

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1686th
MEETING**

Wednesday, 12 November 1969,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 99:	
Question of Korea (<i>continued</i>):	
(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
Organization of work	7

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.1-2);**
- (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.1-2);**
- (d) **Need to put an end to the discussion in the United Nations on the unification of Korea (A/7658)**

1. Mr. SHAW (Australia): Before I turn to the substantive discussion on agenda item 99, the "Question of Korea", I should like to comment briefly on what might be termed some matters of procedure. Firstly I remark on the tactics adopted by representatives of a small group of delegations at this current Assembly and at previous Assemblies. This year two sub-items of the agenda item now under consideration were submitted. Although contentiously phrased, they were accepted on the agenda without dissent. Meetings of the General Committee and the General Assembly were used by supporters of these sub-items as the occasion for lengthy political statements far removed from procedure.

2. Yesterday a further sub-item was accepted by the General Assembly calling for the "Need to put an end to the discussion in the United Nations on the unification of

Korea". In the light of what was said earlier in support of the items which were adopted dealing with Korea, and in the light also of what continues to be said about the threats to the peace in East Asia, this new sub-item indeed appears to make little sense. It can only be seen as a procedural device under which certain delegates have the occasion to make further political statements. The sub-item as proposed and accepted is obviously unconstitutional. The Assembly cannot purport to attempt to limit what international questions future General Assemblies might decide to discuss or not to discuss at a given session. It is obviously absurd to declare here and now that a situation which is agreed to be a threat to the peace should not ever again be discussed in the United Nations.

3. In these remarks on procedure I would register again our objection to the misuse of the rules under which a few delegates purporting to make "rights of reply" or "explanations of vote" in fact take an unfair advantage of the latitude allowed them traditionally by the Chairman and by this Committee in order to indulge in further lengthy statements of substance.

4. I would also comment briefly on the contentious wording of documents recommended to this Committee by certain members which are amongst the proponents here of the régime in North Korea. The documentation from North Korea which was circulated to us is phrased in violent and intemperate language. The vocabulary and the tone of these communications are not the language and tone of the United Nations and there is no reason why we should have to accept them as such.

5. The latest example is document A/C.1/990 which contains a message dated 3 November from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of North Korea. He describes the resolution passed in this Committee on 30 October as "fabricated by U.S. imperialism [in] direct violation of the United Nations principles". We are told that the decision taken by this Committee was "forced through [by] the shameless manoeuvrings of the U.S. imperialists". These views of the North Korean régime were commended to us yesterday by the representative of the USSR. They are, to say the least, hardly complimentary towards this Committee or the United Nations itself. Indeed they confirm the belief expressed by this Committee that it was fair and reasonable to set out some conditions for the hearing of representatives from the two parts of Korea. Once again North Korea has confirmed its attitude to our Organization by stating it would declare null and void all such resolutions of the United Nations.

6. The language to which we take exception is not confined simply to written documents but includes also the terms of some interventions in this debate. A small group of

representatives has the habit of describing the statements of others in this Committee who hold contrary views as “lies and slanders”. Yesterday the representative of the USSR said that the representatives of the United States, Japan, Australia and New Zealand “specialized in slander against North Korea”.

7. As I understand the meaning of the word “slander” it signifies the promulgation of statements which are known by the speaker to be untrue. The Concise Oxford Dictionary defines “slander” as a “false report maliciously uttered to a person’s injury”. If there is anything which I have said or which I say in the future which can be shown to me to be false I stand prepared to be corrected. Otherwise I take it that the meaning of the word “slander” in the communist dictionary is simply “truths which happen to be unpalatable”.

8. Finally, in these introductory remarks let me make it clear that I use the word “communist” not in any pejorative or critical sense. We live in a world in which there is a variety of political, economic and social systems and they are represented in this Assembly. We are not here concerned with the internal affairs of Member States or other States. Our concern is solely with their international policies, and in what we say about those policies we are guided by the terms of the Charter which we have all accepted. When I speak of communism I make a distinction between that and socialism, and this distinction is, I believe, well understood by members of this Committee and in particular by representatives of those countries in Western Europe, in Africa and elsewhere which have socialist governments.

9. Turning now to the substance of agenda item 99, we find that the General Committee has recommended—and its recommendation has been endorsed by the General Assembly—that the various sub-items relating to the question of Korea should be considered together by the First Committee. Individual resolutions have been put forward on some of these sub-items and no doubt they will be considered and voted on individually. For the purposes of a general discussion, however, they may be considered together because they make up a pattern of conflicting interpretations of events in North-East Asia and of conflicting policies in that area.

10. The draft resolution submitted under A/C.1/L.470 and Add.1-2 would require the unconditional withdrawal of all United Nations forces from the Republic of Korea within a period of six months. In respect of four signatories to this draft resolution the question of withdrawal of foreign forces from a country can hardly be considered by them as a matter of principle. Their request has to be seen in the light of their foreign policy aims and those of their allies. Their objective seems to be to restore the position in Korea in 1950 when foreign troops had been withdrawn from South Korea and the way was left open for the invasion of the South by the North.

11. Our earlier discussions and the various reports before this Committee set out the good reasons for the stationing of United Nations forces in the Republic of Korea. In short, those forces are there at the request of the Government of that country to help meet the demonstrable threat of

aggression to South Korea. They are there in accordance with properly taken decisions of the United Nations Security Council.

12. We were told in this Committee yesterday by the representative of the USSR that “there has never been and cannot be any ‘threat from the North’ to South Korea” [*1684th meeting, para. 23*]. These assertions are directly contrary to the facts of history, both past and present. Once again we are forced to remind ourselves of the clear finding of the United Nations in 1950 to the effect that:

“... the invasion of the territory of the Republic of Korea by the armed forces of the North Korean authorities which began on 25th June 1950 was an act of aggression initiated without warning and without provocation in execution of a carefully prepared plan.”¹

13. No assertions in this Committee can rewrite the historical fact that in 1950 there was a threat and an act of aggression from the North against South Korea.

14. It would be welcome news if we could be shown that the policies of the North Korean régime have since changed. For this we would require practical and impartial proof rather than assertions. Regrettably, there is evidence to the contrary in the report of the United Nations Command. Document S/9493² gives details of North Korean violations of the Armistice Agreement during past years and during the first seven months of 1969. This report shows signs of some reduction in the level of incidents, and if this trend were confirmed over a period we might hope that it could be regarded as significant. We have also the report of United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, which states that

“... incidents of intrusion in the demilitarized zone south of the Military Demarcation Line and of infiltration into the interior of the Republic of Korea continued to take place in violation of the Armistice Agreement” [*A/7629, para. 21*].

15. Since the date of that report, 6 September 1969, further incidents have occurred, including the murder of four United Nations personnel south of the demarcation line and the arrest of a considerable number of agents who had been trained and armed and sent into South Korea from the North. In the light of past history and of these continuing events, we would be justified in being sceptical about what would follow the withdrawal of United Nations forces without condition from the Republic of Korea.

16. We were told yesterday by the representative of the Soviet Union that the North Korean régime had declared that if forces were withdrawn from South Korea and “if . . . democratic progressive forces having national consciousness take over power, then it”—that is North Korea—“is prepared to begin negotiations with those forces on the question of the unification of the country by peaceful means”. [*1684th meeting, para. 37*].

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Supplement No. 16, para. 202.*

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1969.*

17. We are told thereby that North Korea requires that what it calls "democratic, progressive forces having national self-awareness" must take power in South Korea. That requirement is made perhaps pursuant to the claims put forward in the North Korean telegram of 3 November 1969 [A/C.1/990] that:

"The solely lawful State of the Korean nation today is the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and it is only the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that represents the genuine national interests and will of the whole North and South Korean people. The so-called 'Republic of Korea Government' of South Korea is a colonial puppet ruling machine rigged up by United States imperialism at the point of its bayonet which is a mere marionette that can exercise no sovereignty whatsoever."

18. Again it is necessary to remind ourselves of the nature of the Government in South Korea. As long ago as 1948 the General Assembly resolved that:

"... there has been established a lawful government (the Government of the Republic of Korea) having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the Temporary Commission was able to observe and consult and in which the great majority of the people of all Korea reside; that this Government is based on elections which were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate of that part of Korea and which were observed by the Temporary Commission; and that this is the only such Government in Korea;" [resolution 195 (III)].

19. Whatever else they show, the results of the elections and referenda held within the Republic of Korea indicate a diversity of opinion and of choice.

20. So far as concerns North Korea, elections to the Supreme People's Assembly in 1957 showed that there were 215 candidates proposed and 215 elected by 99 per cent of the voters. On 25 November 1967, 457 candidates were presented for the same number of seats, and all were elected by a 100 per cent vote. Apparently elections in North Korea are based on the totalitarian practice whereby voters are given no choice except to vote for the candidates presented to them or not to vote at all.

21. Furthermore, if it comes to the point of a general election throughout North and South Korea, it is obvious that representation must be in proportion to the indigenous population. More than two-thirds of the Korean population live in the Republic of Korea, and there is no reason why one vote in the North should be held to be worth two in the South. The essential prerequisite of any elections would be supervision.

22. When we consider this proposal for the withdrawal of United Nations forces from Korea it is relevant to remind ourselves of what happened two and a quarter years ago, when another United Nations force was removed from an area of tension and dispute. No one could say what would have happened if that force had been allowed to remain in position, but at least the United Nations would have had first-hand observation about the facts of the tragic events which developed there.

23. On the other hand, those who are calling for the withdrawal of United Nations forces from Korea, another area of tension and dispute, call also for the dissolution of the United Nations Commission. Surely what we require is not the removal of the duly constituted United Nations body for Korea, but that it be given an opportunity to exercise the functions for which it was intended over the whole of the territory of Korea.

24. Unfortunately, the North Korean régime continues to reject that prospect. In its memorandum in document A/C.1/987 it alleges that the United Nations Commission "has committed all kinds of shameful acts such as falsehood and fabrication, deception and fraudulence". We reject these wild and unsubstantiated accusations against the integrity of the United Nations Commission. The standard of accuracy of the North Korean document can be judged from its description of the South Korean people as "languishing in hunger and poverty" and from its statement that "the United Nations has never received a single report or held a discussion on the activities of the 'United Nations force' in South Korea since its formation." We wonder what we have been reading and discussing these past several years.

25. In evaluating the role of the United Nations Commission, one must admit that the presence of such a Commission in the Republic of Korea in 1950 was not in itself sufficient to discourage the North Koreans from their attack. On the other hand, the presence of United Nations observers on the 38th parallel at that time and of a Commission in Seoul which reported impartially to the United Nations was an important factor in determining the facts of the situation and what the United Nations should do. Again we must ask ourselves whether the objective of those delegations which require the dissolution of UNCURK is to establish a position in which history might be invited to repeat itself.

26. That history involved the widespread destruction of Korea and 450,000 casualties to the people of Korea. That suffering was caused by the aggression of the communist régime in the North, aided and abetted by their powerful friends.

27. The fourth sub-item under item 99 is entitled the "Need to put an end to the discussion in the United Nations on the unification of Korea". As I remarked earlier, 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. One can only conclude that the intention of some supporters of this new item is the same as that in their requirement for the withdrawal of forces and the dissolution of UNCURK, namely, to leave the way open in North-East Asia for the free play of those forces of aggression which have already manifested themselves there.

28. It is a matter of great regret that such demands continue to be put forward with the support of one of the great Powers. Australia respects the special position given to the great Powers under the Charter. With great power goes great responsibility. To those representatives of countries lying in the area of Asia and the Pacific the search for

security in North-East Asia is of fundamental importance. We believe that it is from Asia that the most dangerous threats to the peace of the world will originate.

29. We wish to work towards a position in which all countries in the area respect the sanctity of international boundaries, whether those boundaries are defined by treaty or whether they exist as internationally recognized demarcation lines. Aggression across any boundaries, whether that aggression is direct or indirect, brings into play the obligations of Members under the United Nations Charter. The intrusion of armed groups into another country for the purpose of overthrowing the national Government of that country at the direction and in the interests of an outside State is contrary to the Charter principles regarding the independence of nations and their territorial integrity, national sovereignty and freedom from intervention from outside. We reject the attempt of some delegations to represent acts of infiltration from North Korea into South Korea as the activities of some national liberation force acting in the interests of the South Koreans. The people of South Korea had a taste of the policies and practices of the North Korean régime from 1950 to 1953.

30. It is the earnest hope of Australia that all great Powers accept and apply the principles of the Charter. The unification of Korea will not be achieved by acts of direct and indirect aggression any more than will the reunification of Germany, which consists also of one people. The United Nations solution for Korea is:

“... 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... through genuinely free elections held in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly” [resolution 2466 (XXIII)].

31. That is the intent of the draft resolution submitted by my country and others in document A/C.1/L.471 and Add.1-2. We reserve the right to speak further on draft resolutions or in explanation of vote.

32. Mr. WHALLEY (United States of America): It is a sound debating principle that when one's case is substantively weak the best defence is a vigorous offence. Thus, my delegation recognizes why the representative of the Soviet Union, the first speaker in this phase of our consideration of the question of Korea, adopted the strategy that he employed yesterday. However, we cannot but deplore the harsh and abusive language he chose and his deliberate attempts to mislead members of this Committee through efforts to portray the victim of aggression as an aggressor and other attempts to depict a truculent and intemperate North Korea as peace-loving. Perhaps the answer is that the violent speech to which we were subjected yesterday was intended primarily for consumption elsewhere, in a place where public information is closely controlled, where the reports of objective United Nations commissions are not openly circulated, and where the opportunity to set the record straight in free debate does not yet exist.

33. We cannot do otherwise than deplore the shrill tone and the hackneyed vocabulary used yesterday by the

representative of the Soviet Union. Such phrases as “cold war”, “foreign occupation troops”, “bloody aggressive puppet régime”, “obstinate imperialists”, “obedient tool”, “mercenary clique” are all too reminiscent of a time which we had hoped was long since past in these halls. It would be easier to ignore their rather dated and old-fashioned tenor were we not concerned that their use here, in this Committee, might encourage the hostility of those authorities in Pyongyang for whom they were probably primarily intended—hostility towards their neighbour to the south and towards this Organization. In all frankness, my delegation also questions whether the Soviet Union itself, to say nothing of North Korea, favours the peaceful reunification of Korea under a truly representative form of government.

34. My Government would welcome the opportunity to participate in a meaningful debate which could lead to the reunification of Korea and to the establishment of peace and stability in that country and the surrounding area. However, the items submitted by Algeria and several other countries, and the draft resolutions circulated in conjunction with them, indicate that those countries which support North Korea wish to engage in the same polemics which have marked consideration of this issue in previous years. One would imagine that if they indeed wished to contribute constructively to the objectives of the United Nations in Korea, they would have presented new proposals to this Committee. Moreover, one would imagine that they would have urged North Korea to accept the competency of the United Nations in Korea—as the Republic of Korea has done—in order to attend these discussions and present their views directly to the Committee.

35. Instead, they have revived the same resolutions which have been rejected on many previous occasions by the overwhelming majority of members of this Committee. They have again sponsored a draft resolution calling for the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea [A/C.1/L.472 and Add.1]. They have submitted a draft resolution calling for the withdrawal of United Nations Forces from the Republic of Korea [A/C.1/L.470 and Add.1-2]. They have gone beyond that to demand explicitly that this Organization cease its efforts in behalf of a united, stable and peaceful Korea. My Government is confident that, as in the past, this Committee will reject these proposals which, as it is well aware, would bring to an end the constructive role of the United Nations in Korea.

36. We need only look back twenty years to see what could occur as the result of the withdrawal of the protective shield provided by the United Nations presence in Korea. But for the falsification of history and twisting of facts we witnessed here yesterday, I would not feel it necessary to review the events which brought about the legitimate and necessary role of this Organization in Korea. In the light of that incredible statement, however, I should like very briefly to recall some of those events.

37. Shortly after the withdrawal of United States troops from Korea in 1949 North Korea began a series of raids into the Republic of Korea with the purpose of introducing trained saboteurs into the territory of the Republic. In less than a year North Korea launched a massive, unprovoked surprise attack against the Republic of Korea. In response

to that attack troops placed under the United Nations command were sent to Korea at the request of the Government of the Republic of Korea.

38. After the fighting stopped in 1953 the bulk of the troops which had supported the Republic of Korea in defence of its territorial integrity and political independence were withdrawn. However, mindful of the need for protection against possible renewed aggression by North Korea, the Government of the Republic of Korea requested that some forces remain. Consequently, since the end of hostilities, a number of troops have remained in Korea for sixteen years.

39. These forces are in Korea at the invitation of the Republic of Korea. The presence of these troops is not imposed upon the Korean people, as some would have us believe. If the Republic of Korea wished these troops to withdraw, my Government for its part would quickly comply. The Governments of the other countries which are part of the United Nations command also have repeatedly affirmed their readiness, as stated in paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.471 and Add.1-2, "to withdraw their remaining forces from Korea whenever such action is requested by the Republic of Korea or whenever the conditions for a lasting settlement formulated by the General Assembly have been fulfilled."

40. We are amazed that yesterday the representative of the Soviet Union, of all representatives, had the effrontery to allege the presence of "foreign occupation troops" in Korea. Quite obviously, he does not grasp the great distinction between occupation and invitation.

41. We need only look at the latest report of the United Nations Command, circulated on 31 October of this year as Security Council document S/9493,³ to see why the presence of the United Nations forces in South Korea continues to be desired by the South Koreans themselves. That document, in reporting the most significant violations of the Military Armistice Agreements, is an indictment of the actions and policies of the North Korean régime.

42. I do not wish to take up more of my colleagues' time than is necessary, so I will not enumerate each of the serious incidents described in the report. One or two of those incidents are sufficient to demonstrate the continued need for the United Nations presence in Korea.

43. In March of this year, eight United Nations Command members were killed as the result of an attack from North Korean positions upon a work party that, in accordance with Armistice Agreement provisions, was in the process of replacing a Military Demarcation Line marker. Again in March, North Korean infiltrators landed on the east coast of the Republic of Korea, where they killed one Korean national policeman and attempted to kidnap another.

44. In June, Republic of Korea vessels off the southwestern coast of the Republic of Korea discovered a 75-ton, 150-foot boat which was attempting to pick up an agent from an off-shore island. Military and radar equipment was recovered from that boat. The United Nations Command

report lists many more, but even that list included only the most significant violations of the Armistice Agreements. Since the preparation of that report, the North Koreans have been responsible for additional acts of violence and provocation, including the ambushing and killing of four United Nations Command soldiers.

45. Those hostile acts of North Korea should make it evident to the members of this Committee that that régime is intent upon undermining the Republic of Korea and taking over the entire peninsula. Moreover, in word as well as in deed they have made that intention abundantly clear. Attempts, such as that to which we were treated yesterday, to hide the wolf under the sheep's clothing of an allegedly "innocent and peace-loving North Korea" can deceive no one. The representative of the Soviet Union said yesterday:

"The peace-loving socialist country, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, has never represented and does not now represent a danger for South Korea. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea officially declared . . . that consistent efforts are being made on its part for a peaceful settlement of the Korean question, and . . . it has . . . unequivocally made clear that it has no intention . . . of solving the problem of Korean unification by force of arms." [1684th meeting, para. 23.]

46. Kim Il-Sung has given us his own authoritative definition of a "peaceful solution". Last July, as already noted by the Korean Foreign Minister [*ibid.*, para. 65] he said, in effect, that the unification of Korea can be achieved only after the Government of the Republic of Korea is overthrown. That is indeed a strange definition of "peaceful reunification". Moreover, less than two weeks ago, speaking at a meeting in Pyongyang, Kim Il-Sung reiterated his "peaceful" formula—a formula for continued aggression, subversion and sabotage. He said:

"The main force of the revolution should rise up as one in the anti-United States national salvation struggle and raise a violent storm of revolution all over the southern land."

47. I submit that that is not a formula designed to achieve national salvation in Korea, but rather one which can lead only to national destruction and senseless human suffering. Such statements give the lie to assertions by the same régime that it respects the Charter of the United Nations. It is not hard to understand, therefore, why the Republic of Korea continues to request the presence of United Nations forces on its land.

48. During the period since the signing of the Military Armistice Agreements, the Republic of Korea, under the protection of the United Nations presence and in spite of continual incursions by North Korea, has been able to make remarkable progress in recovering from the effects of the war in the early 1950s. Economically, its rate of growth has been one of the highest for all the developing countries. Its *per capita* income is steadily rising. Politically, it has demonstrated a determination to pursue the purposes and principles set forth in the United Nations Charter. The Republic of Korea has a representative Government with an active political opposition. It has a free press and its citizens enjoy free speech.

³ *Ibid.*

49. When we view its role in international affairs, we see that the Republic of Korea participates constructively in the work of the specialized agencies of the United Nations. It has diplomatic and consular relations with over eighty countries, and in many cases assists those countries in their own economic development. Within East Asia the Republic of Korea co-operates with its partners and makes a welcome contribution to the economic and social growth of the region.

50. Moreover, the Republic of Korea is an independent nation which has shown the United Nations that it wishes to exist in peace, free from the threat of aggression. The achievements of the Republic of Korea have been made possible by the protection afforded that country by the United Nations.

51. There is, of course, one other objective for which the Korean people yearn: the peaceful unification of Korea. Regrettably, despite the serious and responsible efforts of UNCURK, that goal has not been achieved. The Commission, however, has noted in its most recent report that

“... the United Nations presence in the Republic of Korea remains an important factor in maintaining peace in the area. The Commission itself is ready to use its influence and facilities to bring about conditions which could lead to a peaceful settlement of this long-outstanding problem, and to effect the unification of the Korean people.” [A/7629, para. 89.]

We believe it imperative that the Commission continue to work towards those important objectives.

52. For all these reasons the United States delegation has joined with eighteen others in co-sponsoring the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.471 and Add.1-2, which reaffirms the important objectives of the United Nations in Korea, and which would enable UNCURK to continue its efforts to unite the Korean people. We urge members to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/L.471 and Add.1-2.

53. At the same time, we urge the Committee to reject draft resolutions A/C.1/L.470 and Add.1-2 and A/C.1/L.472 and Add.1—proposals of that small, mechanical minority which annually seeks to end the United Nations constructive role in Korea.

54. I would conclude with this thought. The issue in Korea is real and important. It is not a remote issue on some distant planet. Korea, my fellow representatives, is a part of our world, and the world has become a very small place. As the President of Cameroon said in his recent address to the General Assembly, “The unity of man’s destiny is today more concrete and more evident than ever before. For the first time in history, mankind is consciously becoming a unified whole.” [1780th plenary meeting, para. 31.]

55. The Korean people’s destiny and ours—and that of the United Nations—are bound up together. When aggression occurred in Korea nineteen years ago, it is to the everlasting honour of the United Nations that we did not pass by on the other side of the street. Through three years of war and

sixteen years of armistice, we have been faithful to our charge. The immediate prospects for a solution may be far from bright. But let us not grow weary in a good cause. Let us faithfully pursue it until it can at last be fulfilled.

56. Mr. SUKATI (Swaziland): So much has been said on this question of Korea over the twenty years or so that I understand the matter has been before this Organization that even newcomers such as my delegation have read and learned a lot from the older Members. As a new man in the United Nations, I am grateful for the information that some of the older Members, representatives of Western European as well as communist countries, have provided during the course of the debate, last year as well as this year. At this stage let me make it absolutely clear that none of the older Members has particularly come to me to persuade me one way or the other. I have listened to the substance of the addresses of each of those Member States and have been convinced by the facts, bearing in mind, of course, our unswerving loyalty to the United Nations, and I have made up my mind as to which side adheres to the Charter of the United Nations.

57. I must say that I was disappointed with one of the statements made in this very Committee on 29 October, whilst the matter of the invitation aspect was being discussed, when a speaker appeared to condemn the very Organization of which his country is a Member. That particular Member averred in his statement that the younger Members of the United Nations were being misguided by the Commission of the United Nations that had been appointed to investigate and report on the unification and rehabilitation of Korea. To me it would appear that the Member was criticizing himself, if he was not being disloyal to the United Nations which had appointed the Commission. My delegation maintains that if the Commission has not produced the desired results, it should be told so in a proper manner.

58. That brings me to another question which has disturbed my mind since my country joined this Organization and I became its representative. I have wondered why the Members of this Organization will not take collective responsibility on any decision or resolution that has been adopted by the Organization, even when that decision or resolution has been adopted at the highest level, the plenary meeting of the General Assembly. My delegation contends that it should be the responsibility of each and every Member State whose loyalty to the United Nations should be unquestioned, to respect the decisions of this world body.

59. It was pointed out by another Member that no self-respecting Government would agree to being subjected to such treatment as to require it to subscribe to and respect the provisions of the United Nations Charter. Why is that Member here? Does he mean to tell the Organization that his country is not self-respecting? The view of my delegation is that a State that seeks admission into the world body should first show that it recognizes the competence and authority of the United Nations and subscribes to and respects the provisions of its Charter.

60. Now let me deal with the substantive question of Korea and its unification and rehabilitation. The statements

that have been made to this Committee, the reports of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, the documents before us and the positions reflected in the different draft resolutions submitted have all exhaustively, though divergently, contributed to placing the true facts of the question at the disposal of the members of this Committee. Therefore the delegation of Swaziland will limit itself to some observations which in its view deserve to be underlined, if only to support the more exhaustive ones which have been made by the speakers who preceded me.

61. In our objective opinion, it has been determined by the various speakers before me that: first, on the part of the Republic of Korea there is a sincere desire for the unification of its divided land through peaceful means and under the auspices of the United Nations; secondly, on the part of the North Korean régime, there is characteristic obstruction to the fulfilment of the United Nations objective in Korea. Those are the conclusions which my delegation has reached. It will therefore be on the basis of those conclusions that my delegation will continue its statement on the question which is before us.

62. In regard to the peaceful settlement by which the United Nations hopes to see the unification of Korea realized, it will be recalled that the United Nations has been advocating free popular consultation in accordance with democratic principles for the whole of the Korean territory. It is also known to all of us that the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea having been refused entry to North Korea, those general elections had to be held only in the southern half of Korea, giving birth to the Republic of Korea, which in 1948 the United Nations recognized as the only legitimate Government in Korea.

63. At about the same time another régime, emerging from electoral consultations which could not deceitfully escape criticism, was set up in North Korea, which first engaged in armed aggression against the Republic of Korea and subsequently against the United Nations itself. After three long years of hostility, in July 1953 an Armistice Agreement⁴ was signed. One year later a political conference was held in Geneva. The conference adopted measures leading to the peaceful settlement of the Korean problem on the basis of free elections under international control for proportional legislative representation of the indigenous population.

64. Of course the North Korean régime rejected these measures which had been approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1954 [*resolution 811 (IX)*]. Since then these objectives have remained the fundamental course of action of the United Nations, and have been re-affirmed many times with reference to the unification of Korea.

65. The North Korean leaders have openly declared that their régime will never recognize and will firmly reject any and all United Nations resolutions on Korea. In doing so, the North Korean régime challenged the competence and authority of the United Nations. Moreover, the régime in

North Korea went even further and challenged the world Organization as a symbol of peace and security. That is the situation in which North Korea stands vis-à-vis the United Nations.

66. The report presented by the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea is most eloquent in this regard. In the opinion of my delegation there can be no capitulation on the part of our Organization. It is indeed the duty of the General Assembly to remain faithful to its principles and to comply with the consequences of its decisions. That is why my delegation encourages the United Nations to continue to protect the Republic of Korea against any possible new aggression. The world Organization must only assist Korea in finding its national unity along peaceful lines. That is one of the overriding duties of the United Nations with respect to the Republic of Korea, which has accepted the competence and authority of the United Nations and has rendered its full co-operation to the United Nations in its efforts to achieve peaceful unification of Korea.

67. The demand of the North Korean régime that the United Nations Forces should be withdrawn from the Republic of Korea is designed to make the Republic vulnerable to a new aggression. These Forces must continue their mission in Korea until such time as the objectives laid down by the United Nations have been attained. As a matter of fact, that is the ardent wish of the people of Korea.

68. As shown in the memorandum presented by the Republic of Korea [*A/C.1/1985 and Corr.1*], it is enjoying diplomatic relations with a great number of countries; it is a signatory to numerous international treaties and conventions; it is a member of an important number of specialized agencies of the United Nations and participates in a large number of inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations. In strengthening domestically its democratic foundations, the Republic of Korea has embarked upon a free and competitive economic reconstruction of its country.

69. My delegation considers, therefore, that the United Nations has a duty to continue its noble mission, which must result in the unification and rehabilitation of Korea. The achievement of a united Korea which would be independent and democratic would contribute to the maintenance of peace and security not only in that region but also throughout the rest of the world. Moreover, the reunification of Korea would safeguard the sacred principles of the world Organization. Therefore, the action of the United Nations Commission should be encouraged, and accordingly my delegation unreservedly supports the continued efforts of the Commission in Korea. Those are the considerations which will guide our position on the various draft resolutions before the Committee.

70. The CHAIRMAN: There are no other names on the list of speakers for this afternoon.

Organization of work

71. The CHAIRMAN: I should now like to draw the attention of the Committee to document A/C.1/1984, which contains the decision taken by the Committee at its 1651st

⁴ *Ibid.*, Eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1953, document S/3079, appendix A.

meeting on 10 October 1969, concerning organization of work. The last paragraph of that document reads as follows:

“In grouping together the four agenda items relating to disarmament, it was understood that the procedure and priorities for the consideration of these items would be decided upon by the Committee at a later stage in the light of further consultations.”

72. Pursuant to the Committee's decision, I have held consultations concerning the procedure and priorities for the consideration of the four agenda items relating to disarmament, listed under the fifth heading. On the basis of the views expressed during the consultations, I should like to propose for the consideration of the Committee that the disarmament items be dealt with as follows.

73. First, that the general debate on all the four items be held simultaneously. Each delegation in its general debate statement will be free to refer to all the items or to any one or more of them. Also any delegation which does not wish to cover all the items in a single statement will be entitled to take the floor more than once.

74. Second, upon the conclusion of the general debate the Committee, unless it decides otherwise, will take up for consideration the draft resolutions relating to the various items in the following order: agenda item 29: Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

75. Agenda item 104: Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: (a) report of the Conference of

the Committee on Disarmament; (b) conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons and on the destruction of such weapons; (c) report of the Secretary-General.

76. Agenda item 30: Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament.

77. Agenda item 31: Conference of Non-Nuclear Weapon States: (a) implementation of the results of the Conference: report of the Secretary-General; (b) establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control: report of the Secretary-General; (c) contributions of nuclear technology to the economic and scientific advancement of the developing countries: report of the Secretary-General.

78. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee approves my proposal.

It was so decided.

79. The CHAIRMAN: I would remind the Committee that the list of speakers in the general debate on the Korean item will be closed at 12 noon tomorrow, Thursday. There are only five speakers listed for tomorrow. Accordingly, there will be only one meeting, and that will be in the afternoon at 3 o'clock.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.