



UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.2029  
25 November 1974

ENGLISH

Twenty-ninth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Monday, 25 November 1974, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS (Argentina)  
Rapporteur: Mr. COSTA LOBO (Portugal)

- Question of Korea /104/
- (a) Withdrawal of all the foreign troops stationed in South Korea under the flag of the United Nations
  - (b) Urgent need to implement fully the consensus of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly on the Korean question and to maintain peace and security on the Korean peninsula

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be distributed as soon as possible.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent in quadruplicate within three working days to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, Room LX-2332, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

AS THE RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 26 NOVEMBER 1974, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 2 DECEMBER 1974.

The cooperation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

74-71258

292

## AGENDA ITEM 104

## QUESTION OF KOREA

- (a) WITHDRAWAL OF ALL THE FOREIGN TROOPS STATIONED IN SOUTH KOREA UNDER THE FLAG OF THE UNITED NATIONS
- (b) URGENT NEED TO IMPLEMENT FULLY THE CONSENSUS OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON THE KOREAN QUESTION AND TO MAINTAIN PEACE AND SECURITY ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

(A/9703/Add.1-3, A/9741/Add.1-5 and Corr.1; A/C.1/1048, 1049/Add.1: A/C.1/L.676, L.677).

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Today we start, in accordance with the calendar established by the Committee with the consideration of the question of Korea; that is to say, agenda item 104. Representatives will recall that the First Committee unanimously decided at its 1987th meeting on 25 September 1974, in organizing the work for the present session, to invite the delegations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea to participate in the debate on the question of Korea without the right to vote.

In accordance with the First Committee's decision, the Secretary-General addressed separate invitations to both Governments, informing them of the decision taken and requesting them to transmit to him the names of the representatives who would participate in the consideration of this question. On 2 October 1974, the Secretary-General received a communication from the Permanent Observer of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations informing him that his Government would be represented in the discussions on the question of Korea by its Minister for Foreign Affairs. On 4 November, the Secretary-General received a communication from the Permanent Observer of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea informing him that, on behalf of his Government, a delegation would attend to participate in the discussion of the same question.

(The Chairman)

At our meeting on Friday, 22 November, the 2027th meeting, the First Committee decided, after a request for postponement of the debate, that in view of an agreement between the parties which sponsored the two draft resolutions it would meet today only to hear the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and that it would meet tomorrow afternoon, Tuesday, to hear only the representative of the Republic of Korea.

I wish to inform the Committee that this morning the Permanent Observer of the Republic of Korea informed me that, due to unforeseen last-minute circumstances, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, who was to have addressed the Committee tomorrow, will be unable to do so.

(The Chairman)

At the same time, noting the agreement reached by the Committee, I said to the observer of the Republic of Korea that it was the privilege of any delegation to refrain from speaking, but that because of the commitment that had been made he would not now be able to speak until after the conclusion of consideration of the question of Cambodia in the plenary Assembly, that is to say, when the First Committee had decided to take up again the question of Korea. I believe that this is the correct solution because, as I said, the agreement of the First Committee was as I have indicated. Accordingly, the delegation of the Republic of Korea has inscribed its name to speak only after the conclusion of consideration of the question of Cambodia in the plenary Assembly and when the First Committee resumes consideration of the question of Korea.

I thought it necessary to inform the members of the Committee of this situation so that there would not be any misunderstanding of these last-minute arrangements.

In accordance with the decision taken by the First Committee, I now invite the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the Republic of Korea to take their seats in the places specially reserved for them in the conference room.

At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Li Jong Mok, representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and Mr. Tong Jim Park, representative of the Republic of Korea, took places at the Committee table.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call upon the representative of Algeria, who has asked to speak on a point of order.

Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (interpretation from French): We listened most attentively to what you have just announced, Mr. Chairman, in regard to the organization of the work of the First Committee and the debate on the question of Korea. I understand perfectly the difficulties which have been pointed out to you by the delegation of South Korea, which prevent that delegation from addressing the Committee, as scheduled, at its meeting tomorrow. As you have recalled, Sir, the organization of the work of this Committee has been the subject of lengthy discussions, which ended with a compromise which the First Committee adopted without objection, but I feel bound to remind the members

(Mr. Rahal, Algeria)

of the Committee that, taking into account the physical difficulties, which I explained at length, arising out of the impossibility of my delegation and many others of following simultaneously two important debates, one in the plenary Assembly and the other in the First Committee, I did request, through you, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of all the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.677, the postponement of the debate on the question of Korea until the end of the debate in the plenary Assembly on the question of Cambodia.

In so doing I had, of course, counted on the courtesy, first of all, of the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676, on the understanding and courtesy of the delegation of South Korea and on the courtesy and understanding of all my colleagues in the First Committee. It was clearly understood that the postponement requested by my delegation should not introduce a political element into the debate and the request for postponement which I formulated on behalf of all the sponsors of our draft resolution could not be understood as a manoeuvre that might affect the results of our debates.

I regret to note that the courtesy which I had expected has not been manifested, at least on the part of some of those whom I have just mentioned. I regret that we have had to negotiate between two groups of sponsors and have with difficulty arrived at a compromise on the arrangements for our work which does not wholly take into account the natural difficulties I have mentioned. That is what I wished to say to the members of the First Committee, but not because it is my intention to evince the same lack of understanding in regard to the request of the delegation of South Korea. Our group of sponsors will give proof of a courtesy which it has not received, and that is why we have no objection to postponing the South Korean delegation's turn to speak until we resume that discussion on the question of Korea.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The new situation that has just been created in the First Committee as a result of the inability of the delegation of South Korea to speak in the Committee tomorrow as had been agreed, has produced certain complications for a number of delegations. You are quite correct, Mr. Chairman, in pointing out that each delegation has the right in the Assembly or in any body of the United Nations to refrain from speaking at a time agreed to earlier. However, each

EH/lc

A/C.1/PV.2029  
8.10

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

delegation is bound to respect the decision that has been reached by any given organ of the United Nations --- in this instance the First Committee. A considerable amount of work has been done between the representatives of two groups of sponsors and a certain compromise has been reached on the basis of mutual consent. It was agreed that today we would hear the delegation of North Korea and tomorrow we would hear the delegation of South Korea.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

delegations had planned their own work accordingly, in the light of forthcoming discussion in the plenary Assembly of the second question, and this compromise, this plan of work, had been approved by the First Committee on Friday without any objection.

The delegation of the Republic of Korea was familiar with all this. Moreover it was informed of the plan of work of the First Committee and, within that plan, the discussion of the question of Korea was to take place on a specific date, so the delegation had every opportunity to prepare itself for that. Therefore the statement of that delegation which we have heard through you, sir, is most surprising to members of the Committee. This being so, it would be desirable for the delegation of South Korea to find a way out of the situation in order not to complicate the work of the First Committee, create difficulties for the delegations taking part in the work of the First Committee and protract discussion of this question. That is how the matter stands.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I believe it is necessary to mention in connexion with this matter, which I referred to in my statement and which has been taken up by the delegations of Algeria and the Soviet Union, that before we started our meeting today I informed the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of the situation so as to give it the same opportunity -- that is, to refrain from speaking today if that delegation deemed it appropriate. I am informing the First Committee of this because I believe that your Chairman, like Caesar's wife, must not only be above reproach but must be seen to be above reproach.

I now call with great pleasure on His Excellency Li Jong Mok, Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

I call on the representative of China on a point of order.

Mr. HUANG (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation fully supports the proposal just put forward by the representative of Algeria that, since the representative of South Korea cannot comply with the agreement originally reached that he should speak tomorrow, then the debate on the Korean question in this Committee should be delayed until the discussion on the question of Cambodia has been concluded in the plenary Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): May I draw the attention of the representative of China to the fact that the representative of Algeria did not make that motion. On the contrary, if I understood correctly what he said, it was that the group of sponsors of their draft resolution would extend us the courtesy of abiding by the compromise which had been reached. If the representative of Algeria expressed himself otherwise I hope he will correct me, but I did not hear him propose suspension of the debate.

I see that the representative of Algeria confirms that I understood correctly what he said. Accordingly, I now intend to call on the Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

I see that several representatives are asking to speak on a point of order. I shall call on them in the order in which I have seen them, beginning with the representative of Liberia.

Mr. DOSUMU-JIHNSON (Liberia): You will observe, Mr. Chairman, that I have tried to refrain from expressing my view in this Committee for some time now, but I am constrained to do so this morning in view of the position that is about to be taken. It would appear that the United Nations is being made a joke because we feel that we have the majority to carry our line through. We come here and just make everybody look like an idiot. When we left here on Friday the position was known and it was agreed that we come here this morning and hear the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, and that is all we must do today, at the instance of the representative of Algeria. Then on Tuesday we come here and hear the representative of the Republic of Korea. This we understood and this we went away. And now for gentlemen to come here this morning and begin to harangue something else is beyond my comprehension.



(Mr. Dosumu-Johnson, Liberia)

Let us not break up this Organization. Because the type of thing you see going on now is what has been responsible for the break-up of the All African Peoples' Conference; this sort of thing is responsible for making the Afro-Asian Solidarity Peoples' Conference moribund, and this will be responsible for the break-up of the Organization of African Unity. And, if I am not speaking too soon, I say it will be laying the foundations for the disintegration of the United Nations.

When you have given a ruling, Mr. Chairman, and everyone has acquiesced, please let us stick to that. Then people will respect you as Chairman and I will respect the members of this Committee as men of substance and worth.

The CHAIRMAN (intepretation from Spanish): Before calling on the next sneaker who has asked to speak on a point of order, I should like to make it perfectly clear for the benefit of the representative of Liberia that there was an agreement which was adopted unanimously by the Committee. By virtue of that agreement, as he pointed out, we were this morning to hear exclusively the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and tomorrow afternoon the representative of the Republic of Korea. If one of the two speakers does not consider it possible to speak, whatever circumstances may prevent him, we cannot force him to speak. In that case, the only thing we can do -- and this is what I have done -- is to give the other side exactly the same opportunity: that is, also to refrain from speaking if he considers that to be in accordance with his interests.

The representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has said that he is prepared to speak this morning. May I appeal to delegations which have asked to speak on a point of order that we abide by this. In other words, if in any way the commitment agreed to is not followed, let us at least respect the wish of the one who has expressed a desire to address the Committee this morning. As your Chairman sees it, the way to implement the rest of the agreement is by allowing the delegation which refrains from speaking on the date appointed to speak only when the General Assembly concludes its consideration of the question of Cambodia, and not before.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): I abide by your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I have nothing further to add.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): This looks like a storm in a teacup. I, like many others, want a personal assurance that we shall not discuss the question of Korea and the question of Cambodia simultaneously. It so happens that many in this Committee and in the General Assembly face the same problem. It so happens that I have to handle both questions. I cannot split myself between here and the General Assembly. And I believe I am speaking for many other delegations.

Alternating is not so easy either. When one is concentrating on one question and trying to research certain documents, one is called to deal with the other subject. Although they are both in the same geographical area, they are two different items. I should therefore appreciate the Chairman's assurance.

After all, agreements are not sacrosanct, they are subject to certain modifications. It is true that you, Mr. Chairman, asked the members whether they would abide by the agreement and representatives said they would. But now, Monday morning, we find that the situation has changed somewhat.

I agree with my colleague from Tunisia to abide by your ruling -- if one wants to call it a ruling -- or suggestion. But before we proceed, we would like to have the assurance that we will not alternate -- one meeting in the plenary Assembly on Cambodia and one here on Korea. What would happen to us? We would receive scattered training. We are not like you, Mr. Chairman, able to compartmentalize our substance and move from one subject to another.

That is my problem, Mr. Chairman, and if you do not resolve it, I protest.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The understanding of the representative of Saudi Arabia is perfectly correct. This morning we shall hear the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, we shall then adjourn and will not resume consideration of the question of Korea until the question of Cambodia has been completed in the plenary Assembly.

Mr. WILFRED RANSLEY (Portugal): The delegation of Portugal had indicated its intention to speak on a point of order at that stage in the debate when there was obviously a misunderstanding of the statement of the delegation of Algeria. Mr. Chairman, we are happy that your interpretation of the Algerian statement clarifies the situation -- as it in fact was. For our understanding of the Algerian statement was not that the representative of Algeria was making a permanent point of order, insisting on the decision taken at our meeting last Friday by the Experts which had concerned the draft of the Statute.

(Mr. Waldron-Ramsey, Barbados)

That being the case, my delegation feels -- and here we agree with the representative of Saudi Arabia -- that the understanding of our procedure must go forward in such a manner as to avoid any clash between this debate on the question of Korea and the one on the question of Cambodia. That is our understanding of the situation and we are happy with it.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In the interest of clarity I shall repeat once more that the First Committee will not deal with the question of Korea again until after the plenary Assembly has completed its consideration of the question of Cambodia.

Mr. HUA (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The statement I made a few minutes ago was misunderstood. What I meant was that since this Committee had already taken a procedural decision on the Korean question, the representative of north Korea automatically gave up his right to speak tomorrow. For that reason I agree with the proposal of the Algerian representative. In other words after the statement by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea we should suspend temporarily our consideration of the Korean question -- until after the plenary Assembly has completed its consideration of the question of Cambodia, after which we will resume our consideration of the question of Korea.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The understanding of the representative of China is correct.

Since no other representative wishes to speak on the procedural question of Korea, I now call on the Vice-Minister of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to make a statement.

Mr. HUA (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has the honour to inform the members of the plenary Assembly of the fact that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has accepted the decision of the plenary Assembly of the General Assembly of the United Nations regarding the suspension of the consideration of the Korean question until after the plenary Assembly has completed its consideration of the question of Cambodia.

(Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic  
People's Republic of Korea)

First of all, allow me to express my deep thanks to you, Mr. Chairman and representatives of various countries, for your positive co-operation to enable the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in this session, and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the President of the United Nations General Assembly and other United Nations officials concerned, who have facilitated our work and activities.

I also express my thanks to the representatives of various countries who have expressed support for our people's cause of national reunification during the general debate at this session of the General Assembly.

It is at this place that the question of Korea was discussed in 1972 in the presence of the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for the first time in United Nations history and a decision was adopted to dissolve immediately the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, expressing the hope that the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea would be accelerated in accordance with the principles of the 4 July North-South Joint Statement.

That positive measure removed one of the obstacles to the reunification of Korea. But the question of withdrawing all foreign troops from South Korea -- the main obstacle to the reunification of Korea -- still remains unsolved. The withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea is a prerequisite for the termination of foreign interference in the internal affairs of our country and for the peaceful solution of the question of Korean reunification, and is one of the most urgent questions for securing a durable peace in Asia.

The socialist countries, Asian and African countries -- 30 in all -- have submitted to the twenty-ninth session of the United Nations General Assembly an agenda item and a draft resolution on the withdrawal of all foreign troops stationed in South Korea under the flag of the United Nations. We fully support that as a just draft resolution which reflects the will and desire of the Korean people and the peace-loving peoples of the world and, at the same time, we express our profound thanks to the 30 sponsors of that agenda item and draft resolution.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea deems it high time that the United Nations withdraw all foreign troops stationed in South Korea under the flag of the United Nations.

(Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic  
People's Republic of Korea)

The United States has been occupying half of our land for nearly 30 years.

The Korean people cannot indefinitely tolerate the continuation of this tragic reality in which the sovereignty and dignity of the nation is trampled underfoot with half of their country occupied.

Our nation remains divided, still failing in reunification, owing to the continued occupation of South Korea by the United States troops, carrying the United Nations flag with them.

Because of the United States troops' occupation of South Korea, tension has not been removed in Korea and peace is constantly menaced in the Far East and Asia.

United States troops have killed a great number of our people in cold blood and reduced the whole country to ashes in the Korean war, and they have kept Korea divided for 30 years, imposing immeasurable national misfortunes and sufferings on our people. But the United States has again submitted to this session a draft resolution against the withdrawal of United States troops from South Korea.

The joint draft resolution of 27 countries initiated by the United States is aimed at obstructing by all means the discussion of the question of the withdrawal of all the foreign troops from South Korea at the current session of the United Nations General Assembly, with a view to realizing the permanent occupation of South Korea by United States troops against the unanimous will of the entire Korean people and all the peace-loving peoples of the world, who demand the withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea.

I once again appeal to those attending this session who have a national conscience and who treasure justice and peace resolutely to oppose this attempt of the United States and join us in the efforts for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea.

The insistence of the United States on keeping its troops in South Korea is aimed at aggression and maintaining its neo-colonial domination over South Korea. It cannot be interpreted otherwise.

(Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic  
People's Republic of Korea)

Today the United States keeps more than 38,000 troops in South Korea, according to its own official announcement, who are equipped with up-to-date weapons including atomic weapons and guided missiles.

The United States, loudly talking about its "peace policy" and international détente claims that it solves problems with many countries in a peaceful way. If so, why does it insist on maintaining its military bases and huge armed forces in South Korea? If the United States truly wants peace and has no intention of reinvading the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, why does it need its military bases and armed forces in South Korea?

That the insistence of the United States on the indefinite presence of its troops in South Korea is aimed at aggression and colonial domination is clearly substantiated, first of all, by the fact that it has been preparing for a war instead of securing peace, aggravating tension instead of easing it and undermining the dialogue between the North and the South of Korea instead of working for its success.

As fully established once more by the former Captain La Focque of the United States Seventh Fleet in his recent testimony before the United States Congress Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the United States has not only brought in and stockpiled in South Korea nuclear warheads and weapons capable of launching them, but has also deployed atomic weapons up to the forward area along the Demilitarized Zone and has staged test-firing provocative exercises on many occasions.

Last July, even the ground reserve forces of the United States army based in Hawaii were "swiftly airlifted" to South Korea to stage war exercises in preparation to meet a real war.

The United States, together with the bellicose elements of South Korea, have ceaselessly conducted all sorts of war exercises, including combat training and "civil anti-air-raid drills", and have committed frequent military provocations against the northern half of the Republic.

The United States side committed more than 17,000 violations of the Armistice Agreement against our side along the Military Demarcation Line from January to October this year.

(Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic  
People's Republic of Korea)

Can you believe that all this is really intended for defending peace and easing tension?

The United States intention to continue to keep its troops in South Korea is not for peace but solely for aggression; that is clearly shown by the fact that it still does not even give any answer to our proposal on concluding a peace agreement to remove the state of confrontation between the North and the South and to achieve a durable peace in our country. Why does the United States turn its face away from our proposal for replacing the Armistice Agreement with a peace agreement?

It is said, as all representatives are aware, that the present era is an era advancing towards peace. Then why does the United States doggedly oppose our demand that a peace agreement be concluded, that all foreign troops pull out of South Korea, and that the Korean people be left to solve the question of Korean reunification by themselves, and why does it only insist that its troops should remain in South Korea? What is this, if it is not a design for aggression?

The fact that the United States has only an aggressive aim in Korea can also be clearly seen in its stand on the dialogue between the North and the South.

When the dialogue was under way between the North and the South, the United States stirred up an atmosphere of war, not an atmosphere of peace it continued to provide the South Korean authorities with weapons, and to egg them on to confrontation instead of dialogue, saying that South Korea should get the upper hand in strength. Is this helpful to the dialogue? Is it not an act of fishing in troubled waters to set the South Korean bellicose elements to fight their fellow Koreans?



(Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic  
People's Republic of Korea)

The twenty-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly expressed the hope that the question of our country's reunification would be solved peacefully through dialogue between the North and the South; but the United States perpetrates such acts as these in contrast to the lip service it pays in support of the dialogue. That is an open expression of its stereotyped, double-dealing tactics.

It is precisely because of such acts of aggression and intervention by the United States that the South Korean authorities betray in their deeds the three principles of independence, peaceful reunification and great national unity agreed in the North-South Joint Statement. They resort to double-faced tactics and, while ostensibly giving lip service in favour of reunification, divide our country in its reliance on outside forces, step up war preparations against us, and completely rupture the dialogue.

The persistence of the United States in maintaining its troops in South Korea is, in the long run, no more than the revelation of its desire to take a firmer hold on South Korea as its most important stronghold for Asian aggression, in view of the fact that it is now being driven out of many places in Asia.

Their design is to take over one half of the Korean territory for ever, and launch another aggressive war against our Republic in league with the South Korean reactionaries.

The United States is using the so-called "threat of southward aggression" as a pretext to justify its policy of aggression and war against Korea. But that is ridiculous logic. At present, South Korea has a regular army 700,000 strong, and a "homeland reserve army" of 2.5 million, which, when put together, constitute a huge armed force 3.2 million strong.

In recent years the United States has poured into South Korea a fabulous sum of military aid amounting to \$1,500 million for 'modernization of the ROK army'.

South Korea has more armed forces than we do: its population is double that of ours. That being the case, who is threatened: we, or South Korea? That is clear even to a three-year-old child. What constitutes the actual danger in Korea today is not the "threat of southward aggression" from the North but the threat of northward aggression from the South. There is no need for further argument about that.

(Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic  
People's Republic of Korea)

Recently, the South Korean authorities have invented all kinds of heinous plots, frequently to give support in every way to their made-up story of the fictitious "threat of southward aggression".

After committing a grave military provocation by firing hundreds of rounds of shells and bullets into our side in the demilitarized zone on the western sector of the front some time ago, they rigged up the case of an "underground tunnel", allegedly built by our side, only to kick up a frenzied racket against our Republic.

However, the South Korean authorities' habitual fraud and deceit in successively staging preposterous, tricky farces -- all intended to shift the responsibility on to us -- is so widely known to the world that they can deceive no one.

Both Bennett and Michaels, former commanders-in-chief of the United Nations forces, testified that South Korea was "superior to North Korea" in the "size of armed forces" and that South Korea "can deter the war capacity of North Korea".

Though South Korea has a larger army and a bigger population than we do, they say that the United States troops cannot pull out of South Korea because of the "threat of southward aggression". That is, indeed, the act of a thief who turns on the master with a club.

Moreover, the Government of our Republic has stated on every occasion that it has no intention of solving the question of the country's reunification by means of war.

That is why unbiased world public opinion is now unanimous in exposing the fact that the so-called "threat of southward aggression" clamoured about by the United States is "an unrealistic and unconvincing pretext". It is precisely with a view to achieving its aggressive aim of reducing South Korea to the status of a permanent colony and military base that the United States maintains and zealously supports the repressive fascist system in South Korea.

(Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic  
People's Republic of Korea)

That is proved by the statement of the United States Secretary of State before the United States House Appropriations Committee on 24 July last when he said that despite the violations of human rights and the repressive policy in South Korea, the United States Government had

"... decided to continue economic and military aid to South Korea for security in Asia".

What does the United States mean by "security in Asia"? That is balderdash, showing the intention of the United States to play the role of world policeman. It only reveals the outdated, imperialistic and wild ambition of aggression of the United States, which wants to send its troops anywhere at will to commit aggression. It has been proved more glaringly by Mr. Ford, who went to South Korea a few days ago after having been sworn in as the new President of the United States, only to express open support for the South Korean authorities in the preparations for war, by declaring that the United States "had no plan" to withdraw its troops from South Korea; that the American troops and the South Korean forces must "maintain a high degree of strength and readiness"; that the United States would render "prompt and effective assistance" to South Korea in case a war broke out, accelerate the "modernization programme for the ROK army" and "render support" to the further development of war industries of South Korea; and so on.

Mr. Ford's trip to South Korea was, indeed, a trip for war expansion and aggression, which unreservedly revealed his true colours as a warmonger who gives off the smell of gun-powder, and the unchanged ambition of the United States for aggression.

"Mister" Ford went to see "Mister" Park Jung Hi to take him protectively under his wing at a time when the youth, students and patriotic people of all strata in South Korea were waging a fierce, massive anti-"government" struggle under the slogans of "Park Jung Hi, resign!" and "Away with the dictatorial régime!" This is an intolerable insult to the South Korean people and a challenge to the entire Korean people and the peace-loving peoples of the world.

The South Korean people have again embarked courageously on the road of struggle, unable to live any longer under the fascist suppression of the South Korean authorities.

(Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea)

Patriotic young people, students, and people all across South Korea, including the students of all universities and colleges in Seoul, have been waging a fierce anti-government struggle again for more than two months since last September.

Those who are fighting in South Korea in demand of the right to existence, freedom, democracy and the reunification of the country include not only the young people and students but also the workers who languish in their extreme deprivation of rights and hardships of life, the religious believers who are deprived of their freedom of religion, the journalists whose freedom of speech is suppressed, and the conscientious democratic figures in opposition.

This patently shows that if United States troops had not protected the present South Korean authorities with their bayonets, the South Korean people would have already overthrown the fascist rule and achieved a democratic society long ago and, accordingly, much progress would have been made in the cause of accelerating the peaceful reunification of Korea.

Is it not an act of aggression and interference in another's internal affairs that the United States protects and encourages the anti-popular, fascist dictatorial régime at the point of the bayonet in total violation of the will of the Korean people? What is worse is that the United States is now bringing into South Korea all the weapons and armed forces which it has been forced to remove from other parts of Asia.

The United States has introduced into South Korea up-to-date heavy weapons and military equipment evacuated from South Vietnam, moved its tactical air force into South Korea from Japan, and brought into South Korea the fighter-bomber units withdrawn from Thailand.

The United States seems to think that it can do anything it likes in South Korea, although it is compelled to get out of other parts of Asia. This is to hold our Korean nation in the worst context, which stirs our national indignation.

Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea

While engaging in all acts of aggression and war in Korea in this way, the United States claims before the people of the world that it respects sovereignty and is running from one place to another for what it calls peace. How hypocritical and deceptive it is.

The United States has occupied another country for 30 years, abusing the United Nations flag. This is enough. It is high time it got out of there. Today there is no ground or pretext whatsoever for United States troops to remain in South Korea. By origin, the occupation of South Korea by United States troops under the United Nations flag is an act of aggression in flagrant violation of publicly recognized principles of international law relating to respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty and non-interference in another's internal affairs.

The United States has so far used the United Nations resolution as a pretext for legalizing the occupation of South Korea by United States troops. But this United Nations resolution was unwarrantedly fabricated in violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter at a time when the United States had a firm hand on the United Nations in the early 1950s before the admission of the majority of the present third world nations into the United Nations.

The presence of United States troops in South Korea still today, when more than 20 years have passed since the realization of the armistice in Korea, is a violation of the Korean Armistice Agreement, which envisages the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea after the cease-fire. It also runs completely counter to the principles of the North-South Joint Statement, which provides for reunifying the country independently without the interference of any outside military forces.

Finding it more and more difficult to keep its troops in South Korea under the name of the United Nations forces, the United States has now gone the length of putting about, as its last resort, the sophistry that United States troops would not pull out of South Korea even if the United Nations General Assembly were to adopt a resolution on the withdrawal of United Nations forces, because United States troops now are not United Nations forces but forces stationed in South Korea under the ROK-US mutual defence pact.

(Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea)

It was at this forum of the United Nations that United States representatives in the past always maintained that United States troops stationed in South Korea could not withdraw from there without a United Nations resolution as they were United Nations forces. But now they say that United States troops are not United Nations forces but troops stationed there under what they call the "pact" concluded with South Korea. This is to despise and flout United Nations Member States and world public opinion.

This sophism, which can convince nobody, only serves to fully reveal the brazen-faced nature of the United States. The so-called ROK-US mutual defence pact is an illegal document which the United States faked with the traitorous forces of South Korea in an attempt to justify the permanent occupation of South Korea by United States troops, in direct violation of the Korean Armistice Agreement immediately following on its signature. The Korean people do not recognize it. The United States now tries to justify its troops' occupation of South Korea by what it calls the "pact" concluded with the traitorous forces of South Korea, when it cannot justify it even in the name of the United Nations. This only helps to reveal that United States troops have no pretext whatsoever to remain in South Korea any longer.

(Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea)

Now it is not only an urgent requirement of the development of the situation in our country but also an irresistible demand of the times that United States troops be withdrawn from South Korea.

Ours is an era when imperialism is going to ruin and socialism and national liberation revolution are emerging victorious.

Hundreds of millions of people in Asia, Africa and Latin America which were subjected to humiliation and oppression in the past have now cast off the cursed colonial yoke and emerged on the scene of history as its master, defending their national dignity and sovereignty and energetically hewing out their destiny for themselves under the uplifted banner of independence.

Today, no nation, except a handful of traitorous forces such as the South Korean rulers, wants to live shackled to others or to allow others to trample underfoot its national dignity.

The Fourth Summit Conference of Non Aligned States, held in Algeria last year, in which the Heads of State or Government from over 80 countries of the world participated unanimously adopted a resolution calling for the withdrawal of all foreign troops stationed in South Korea and the termination of all forms of interference in the internal affairs of Korea by outside forces.

Also, during the general debate at the twenty ninth session of the United Nations General Assembly the representatives of many countries held that the foreign troops must get out of South Korea and that the Korean question be left to the Korean people themselves so that they might solve it independently: no one said that foreign troops should keep on occupying South Korea. This is the very reflection of the trend of present times, and this current will flow with increasing force as the days go by.

We consider it necessary, first of all, to take an immediate measure to ease tension in the land of Korea if world peace is to be maintained at present in conformity with the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

In order to ease tension and ensure a durable peace in Korea, the United States troops stationed in South Korea under the United Nations flag must be withdrawn and the Korean question left to the Korean people themselves.

If it should be decided to withdraw United States troops from South Korea we will be ready to negotiate with the United States at any time on the problems that may arise in connexion with the withdrawal.

(Mr. Li Jong Mok Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea)

The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea already made a proposal last March on concluding a peace agreement between our Republic and the United States containing the following provisions:

First, both sides shall pledge to each other not to invade the other side and shall remove all dangers of direct armed conflict.

The United States shall be obliged not to instigate the South Korean authorities to war provocation manoeuvres and fascist repression of the South Korean people, or to patronize them not to obstruct the north and south of Korea as they reunify the country independently and peacefully in accordance with the North-South Joint Statement, not to interfere in any way in the internal affairs of Korea.

Secondly, both sides shall discontinue the reinforcement of armed forces and the arms race and stop introducing any weapons, combat equipment and war supplies from beyond the boundary of Korea.

Thirdly, the helmets of the "United Nations Forces" shall be stripped from the foreign troops stationed in South Korea, and they shall all be withdrawn along with all their weapons, at the earliest possible date.

Fourthly, Korea shall not be reduced to a military or operational base for any foreign country after the withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea.

A peace agreement, if it is concluded, between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States of America will put an end to foreign interference in the internal affairs of our country and will pave the way to a peaceful solution of the question of Korean reunification by the Koreans themselves. It will also make a great contribution to preserving peace and security in Asia.

The questions of converting the armistice into a durable peace and of realizing the peaceful reunification of our country after the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Korea are internal affairs of the Korean people that must be solved between the authorities of the north and south through negotiations, and no third party should meddle.

At the enlarged meeting of the Central Committee of the Democratic Front for the Reunification of the Fatherland held some time ago, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has clearly stated



(Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea)

stand of the Government of our Republic that the problems that may arise after the withdrawal of the United States troops from South Korea may be discussed and settled through bilateral military talks between the military authorities of the north and the south.

We believe that at these military talks we can discuss and settle such questions as guaranteeing between the north and south that force shall not be used by one side against the other, in conformity with the principles of the Joint Statement; arranging new military measures, including those for removing the state of military confrontation between the north and south and binding the north and south under an obligation to implement the main provisions of the Korean Armistice Agreement in order to prevent the outbreak of armed conflicts between them after the withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea, forming a north-south joint military commission to replace the present Military Armistice Commission; and reducing the numerical strength of the armed forces of the north and south to 100,000 or less, each, and discontinuing the arms race and the introduction of weapons from abroad, and so forth, with a view to easing tension in Korea.

(Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic  
People's Republic of Korea)

If any other organ is needed, apart from the North-South Joint Military Commission, to help preserve peace in Korea, the present Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission could be maintained, with any new necessary functions, pending the conclusion of a peace agreement between the north and the south.

A firm guarantee will be provided for the preservation of peace in our country if the north and the south convene bilateral military talks to discuss and solve the above-mentioned questions, and form a North-South Joint Military Commission to implement a mutual agreement to be made between the two sides, on the condition that all the foreign troops are withdrawn from South Korea.

We never want to fight our fellow countrymen; we are striving to convert the armistice into a durable peace in our country, and to solve the question of national reunification by peaceful means, and not in any circumstances by means of force.

Our people have lived in harmony for thousands of years in the same territory, and they have the full ability to hew out their destiny by their own efforts.

If the United States troops are withdrawn from South Korea and the United States interference in the internal affairs of our country is terminated for good, the people in the north and the south of Korea can themselves find excellent ways and means for reunifying their fatherland on the basis of the North-South Joint Statement, and attaining prosperity in their reunified country.

We have already put forward a large number of most reasonable proposals for solving the question of reunification.

The five-point proposal on national reunification of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, presented by the respected and beloved Leader of our people Comrad Kim Il Sung, Head of State of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, on 23 June last year is a patriotic national-salvation programme which illuminates the prospect of reunification.

The main essence of the five-point proposal on national reunification is to remove the state of military confrontation and ease tension.

(Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic  
People's Republic of Korea)

between the north and the south, to realize many-sided collaboration and interchange between the north and the south, to convene a Great National Congress composed of the representatives of people of all walks of life and all political parties and social organizations in the north and the south, to institute a North-South Confederation under the single national title of the Confederal Republic of Koryo, and to enter the United Nations under the single national title. This proposal opened up the right way for us to solving the question of reunification in conformity with the will and national interests of the entire Korean people.

The most important way of solving the question of Korean reunification through the negotiations between the north and the south is to convene a Great National Congress and a political consultative conference with the participation of the representatives of all political parties and social organizations and personages of all walks of life in the north and the south.

At the Great National Congress or the political consultative conference, we may discuss the measures for realizing collaboration and interchange between the north and the south in various fields, and deciding on the institutional framework of the Confederation, as well as the question of jointly entering the international arena to defend the interests of the whole nation.

It is our belief that the north and the south may deepen mutual understanding and trust through this course, and may institute a Confederation under the single national title, the Confederal Republic of Koryo. Under this Confederation the two sides will implement the policies discussed at the Great National Congress while retaining the present political systems of North and South Korea as they are for the time being.

If we do not impose our system on the South Korean side, and they do not impose their system on us, both sides can realize the great unity of the nation, transcending the differences of political views and religious beliefs, even though the two political systems existing in the north and the south are left intact as they are. In that case there will be neither arms drive nor war, and a strong basis will be built for realizing the complete reunification of the fatherland.

(Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic People's  
Republic of Korea)

. By this course, we shall be able to realize the complete reunification and independence of our country through the setting up of a unified central government through north-south general elections to be held on democratic principles.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea sincerely hopes that the United Nations General Assembly this year will be marked as a historic session which will make a substantial contribution to accelerating the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea by adopting a just decision for the withdrawal of all the foreign troops stationed in South Korea under the banner of the "United Nations forces", in conformity with the common aspirations of the Korean people and the peoples of the world, and the requirement of the times.

If a resolution is adopted on withdrawing all the foreign troops stationed in South Korea under the United Nations flag, it will not only mark an epochal turning point in the struggle of the Korean people for national reunification, but also record a new chapter in the history of the United Nations, and make a great contribution to peace in Asia and the rest of the world.

We once again appeal to the representatives from various friendly countries present at this session, and to the Governments and peoples of all countries of the world to make positive endeavours so that the United Nations may take appropriate measures to enable the Korean people to achieve the reunification of Korea on the principle of national self-determination.

We have still many difficulties before us, but we are now looking forward to the prospect of reunification with confidence. No one can weaken the strong will of our people to reunify their country by their own efforts, nor can any divisive elements check the forward movement of our nation towards the great national unity and peaceful reunification of the country.

The struggle of the Korean people for national reunification is a link in the whole chain of the struggle of the peoples of the whole world against imperialism, old and new colonialism, and racism, and for the termination of all forms of interference and defence of national independence and world peace.

(Mr. Li Jong Mok, Democratic  
People's Republic of Korea)

With the active support and encouragement of the peace-loving peoples of the world, the Korean people will, sooner or later, eliminate the misfortunes of national division and will certainly build on the territory of their fatherland a rich and powerful, prosperous and sovereign, independent and unified State where the entire people in the north and the south will be able to enjoy happiness together.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As I indicated at the beginning of the meeting today, we shall suspend the debate on the question of Korea until the plenary Assembly completes consideration of the question of Cambodia. In due course members will find an announcement in the Journal of when the First Committee will meet again to continue the consideration of the question of Korea.

I should like to inform the First Committee that on Wednesday afternoon we shall meet to conclude the consideration of the disarmament items. I am informed that at that time we shall have available the revised version of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.698, the text introduced by the Syrian Arab Republic in relation to napalm. The draft resolution on a world disarmament conference in document A/C.1/L.703 has now been submitted. Accordingly, the Committee will meet on Wednesday afternoon to vote on those two draft resolutions and thus conclude the consideration of all disarmament items.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.