not think that I am suggesting a ruling—to have consultations and see whether there is something which I, or any of my colleagues, have not thought of—sometimes by consultation one explores things that one has not thought of before—and present us, if not tomorrow, at least before we deal with the substance of the matter, with a hope of solution on the invitation aspect one way or the other. If, after consulting the two sides, you arrive at something tangible, then we shall all be happy. If not, we shall have salved our consciences; and if those two draft resolutions are going to be acted upon in any case, at least we shall have tried our best.

105. I want it to be known that my intervention does not constitute any policy on the part of a State or group of States. I have tried to talk as objectively as it was humanly possible to do.

106. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic): I wish to recount briefly what took place this morning concerning the position of the delegation of the United Arab Republic on adjournment of the meeting of the First Committee.

107. Mr. El-Zayyat proposed its adjournment in view of the fact that the plenary Assembly was scheduled to begin consideration of the situation in the Middle East, agenda item 22. He emphasized that representatives in the First Committee would wish to devote their attention and efforts to such an urgent and important problem, to which the General Assembly has given priority consideration.

108. It will be recalled that the representative of the United States, Mr. Phillips, sought clarification regarding the precise implications of the position of the United Arab

Republic delegation, and asked specifically whether it meant adjournment of the meeting or suspension of the debate in the First Committee pending conclusion of the General Assembly's consideration of the situation in the Middle East.

109. In your wisdom, Mr. Chairman, you deemed it practicable to deal in the morning meeting with the specific aspect of adjournment of the meeting and defer the other aspects for consideration at the end of the afternoon meeting.

110. The Committee has responded favourably to my delegation's suggestion of this morning and I wish to express our appreciation to the members of the First Committee for their understanding and co-operation.

111. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like now to put the following suggestion before the Committee for its consideration. I should like to suggest that the First Committee suspend its meetings until the plenary Assembly has concluded its consideration of the item on the situation in the Middle East. The reason for this suggestion has already been explained by Mr. El-Zayyat. I wish, therefore, to emphasize the following facts.

112. We are mindful of the heavy schedule of the First Committee and we are keen to contribute our utmost to enabling the Committee to expedite its work. In this connexion I should like to mention that the plenary Assembly is not meeting tomorrow morning to consider the situation in the Middle East: there will be only one meeting in the afternoon. The First Committee could therefore meet in the morning. This explains what we mean by our suggestion that it would be only when the Assembly was discussing the Middle East situation that the First Committee would not meet; so that whenever the Middle East situation was not being considered in the plenary Assembly, the First Committee could resume its work.

113. I would like to indicate also that owing to the urgent character of the question before the plenary, namely, the situation in the Middle East, we have the earnest hope, and in fact the expectation, that it will be terminated by the end of this week so that the First Committee might expect to resume its regular work by Friday afternoon. We are aware that the First Committee needs to adjust its time-table and to have some definite indication in the light of which it could properly do so.

114. Mr. WARNER (United Kingdom): I very much appreciate the suggestions which have been made to us by the representative of the United Arab Republic, and of course my delegation would wish to do everything possible to meet his suggestions. I wonder, however, if I might have a point of clarification. Supposing that by mid-day Friday the debate on the Middle East had not yet been completed in plenary, what would then be the situation? Could we count on resuming our work in this Committee nevertheless, having given these three clear days for the conduct of the debate in the Assembly, or would we then be requested once again to postpone our work? I would be very grateful for an assurance on that, because, of course, if the intention is that we would definitely, whatever happens, resume our work down here on Friday afternoon, then the proposal

made by the representative of the United Arab Republic would be very much easier to accept and more convenient to the quick completion of our business in this Committee.

115. The second point I want to raise, which is not a popular one and I doubt if my colleagues will thank me for it, is that I assume what has been proposed does not exclude the possibility of evening meetings of this Committee, so that we can get on with our work perhaps sometimes in the evenings after there has been discussion in the plenary of the Middle East problem during the morning and the afternoon.

116. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic): I am grateful to the representative of the United Kingdom for the points of clarification he has submitted. I take it I only have to address myself to the first point. I thought that such an understanding was implicit in what I said, but I gladly make it explicit.

117. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): If there are no further comments on this matter, I shall consider that the First Committee agrees with the suggestions made by the representative of the United Arab Republic in his second statement. If you will allow me, I would summarize the decision that the Committee would take as follows: to suspend meetings of the First Committee in order to avoid their overlapping with the meetings of the plenary of the General Assembly while the latter is considering the situation in the Middle East. In other words, the First Committee would suspend its meetings whenever one coincides with a meeting of the plenary of the General Assembly to discuss the question of the Middle East; but regardless of the duration of the debate on the Middle East in the plenary, the Committee would resume its normal schedule of meetings on Friday afternoon. Of course—and on this I do not think there are any differences of view—this does not exclude the possibility of evening meetings in order to conclude our own work. Is there any comment with regard to my summary?

118. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): My delegation has listened with great sympathy to the suggestion made by the representative of the United Arab Republic and his further clarification in his second statement. My delegation is prepared to accept such a request but, on the other hand, in the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom there was reference to the possibility of a second alternative, that is, that the First Committee might like to convene its meetings in the evening. My delegation has no objection to evening meetings, but at the same time, while we do not underestimate the importance and the urgency of the debate on the Middle East, we feel also that the situation in the Far East, particularly in Korea, does deserve equally important and urgent attention by the Committee. I feel that evening meetings to debate the question of Korea may affect the attendance and may have some unpleasant repercussions. So with this in mind I would ask you to disregard the request put forward by the representative of the United Kingdom in his second alternative, and perhaps we should only meet in the morning or in the afternoon on the Korean question, and not in the evening.

119. Mr. WARNER (United Kingdom): If I could clarify my statement, I did not propose evening meetings as an

alternative, I proposed them in addition, so that we might get ahead faster. But I take the point made by the representative of Thailand.

120. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): May I suggest that if necessary we should meet on Saturdays and Sunday mornings. We are here to work. The Security Council meets at night, and these are questions of great importance. We only have seven weeks to 15 December. The Security Council meets at any time of the day and stays sometimes until after midnight. These questions are political questions, whether it be the question of the Middle East, disarmament, Korea, or whatever is on our agenda. If there are financial implications that have to be taken into consideration, and somebody might tell us there are financial implications, let those who hold the purse-strings, especially the major contributing Powers, loosen the strings and contribute a bigger share to the United Nations, which is the best premium for ensuring peace so far.

121. Mr. PHILLIPS (United States of America): I should like to request one clarification. My assumption, which has already been confirmed by the response of my British colleague to the question raised by the representative of Thailand, is that night meetings will probably be necessary in order to permit us to complete the discussion on the invitation aspects of the Korean item in time to take a vote on Friday afternoon. That is what seems to me to be indicated; and, if so, I would very much hope that the speakers' list might be closed at a reasonable time to enable us to meet that schedule, otherwise it will be very difficult to anticipate completing this item by Friday afternoon, when I would hope the Chair would be prepared to proceed to the vote on the draft resolutions.

122. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): I deeply share the concern of our colleague from Saudi Arabia about the importance of giving due attention to political items, having shared his experiences of night sessions on items of common interest. However, while we are clarifying the programme, with regard to the fact that discussion of the items on disarmament was to start on the twenty-eighth of this month and to your interpretation of the proposal made by the representative of the United Arab Republic that the item on Korea be resumed on the twenty-eighth, I should be glad if you, Mr. Chairman, could further clarify whether we can have the assurance that the items on disarmament would be taken up not later than Monday, 2 November, so that we may know what our programme is, having regard to the list in document A/C.1/1006 of 5 October 1970.

123. Mrs. GAVRILOVA (Bulgaria): Mr. Chairman, would you please tell us how many more meetings are scheduled for discussion of the invitation aspects of the question of Korea.

124. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall be happy to reply to the question of the representative of Bulgaria. According to document A/C.1/1006, which contains the tentative time-table, we had planned to devote two working days—26 and 27 October—in other words, four meetings, to the discussion of the invitation aspects of the question of Korea. The meeting we have had this afternoon was the first of the four.

125. If there are no further comments I shall summarize what I consider to be the practical agreement of the Committee.

126. During the next few days—Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday—the Committee will meet only when there is no discussion of the Middle East situation in plenary. On Friday afternoon, the First Committee will resume its normal activities, and it is hoped that a vote will be taken then on the draft resolutions submitted on the invitation aspects of the question of Korea. At any rate, on Monday we will begin discussion of the disarmament items.

127. I should like to add that, since two days—four meetings—were set aside for discussion of this subject, it would be desirable that we close the list of speakers on this aspect of the Korean question. I would suggest that the list of speakers be closed tomorrow at the end of the morning meeting.

128. The possibility of night meetings cannot be excluded but, obviously, that would depend on the number of speakers on the list. If we want to conclude our work on this item on Friday afternoon, we will have to close the general debate during the time allotted to us. And since that time, at the moment, seems to be limited to the meeting tomorrow morning as no plenary meeting is scheduled for then, we would have to consider the possibility either of holding meetings after the debate is over in the plenary, that is after 6 o'clock or even later, or of holding night meetings. I do not know if this correctly summarizes the agreement at which the Committee has arrived.

129. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee decides to follow the outline I have just given.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.