



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/C.1/PV.2035
4 December 1974

ENGLISH

Twenty-ninth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND AND THIRTY-FIFTH
MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Wednesday, 4 December 1974, at 3 p.m.

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. ORTIZ de ROZAS	(Argentina)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. COSTA LOBO	(Portugal)

Question of Korea: /104/ (continued)

- (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 THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 5 DECEMBER 1974, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 10 DECEMBER 1974.

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

74-71294/A

AGENDA ITEM 104 (continued)

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, L.704).

Mr. RAE (Canada): Canada regrets that the Korean question has been raised again at this year's General Assembly. We consider that matters concerning Korea must be resolved by the people of Korea, and we therefore question whether resolutions on Korea should be brought to the United Nations without at least a basis for negotiations having been agreed upon by both sides in Korea. In our view, the resolution adopted by consensus at last year's General Assembly established a sound framework for fruitful negotiations. However, negotiations between North and South Korea have not so far been productive, and thus we find ourselves participating, reluctantly, in another debate on the Korean question.

I say "reluctantly" because past experience indicates that the acrimonious debate of Korean questions at the General Assembly is not conducive to, and indeed distracts attention from, the urgent need for positive negotiations between the two sides. My delegation would therefore prefer that our deliberations this year simply focus on the need to urge the authorities of both sides to resume negotiations in accordance with last year's consensus decisions.

However, much is again being made of the United Nations Command and the presence of United States troops in South Korea. Therefore, permit me to restate briefly my Government's position on those two quite separate issues.

Canada does not consider that the United Nations Command in any way hinders or inhibits the search for peace in Korea. Indeed, we consider that, by contributing to the observance of the 1953 Armistice Agreement, the

MLG/hcd

A/C.1/PV.2035

3-5

(Mr. Rae, Canada)

United Nations Command is important to stability on the Korean peninsula and in the entire region. As to the future of the United Nations Command, it is the view of my Government that, because the United Nations Command was established by a Security Council resolution and because the Security Council remains the only United Nations body competent to review the status of the United Nations Command, the United Nations Command cannot be withdrawn by a resolution passed by the General Assembly. Moreover, Canada considers that the United Nations Command, as one of the signatories to the 1953 Armistice Agreement, should not be withdrawn until all parties concerned, including the Security Council, decide upon an alternative arrangement which would effectively ensure the peace and security of the area.

(Mr. Rae, Canada)

With regard to the presence of United States troops in South Korea, they are there under the 1954 bilateral agreement between the United States and the Republic of Korea. Canada therefore regards the presence of the United States troops in South Korea essentially as a bilateral matter between the Governments of the United States and the Republic of Korea.

In spite of reservations over the need for a Korean debate this year, Canada has agreed to co-sponsor the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676. This draft resolution urges North and South Korea to continue their dialogue and expresses the hope that the Security Council will consider the future of the United Nations Command in consultation with the parties directly concerned. In these respects the draft resolution clearly follows the spirit of the consensus achieved last year. We therefore regard the draft resolution as reasonable and moderate, one drafted in a spirit of accommodation and aimed at defining common ground for continuing the search for a peaceful solution of the Korean question.

For more than 20 years Canada has had a deep interest in the maintenance of peace and security in Korea. We remember the 378 Canadians who served with the United Nations Force in Korea and who are buried at Pusan. It is our hope that the Korean people will achieve reunification by their own peaceful efforts, and we support the efforts made thus far to reduce tension and resolve differences in Korea. However, we are concerned that the atmosphere created by the events of the past year has not contributed to further progress in North-South negotiations. We would therefore call for wide support of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676 and urge both Governments to reaffirm their intention, as they did in their Joint Communiqué of 4 July 1972, to refrain from recrimination and acts of armed provocation. Such a reaffirmation, we believe, would be a positive step forward at this stage.

Mr. TRAORE (Mali) (interpretation from French): The valiant people of Korea, which has never renounced the aim of forging its own destiny, has devoted itself throughout its centuries-old history to achieving peace and concord. It has always fought against and triumphed over attempts to break up the country.

(Mr. Traore, Mali)

The foreign occupation it endured throughout the Second World War was unable to destroy its unity. It was not until the intervention in Asia in 1945 by the Allies to bring about the surrender of the Axis Powers that we witnessed the partition of Korea which is our concern today. The situation only deteriorated further when certain Powers, interpreting the provisions of the Charter solely in the light of their policy of hegemony, led our Organization into a war which was fundamentally contrary to its purposes and objectives.

However, the General Assembly in its resolution of 14 November 1947 put an end to the authority of foreign forces over Korea and recognized the right to independence of the Korean people. The Assembly of the people of all Korea, made up of 360 representatives for the South and 212 for the North met and elected President Kim Il Sung their Head of Government. The unity of the country was once again saved. But external forces, with the support of such elements as Syngman Rhee, physically liquidated the patriots of the South who were in favour of reunification.

Trouble broke out, and a painful and fratricidal war began in Korea, brought about by foreign intervention. The aggressors, beaten back by the patriotic forces, had to appeal once again to the United Nations to limit their defeat. It was in these circumstances that the Armistice Agreement of Panmunjom was signed on 27 July 1953. The solemn commitment under article V, according to which a high-level conference was to be convened to seek a peaceful settlement of the Korean question, remained a dead letter. Apart from an exchange of prisoners and a decision on the demarcation line, what had happened represented a deterioration in the situation on the Korean peninsula. The administration of the southern part of the country, defying the legitimate aspirations of the entire Korean people, placed itself at the service of the policy of hegemony of its masters. South Korea thus became the leverage for achieving a certain dream of colonial reconquest in the Far East.

The troops at present stationed in South Korea under the United Nations flag, which are over-armed and undertake constant military forays, have never been under the administration or management of our world Organization. The rules which apply elsewhere to United Nations peace-keeping forces are unknown to them. Their action falls within the global strategy of one single Power, which is misusing an illicit sanction by the United Nations.

(Mr. Traore, Mali)

The Organization should long ago have refused to lend its name to this bloody game. This tragedy has lasted all too long, to the detriment of the Korean people and of peace. Yet, all the necessary conditions existed to free the United Nations from the Korean crisis. In fact the pressure exercised by the peoples that love peace and justice upon the transnational military-industrial complex led to a progressive normalization of the relations among the Powers. The international language became rich with new words: "peaceful coexistence", "détente", "disarmament", "co-operation", "development" and so on. Thanks to the patient efforts made for the survival of mankind, we have the many agreements concerning the liberation of the peoples of Asia, Latin America and Africa. The frontiers of nations have been opened and Governments are becoming increasingly aware of the futility of armed might.

Korea cannot and must not be left outside this great current of renewal directed towards establishing a new world based on tolerance, peace and progress, a world where peoples will forge their own destinies according to their own character, without outside interference.

Our delegations have always deplored and denounced interference by the United Nations in the internal affairs of Korea. Without further delay we must relieve it of this heavy mortgage by dissolving the United Nations Command in Korea, and by removing from South Korea the United Nations flag, which is a sign of peace and which therefore should be flown only for peace, and not to cover the imperialist designs of certain Powers.

On 21 November 1973 the First Committee seemed to face these realities by recommending to the General Assembly the immediate dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

(Mr. Traore, Mali)

This recommendation was a not inconsiderable factor in the consensus at which we arrived. Even though the consensus does have serious omissions, my delegation raised no objection because it won the support, among others, of the main parties to the dispute. We adhered to it also because we have always adhered to proposals that are intended, through negotiations undertaken in good faith, to remove tensions which could at any moment place the fate of mankind in jeopardy. Like most delegations, we had also hoped that the consensus would revive the negotiations started by the parties and lead to a final settlement of the Korean question. Today -- that is to say, a year after the adoption of that consensus -- the situation remains unchanged and there is always the threat that it will deteriorate.

In the debate which has just started, we must set as our main objective the goal of making the process of the settlement of the crisis more dynamic, while naturally taking into account the ineffectiveness of the consensus and the three main principles which must guide our action, namely, the reunification of the country achieved independence without outside interference, the reunification of the country by peaceful means without recourse to force, and the great unity of the nation. Our Organization must help to give practical effect to the profound aspirations of the entire Korean people for national unity.

To this end, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, by its co-operation has facilitated the task. My delegation has already had occasion in this connexion to draw the attention of our Committee to the wise five-point proposals presented by President Kim Il Sung who, after the cowardly assassination of the patriot Cho Pong An, received a democratic and plenipotentiary mandate from the Assembly of the people of all Korea, north and south alike, to achieve the peaceful unification of the country. We reaffirm that those proposals remain a realistic basis for the settlement of the Korean crisis. Their objectives are in accord with the principles of the Charter with regard to the peaceful settlement of disputes. It is the duty of the United Nations to support them and to ensure that they prevail, thus restoring its reputation in the Korean question.

(Mr. Traore, Mali)

As the programme presented by the Fifth Congress of the Korean Workers' Party affirmed, the happiness of all the Korean people cannot be achieved in an artificially divided country. The formula "divide and rule" unfortunately still has supporters. That policy has been a failure since the time of Caesar. It has brought only suffering and unnecessary grievance to the people to which it has been applied since the Second World War. The unification of Korea is, therefore, essential for the establishment of a lasting peace in that country and in the entire Indo-Chinese subcontinent. Our Organization must not be part of the warlike policy of "divide and rule" which has until now prevailed.

In the course of the debate on the question of Cambodia in the General Assembly, we listened to lengthy statements on how essential it was to allow the peoples of Asia to shape their own destiny free from outside interference. A dialogue, we were told, is the only formula which the United Nations can recommend to the parties to dispute. We doubt the sincerity of those who endorse that view, because it is they themselves who, on the item we are considering, advocate the presence of the so-called United Nations forces in Korea. Korea is also an Asian country. The five-point proposals of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea advocate nothing other than an open and frank dialogue among Koreans.

Those proposals were made public at both the governmental and parliamentary levels, as we know from the letter of the Supreme People's Assembly of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea addressed to all the Parliaments and Governments of the world. They have been further enriched by the new initiatives taken last March by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to normalize relations with the United States of America, whose Government is mainly responsible for the situation now prevailing in Korea.

These new proposals were presented in detail by the head of the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the statement he made in our Committee on 25 November last. They all centred on the sincere desire of his Government to create the objective conditions necessary for the restoration of peace in the country.

(Mr. Traore, Mali)

The peaceful reunification of Korea will be achieved by the Koreans themselves, free from outside interference. Any delays, intimidations, increases of foreign military bases in the southern part of the country will be of no avail.

The Seoul administration, on the orders of its masters, will for some time still drown in blood the revolt of the workers, peasants, students, intellectuals and religious people, those who struggle with their brothers in the north to end the exploitation of the resources of their country, but the victory of the Korean people is inevitable. Only the reunification of Korea can absolve the United Nations of its interference in the internal affairs of that country.

The illegal presence of foreign occupation forces on Korean soil under cover of the flag of the United Nations can only prolong the calvary of the Korean people and further engage our responsibility. Clashes will continue as long as the Korean country remains divided against the will of its people.

We find this determination in the statement made by President Kim Il Sung on 1 October 1974, when he said:

"Since Korea is one and since our nation is homogeneous, it cannot be divided in two, it cannot be permanently divided into two countries."

It is in view of that national feeling of the Korean people and of the correct assessment of the role of the United Nations in its primary mission to maintain peace throughout the world that 38 countries, including Mali, have submitted the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.677 for the consideration of the First Committee. This draft followed logically from the dynamics of the settlement process which was started last year on the Korean question. Indeed, we have agreed on the need to continue negotiations by the two Korean parties without any outside interference in order to achieve the unity of the country. This fundamental condition will always be distorted as long as the southern part of Korea seeks the support of foreign troops under cover of the flag of our Organization in order to perpetuate the division of the country, in defiance of the profound aspirations of the people.

(Mr. Traore, Mali)

The choice of the United Nations, an Organization created by the will of peoples and on their behalf, must fall on the Korean population almost all of whom are fighting in extremely difficult conditions for the unification of their country and not on a handful of traitors and their allies who, as each General Assembly session approaches, endeavour to surprise us by statements that are forgotten as soon as made. The maintenance of foreign troops under the United Nations flag is contrary to our Organization's mission of peace. It is a complete denial of the ethics of our Organization because, in Korea, it is the United Nations that is waging war against the people; because, in Korea, it is the United Nations that is violating the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of the country. It is furthermore a defiance of the right of all peoples to be masters of their own destinies, a right recognized by the Charter.

On the other hand, we believe that the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676 have no other objective than to maintain the state of tension in the Korean peninsula. While American bombs rained down in Korea, the Security Council in 1950 illegally led our Organization into a long and bloody war against the people of Korea. Our Committee must without hesitation reject inconsistent proposals which seek not to obtain peace in Korea in terms of the profound aspirations of its people but to perpetuate the partition of that through unworthy manoeuvres. Furthermore, our Organization, which since the beginning has undertaken to guarantee the territorial integrity and the unity of the Korean nation, cannot, without denying itself, sanction the pernicious formula for the admission of two Korean States.

The Korean people wishes to be reconciled with itself and wishes to achieve its unity in peace. The United Nations must assist it in that. The flag of our Organization flies in that country but does not serve it in that task. Members of our Committee should ponder this seriously and take the long-awaited decision to give back to the Korean people its right to a national destiny.

Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): In connexion with the new discussion in the First Committee of the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly on the question of Korea, the delegation of the USSR considers it necessary to state the position of the Soviet

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

Union on this important question, which the United Nations has been dealing with for more than 20 years. The discussion of the Korean question at this session of the Assembly is taking place in more favourable circumstances than ever before in the whole long history of the consideration of this matter in the United Nations. There has been a change for the better in the general international situation. The time of the cold war, of which the peoples of the world had wearied, has passed into oblivion. There is an intensification and a strengthening of the process of international détente. The peoples of the world have heaved a sigh of relief and are breathing more freely. Prospects have emerged for ridding mankind of the threat of a thermonuclear catastrophe. The United Nations, for its part, is making a contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security. The overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations voted in the United Nations for the non-use of force in international relations and for the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, and favoured the convening of a world disarmament conference and the prohibition of the use of the environment and climate for military purposes. A number of other decisions have also been taken designed to strengthen peace. Not without difficulty, but firmly and with conviction, the negotiation process is being developed in a positive way by the European countries, and also by the United States and Canada, on such topical questions as European security and co-operation and the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. The recent meeting of the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade Brezhnev, with the United States President, Mr. Ford, was an important event of great international significance for the further development of United States-USSR relations on the basis of the principle of peaceful coexistence. The political results of this meeting, as is pointed out in the decision of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, give new momentum to a strengthening of international détente, and to an expansion of the mutually advantageous co-operation of States with different social systems, and make a constructive contribution to the strengthening of universal peace.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

The changes which have been engendered by the process of the easing of international tension have had a fundamental effect also on the Asian continent. It can be said with every justification that the favourable influence of the process of détente, in one way or another, is being felt everywhere. Were it not for the trend towards détente, the situation, even in those parts of the world where unfortunately there is still tension, would be much more complicated and explosive, and this also applies to the situation in the Korean peninsula. A favourable influence on the general situation in which the discussion of the Korean question is going on at this session of the Assembly has been exerted by the consistent and firm, peace-loving actions of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea which enjoys growing understanding and support inside the United Nations. There has been an improvement in the conditions for a business-like discussion of the question of Korea in the United Nations itself.

At the last session of the Assembly, the many years of discrimination against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the United Nations were finally brought to an end. Its official representatives, for the first time, had an opportunity to take part in the discussion of matters relating to Korea. Members of the United Nations, throughout the long history of the discussion of the Korean question, have finally also been able to hear the views of the other side, those of the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, a fact which, without any doubt, has facilitated a constructive discussion of the complicated problems connected with the present situation in the Korean peninsula and with the creation of the necessary conditions for the peaceful democratic reunification of the country.

Of great significance in this context, too, is the decision of the Assembly to grant the right of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to set up its own official permanent observer mission to the United Nations. We welcome, with great satisfaction, to the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly

the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea headed by the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs, our distinguished guest and comrade, Li Jong Mok. The Korean problem has remained for more than two decades on the agenda of General Assembly sessions. Once again, as so many times in the past, the United Nations has had to deal with this question ever since the Korean people became the victim of foreign military intervention, when, even after the sounds of artillery fire in the Second World War had died away and longed-for peace came to the world, foreign troops arrived in Korea. This question, unfortunately, still retains its significance and urgency because, up to this very day, foreign intervention in the internal affairs of the Korean people has not ceased and foreign troops, which are an instrument of this intervention, still remain in South Korea despite the will of the Korean people.

The most paradoxical thing in this whole abnormal situation is the fact that these are the troops of only one State. However, in order to camouflage their stationing in South Korea, they are known as the United Nations forces and are illegally using the flag of this authoritative international Organization. The need to discuss the question of the withdrawal of all foreign troops stationed under the United Nations flag in South Korea and to take an urgent decision at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly on this matter arises from the fact that the presence of foreign troops in the south of the peninsula continues to be a dangerous source of tension in this area. Speaking in the general debate at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, the Foreign Minister of the USSR, Comrade A.A. Gromyko, touching on this question stated:

"The agenda of this session includes an item which has a direct bearing on the improvement of the situation in Asia. This is the proposal by 32 States, including the Soviet Union, on the withdrawal of all foreign troops stationed in South Korea under the flag of the United Nations. The presence of those troops, which have now been there for more than two decades, represents a source of constant military and political tension in the Korean Peninsula. Their presence is still more inappropriate under present conditions when, on the initiative of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, efforts are being made to bring about the peaceful reunification of Korea." (A/PV.2240, pp. 63-65.)

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

Indeed, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Premier Kim Il Sung personally have done a great deal to clear away the debris of the cold war and to create a favourable political situation in Korea, promoting abroad an independent settlement of the Korean problem by the Koreans themselves without any external intervention. In 1972, as the result of an important political initiative taken by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the first steps were taken along the difficult and complicated road towards the restoration of the national unity of Korea. A dialogue was begun between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea. Agreement was achieved on the setting up of a co-ordinating committee of the North and South, and meetings of this committee were held. In the North-South Joint Declaration dated 4 July 1972, general principles were enunciated for the unification of the country by peaceful means and by the efforts of the Korean people itself without any external intervention. It then remained to implement the agreement that had been achieved, and translate the agreed-upon positions of principle into practical deeds and specific measures.

It was precisely along these lines that efforts were concentrated by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which had patiently and consistently adopted the policy of peaceful unification of Korea by democratic means by the Koreans themselves on the basis of the sovereign rights of the Korean people without foreign intervention.

As is evident from the last memorandum of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, known to representatives in the Assembly as document A/C.1/1048, issued in connexion with the discussion of the Korean question, the consistent policy of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is "to put an early end to the division of Korea and settle the internal affairs of the nation by the Korean people themselves without any interference of outside forces in accordance with the principle of national self-determination and by peaceful means" (A/C.1/1048, p. 3).

It was precisely to attain these noble goals that the proposals of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were designed. They were made up of five points, and it was these points which made up a genuine

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

patriotic programme for national reunification of Korea by peaceful democratic means. The substance of this programme is to put an end to the state of military confrontation; ease tension between the north and the south; implement comprehensive co-operation and mutual exchanges between the north and the south; convene a Grand National Congress or a consultative conference with the participation of representatives of political parties, social organizations and representatives of all sectors of the population, north and south; and create a confederation. The convening of a Grand National Congress or a consultative conference was considered by the North Koreans, in present circumstances, to provide the most important means of solving the problem of the reunification of Korea by means of negotiation between north and south. In order to continue dialogue between north and south, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea proposed the holding of the above-mentioned Congress or conference in this very year, and the discussion at that Congress of measures to ensure co-operation and mutual exchanges between north and south in various fields, the creation of a confederation, and the solution of the problem of their joint emergence into the international arena.

The North Koreans have also recently made sincere efforts to begin talks within the framework of the Red Cross in order to solve the humanitarian problems involved in the uniting of families. As the result of talks there was agreement between the parties on important principles in this area, although, as we know, as the result of a position taken by the Seoul régime, talks on this question, too, have remained at a deadlock.

An important international political step towards the normalization of the situation in the Korean peninsula also resulted from the next important initiative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In order to create a more favourable atmosphere for the acceleration of independent and peaceful unification of the country, the Supreme People's Assembly of the Democratic People's Republic, on 25 March this year, made an official proposal for the conclusion of a peace agreement between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States. It proposed, inter alia, the assumption of mutual obligations respecting non-aggression and the elimination of the danger of a direct armed conflict, the cessation of the arms race, the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea, and

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

also an obligation, after the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea, not to transform Korea into a military or operational base for any foreign State. Which of the delegations from peace-loving countries here at this session of the Assembly would venture to call these proposals non-peace-loving or unconstructive?

Furthermore, in a display of genuine desire to eliminate the state of military conflict in Korea, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, at meetings of the co-ordinating committee of the north and south, has repeatedly proposed to the South Koreans that they should conclude a peace agreement between the north and south.

In the statement of the head of delegation of the Democratic People's Republic, the Vice Minister for Foreign Affairs, Comrade Li Jong Mok, once again, with the utmost frankness, candour and sincerity, a realistic programme for the peaceful democratic reunification of Korea was put forward, and in a detailed and well argued manner the fundamental content of the most important proposals of the North Koreans on this question were developed. These proposals are fully in keeping with the principles contained in the North-South Joint Declaration of 4 July 1972.

All these facts eloquently testify to the fact that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has shown no lack of initiative, goodwill, and readiness to proceed to the adoption of practical measures to attain effective agreement for the peaceful solution of the Korean problem. These noble efforts of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, aimed at the peaceful reunification of Korea, enjoy sympathy and broad support throughout the world and the United Nations.

The measures of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, designed to create favourable circumstances for the settlement of the Korean problem in the interest of strengthening peace and security in the Far East, have always won and continue to win the understanding and support of the Soviet Union and all sincere friends of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Soviet Union supports that country's programme to bring about the peaceful democratic reunification of Korea.

5/jm/gt

A/C.1/PV.2035
24-25

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

The General Assembly, in a decision taken unanimously at its twenty-eighth session, expressed the hope that the North and the South of Korea would continue their dialogue and widen their many-sided exchanges and co-operation in the spirit of the three principles of national reunification in regard to which agreement was reached in the Joint Communiqué of 4 July 1972. However, this did not happen. The Seoul régime used every means in its power to complicate, to delay, and in the final analysis to curb the process of the gradual peaceful reunification of Korea. It emerges clearly from the documents submitted and from all the facts and data adduced in the detailed and cogent statement of the head of the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, that because of that stand by South Korea, the talks between the North and the South, and the work of the co-ordinating committee set up in 1972 have made no progress, and thus far have not yielded any practical results.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

The puppet régime in Seoul, relying on the protection and support it gets from outside, is stubbornly rejecting all constructive proposals of the North Koreans. Furthermore, the Seoul militarists are continuing what has now become a habit with it and something which has in fact become its second nature: that is, its permanent system of armed provocations on the demarcation line against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. A quite definite and justified impression is being created that the militarists in Seoul are suffering from a built-in incurable military flaw, and are testing the latest forms of weaponry and military equipment, which are flowing so abundantly and constantly into South Korea.

In those circumstances, particularly conspicuous is the danger of the continuing presence and activity of foreign troops on Korean soil, which are there under the fictitious camouflage of the United Nations flag. We all know very well that foreign troops stationed under the United Nations flag in South Korea are not United Nations troops, but the troops of a single major foreign Power, the United States of America. Those troops are illegally known as the United Nations troops, and the command of those troops is illegally known as the United Nations Command.

In that regard it should be pointed out that the adoption by the Security Council, at one point, of a decision to create the so-called United Nations Force in Korea, and accordingly, the so-called United Nations Command, is illegal. It is not in accordance with the Charter since it was adopted in the absence of two permanent members of the Security Council: the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. In fact neither those troops nor the Command has in fact any relationship with the United Nations, and this is something we all know very well too. The difference between us, the participants at this meeting of the First Committee, who all know the truth, lies in this: that some know it and openly, honestly and frankly say so, while others know it, but pretend that they do not notice it and continue shamefully to close their eyes to this truth and to pass over this reality in silence.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

It is quite obvious that the development of the healthy processes in the Korean peninsula towards the peaceful reunification of the country is being hindered by the continuing foreign interference in the affairs of the Korean people. The most flagrant and heinous weapon of this interference are the foreign troops in South Korea, the 38,000-man foreign army, equipped with the latest types of contemporary weapons. Foreign troops are serving as a bulwark for those extreme reactionary forces in South Korea which, because of interests alien to the Korean people, are striving to hinder the peaceful unification of Korea.

This is demonstrated by the unprecedented wave of terror and repression going on in the south which has been launched by the régime against the growing democratic movement of broad masses of the South Korean population who are standing up for their democratic and social rights for freedom and the peaceful unification of Korea. The maintenance of foreign troops in South Korea is a major obstacle to peaceful unification of their country.

In view of all those facts, it is quite obvious that the cessation of interference by imperialist forces in the internal affairs of Korea and the withdrawal of all foreign troops stationed under the United Nations flag in South Korea is the key to the solution of the problem of an independent and peaceful unification of Korea. The Korean people quite rightly expect from the United Nations and its General Assembly that help in ensuring the creation of favourable conditions for the independent, peaceful unification of their country without foreign interference.

The United Nations can and must help it in this just cause. It is its international duty to bring about the realization of these aspirations and hopes of the Korean people. For this, we are firmly convinced that the United Nations should direct its efforts to putting an end to foreign interference in the affairs of Korea in any form, regardless of what guise and pretext may be attempted to cover it up and justify it.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

At the twenty-eight session of the General Assembly, the first positive step was taken along the correct lines in the Korean matter . This is demonstrated by the decision on the dissolution of the notorious, illegally constituted and totally bankrupt so-called United Nations Commission for the Reunification and Rehabilitation of Korea, which for so long was one of the means of interference of outside forces in the affairs of the Korean people and was used for purposes which had nothing in common whatsoever with the requirements of the United Nations Charter.

However, the General Assembly, having said A must go on to say B. It would be natural and logical, therefore, if the present session of the General Assembly were to take the second correct step in that direction and take a decision to withdraw all foreign troops stationed in South Korea under the United Nations flag. Since the signing of the Armistice Agreement in Korea more than 20 years have gone by and the maintenance of foreign troops on Korean soil is an aggressive anachronism which cannot possibly be justified.

No references to so-called lack of trust in the north, no hostile propaganda about what is called the threat from the north can cover up and justify this aggressive anachronism which is a holdover from the times of the cold war. Nor should we forget that these foreign troops, illegally camouflaged by the United Nations flag, are being used for purposes which have nothing in common with the task of preserving and strengthening peace in the Korean peninsula and throughout the Far East as a whole.

We should also take into account the extremely important and universally known fact, that in the territory of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea there have been for a long time no foreign armed forces, not a single foreign soldier. Therefore, it is quite natural and proper to raise the question of withdrawing troops from South Korea too, so that the north and the south of that country can be on an equal footing in the consideration and solution of those problems which are of vital interest for the whole Korean people and, above all, for the question of the peaceful unification of that country. Assertions which have been repeated for so many years now from rostrums, in the United Nations, that foreign troops, are allegedly necessary in South Korea because of a mythical threat from the north, cannot possibly withstand criticism. They are fallacious through and through.

AW/45

A/C.1/PV.2035

29-30

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

We cannot help recalling our saying: "If a mother-in-law is a dishonest woman, then she will not even believe her daughter-in-law". And we all are very well aware now, from first-hand sources, of the fact, of the numerous proposals of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea aimed at the peaceful settlement of the Korean problem and the cessation of military confrontation in Korea. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has officially proposed, and has once again now confirmed, its readiness to agree to a substantial reduction of armed forces in the south and north to the number of 100,000 men or less on both sides.

The trumped-up and false character of the assertions of a threat from the north become ever clearer in the light of the fact that the Seoul régime maintains armed forces much greater in number than the strength of the army of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and is feverishly continuing to equip them with the latest kind of modern weapons; and highly placed foreign representatives of a so-called United Nations Command in South Korea have more than once openly and officially stated the fact that the South Koreans are militarily superior to the north.

Furthermore, a number of representatives in the First Committee know that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is firmly and consistently pursuing a policy of peaceful reunification of Korea without the use of force, without attempting to resolve the question of the reunification of the country by military means. That unswerving, peace-loving policy of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has been confirmed in the statement of its official representative at this session of the General Assembly. In the First Committee, in his statement of 25 November 1974, Comrade Li Jong Mok stated:

"... 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." (2029th meeting, p. 4)

Surely that is eloquent proof of genuinely peace-loving intentions and testifies to the absence of any North Korean militarist or aggressive intentions with regard to the South.

There are those who assert that foreign troops should remain in South Korea as a kind of guarantee of the implementation of the Armistice Agreement in Korea. That too is a trumped-up and completely groundless assertion by those who prefer to live constantly in circumstances of temporary armistice rather than lasting peace, and, as indicated in the statement of its official representative, it is in fact the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that is proposing practical measures with the purpose not only of ensuring implementation of the Armistice Agreement but of converting it into a lasting peace agreement.

The North Koreans quite rightly consider that questions that might arise after the withdrawal of United States troops from South Korea could be considered and settled by means of bilateral negotiations between the military authorities of the North and the South. In the view of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, those negotiations could deal with such questions as

"guaranteeing between the north and south that forces shall not be used by one side against the other, arranging new military measures ... to implement the main provisions of the Korean Armistice Agreement in order to prevent the outbreak of armed conflicts ... forming a north-south

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

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 ...

"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."

(Ibid., pp. 38-40, 41)

Thus the North Koreans propose the implementation of genuine guarantees for preserving peace in Korea by the Koreans themselves without foreign intervention after foreign troops have left Korean soil. Only the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea can genuinely lead to the strengthening of stability and peace in Korea, and there is no need for any guarantees.

Once again we have heard the well-worn references we have been hearing for 20 years now to the effect that the maintenance of foreign troops in South Korea would help to promote stabilization of the situation in the area. Those assertions are refuted by the facts of life and by the comparatively recent history of the Korean people, which has had to undergo such cruel suffering. Indeed, if it stabilizes anything, the presence of foreign troops in South Korea stabilizes only the perpetuation of the division of a country and maintenance of a source of tension and instability in the area.

Recently some have been going about and putting forward the idea that progress in dialogue between the two parties could be promoted by the simultaneous admission to the United Nations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea. However, given the actual political situation in Korea, such a step could have quite the opposite effect. The point is that the difficulties which pose an obstacle to the unification of North and South Korea and the peaceful independent resolution of the Korean problem arise not from the lack of any possibility of establishing contacts between the parties but from quite a different source -- that is, the foreign intervention in the internal affairs of the Korean people that has been going on constantly for about a quarter-century. One of its manifestations is the maintenance in South Korea of foreign troops camouflaged by the United Nations flag.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

Accordingly, there is nothing to justify maintaining foreign armed forces in South Korea. There are no serious arguments in favour of that, apart from the obvious desire of certain quarters both inside South Korea and outside it to perpetuate the present division of Korea and to preserve the existing situation in defiance of the expressed will of the Korean people.

The United Nations General Assembly cannot much longer accept a situation in which the United Nations flag is used by foreign troops for purposes diametrically opposed to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. The General Assembly must clearly and unambiguously express the view that all foreign troops stationed in South Korea should be withdrawn. The sooner that is done, the sooner there will be progress towards the peaceful democratic unification of Korea.

We are convinced that the further normalization of the situation on the Korean peninsula and the creation of conditions favourable for the independent and peaceful reunification of the country would be considerably advanced if the General Assembly adopted a clear-cut decision to withdraw from South Korea all foreign troops stationed there under the United Nations flag.

It is precisely with that goal in mind that the draft resolution sponsored by a large group of socialist and non-aligned States Members of the United Nations has been proposed. The Soviet Union is one of its sponsors. Adoption of that draft would provide convincing proof of the aspiration and desire of Member States of the United Nations to grant the Korean people the opportunity freely to decide its own destiny and itself to solve the problem of the reunification of its homeland by peaceful means on a universal democratic basis without any foreign intervention. The adoption by the General Assembly of such a decision would also be in keeping with the fundamental goals of the United Nations in the new circumstances of the easing of international tension. By so doing, the General Assembly would make a useful and positive contribution to the cause of strengthening the process of détente, extending it everywhere, and making it irreversible.

In contradistinction to that draft resolution, the 26-Power draft nowhere provides for the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of South Korea and is in essence designed to maintain the division of Korea.

(Mr. Malik, USSR)

In Asia the idea of ensuring reliable security through the joint efforts of the countries of that continent is constantly gaining ground. The strengthening of security in Asia on a collective basis with the participation of all States without exception is in keeping with the spirit of the times and the interests of the peoples of that great continent. Therefore, the Soviet Union has supported and will continue to support the positive efforts of Asian States to seek reliable solutions to the problems of peace and security on that continent. There is no doubt that a settlement of the Korean problem would make an important contribution to improving the situation not only in the Far East but in Asia as a whole.

Mr. ROMAN (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, my delegation sincerely congratulates you on the outstanding way in which you are guiding the work of this Committee. The wisdom, skill and prudent firmness with which you are doing so are typical of your qualities of leadership. I congratulate you on the well-deserved tribute that has been paid to you and to your noble country.

My delegation wishes to speak in this important debate as one of the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676, entitled "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".

(Mr. Roman, Costa Rica)

My delegation has been following the debate with genuine attention, and we consider that much of what has been said here is important and significant, both because enlightening opinions have been expressed, which will help to determine the position of the United Nations as fairly as possible, and also because it confirms the fact that this lofty forum, the only one able to provide an adequate and dignified solution to the problem of Korea, offers every nation the possibility of engaging in a constructive dialogue.

The events which occurred in a period which belong rather to history than to any judgement we may formulate today, prove that ideological clashes of the post-war period led certain peoples to the misfortune of being the battle scenes for confrontations, dividing them and causing bloodshed among brothers.

The fanatical period of the cold war, which caused many to believe that only a single concept could predominate in the world regarding the organization of society and of man's relations with a State, led the world to dangerous extremes. It divided nations which had been allies in the struggle against nazism; it severed any form of dialogue between the nations of one side and the other; it created favourable conditions for the terrifying nuclear confrontation between the great Powers; and it led to the outbreak of conventional wars for strategic supremacy in some parts of the world.

The cold war, so well called because it unleashed hostilities of all kinds among nations which had opposing ideological theories, marked only by the absence of the roar of cannons, brought real war to some parts of the world.

The outbreak of the Korean war, less than a quarter of a century ago, comes within this framework, although in the course of this debate, in which some passion has been shown, attempts have been made to explain it somewhat superficially. Like the war itself, the most tragic part of this confrontation in Korea was that it shattered the integrity of a people which had for thousands of years maintained its cohesion on the same territory, with the same language, culture and traditions, and had done so with a real sense of national identity.

(Mr. Roman, Costa Rica)

The world has now been witnessing with pleasure how that hopeless picture of confrontation and hostility has developed to the present period of détente. The hopes of the leaders of the great Powers, to remove the frictions of the cold war, have been supported by a great number of countries of the world, large and small. This atmosphere, conducive to peace and harmony in the world, should enable us to analyse the question of Korea, in so far as the United Nations is concerned, without allowing ourselves to be carried away by passions, and thus to ensure, by applying the utmost common sense, that the item receives the serious treatment it deserves by the international community. With so much passion displayed and such a deep scar left on the Korean people by the war, it would be thoughtless for anyone now to try to rekindle a fire which has barely begun to die down.

We affirm that it is for the Korean people itself to shape its destiny, and for the two sides who represent it to speak on its behalf. My delegation received with pleasure the news of the dialogue started on 4 June 1972 between the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, for the first time in a quarter of a century. Then as now, we add our voice of encouragement to the continuation of that effort at negotiation because we are firmly convinced that only thus can the goal of unification of the country be achieved.

Our statement will, therefore, be limited to the role which the United Nations has played in the past, as well as the role which it will have to play in the future in order to help, by its action, to achieve the aspirations of the Korean people for the reunification of their country.

Since it is always rash to speak of what might have happened had the United Nations not intervened in the Korean war, my delegation is rather more inclined to believe that in view of all the negative factors in the iciest period of the cold war, it would have been difficult, without the intervention of the United Nations, to achieve the Armistice which, albeit fragile, has maintained peace in the region for many years.

(Mr. Roman, Costa Rica)

At the end of 1973, during the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, the United Nations for the first time considered the Korean question in the presence of the parties concerned. The debate in this Committee today reminds us of the one we had last year. Nevertheless, what characterized that debate was that after a few days of discussion we were fortunately able to arrive at a consensus which was accepted both by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea.

In that consensus, the General Assembly took note with satisfaction of the fact that the two Korean parties had issued the Joint Communiqué and expressed the hope that both sides would continue their dialogue and broaden the co-operation and exchanges between them in various fields. The consensus also included the decision to dissolve the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

The only part of that consensus implemented so far was the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. The rest of the consensus, which encouraged resumption of the dialogue between the two sides has made no significant progress since then. Instead, there have been disagreements which threaten to vitiate the initial achievements.

It is clear that if the dialogue is to be reestablished, an atmosphere of confidence between the two parties must prevail, and neither must be suspicious of the intentions of the other. It is, therefore, natural and logical that neither of them should be compelled to go to the negotiating table if, in doing so, it jeopardizes its own security interests.

Hence, the undesirability of advocating any resolution which would run counter to the wishes of one of the two parties which does not wish to have its security interests affected. Such a requirement would introduce a prior condition which would not facilitate future arrangements. This is the disadvantage which my delegation sees in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.677.

(Mr. Roman, Costa Rica)

The United Nations Command in South Korea is there with the consent of the Government of that country. This then falls within the sovereignty of a State to allow the stationing of troops of another State on its soil, and if United States forces are stationed in South Korea, it is because of the consent of the receiving country.

The Government of South Korea considers that the role of the United Nations Command on its soil is a vital factor to maintain peace and security on the Korean peninsula. Furthermore, we must recall that that Command was created by Security Council resolution 84 (1950) of 7 July 1950, and that the only organ which can now decide whether it should be maintained is the Security Council itself and not the General Assembly.

It must be borne in mind that the United Nations Command, in representing the Organization, is part of the armistice structure which was signed in 1953, after several years of war and bloodshed on the Korean peninsula, and that that Armistice Agreement is still in effect. A premature dissolution of the Command, prior to negotiation of agreements between the parties which would constitute a valid alternative for the armistice, would endanger the complicated efforts which have been made to maintain the cease-fire for over two decades.

(Mr. Roman, Costa Rica)

Nevertheless, my country as a Member of the Security Council would be prepared to vote in favour of the dissolution of the United Nations Command when the representatives of the two Korean States officially notify the Security Council that its existence is no longer considered to be necessary.

For the reasons I have stated, my delegation considers that in the present circumstances the thesis of the draft resolution of which we are a sponsor is more realistic. It sets no preconditions which in advance may be considered to be unacceptable to one of the parties, and refers to the sovereign decision of the parties all matters relating to the peaceful reunification of Korea. Furthermore, it lays down the principle that it is the Security Council which is competent to decide on the future of the United Nations Command, without prejudging the conditions under which efforts at the reunification of the country should continue.

The pacifist tradition of the country I represent causes us to support the thesis which, in our opinion, is most in accord with the purposes which have guided this Organization in serving the interests of peace.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica for his very cordial words addressed to the Chairman.

Mr. MERENNE (Belgium) (interpretation from French): The numerous statements which my delegation has been hearing for some days now illustrate the questions which one is prompted to ask in dealing with the question of Korea.

The problem has two sides to it: a desire for reunification which has been expressed for some 30 years and the establishment of two different social systems in the course of that period. The communiqué of 4 July 1972 took into account those two facts and laid the foundation for a dialogue of reconciliation. The consensus of 28 November 1973 affirmed that objective.

(Mr. Mérenne, Belgium)

However, one year later, we find ourselves at the same point.

"No doubt it will require a great deal of courage and obduracy on the part of the leaders of both sides" -- said Ambassador Rahal -- "to confront this situation..." (2032nd meeting, p. 17-20)

Fifty million Koreans are still not represented in the United Nations, contrary to the principle of universality so often proclaimed by most Member States, and unlike the case of some other Members which are convinced that the admission of two States from the same nation to our Organization would not be prejudicial to their ability to form or to maintain their union.

There are many who, impatient at the lack of progress, would like to have the status of the United Nations Command reconsidered. That concern is reflected in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676 which is supported by my Government. That draft resolution is considered by the Belgian delegation in its new form, that is to say, as revised by the truly positive amendment made to operative paragraph 2, which proposes the examination of the

"dissolution of the United Nations Command in conjunction with arrangements to maintain the Armistice Agreement".

I hope that the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676 will be able to accept that amendment soon.

The draft resolution makes clear that this text does not, ipso facto, exclude the subsequent achievement of the objective laid down by the other draft resolution, that in document A/C.1/L.677; but one seems to us realistic and feasible while the other seems to us to have been drafted in haste in order to fix a final target.

Why indeed should one call for immediate withdrawal after there has been so much procrastination for 20 years, that is to say, ever since the armistice was concluded? To do so is to disregard the fact that the Command was a party to the agreement of 27 July 1953. We see a fundamental contradiction between acceptance of the consensus of 1973, which called for continuation of dialogue, and the request for an immediate end to the presence of troops under the United Nations flag.

(Mr. Mérenne, Belgium)

Feverish haste never encourages peace. It exacerbates the partners to the talks and tends dangerously to remind them of events which are never too far distant, even after 25 years, when they affect vital and fundamental human interests.

My delegation listened attentively to the statement of Mr. Li Jong Mok, Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of North Korea and I noted -- what to follow the advice of Mr. Huang Hua, Ambassador of China, I judge to be a positive element -- that the Government of Pyongyang is ready to negotiate with the United States at any time on problems which may arise if troops are withdrawn. As to the other problems which would arise after the withdrawal of troops, here again, according to the North Korean Minister, they could be the subject of bilateral military contacts and meetings of a North-South military commission which would replace the present armistice commission.

These problems which will precede, accompany and follow the dissolution of the United Nations Command are not however minor or merely local. They affect the whole world community, in particular the Security Council; they concern the parties directly involved in this international question and they affect the interests of South Korea as well as those of North Korea. In a word, it is nothing more nor less than a question of establishing conditions for a lasting peace after a quarter of a century of vain expectations.

The conditions should be laid down with the consent of the two Governments of Seoul and Pyongyang, before the withdrawal of the Command but after having taken the necessary measures to respect the Armistice Agreement.

Those are the points that I wanted to raise after having carefully studied the two texts which we have before us. The draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676, as amended, aims positively at a global solution of the Korean question and protects the two States from outside interference, a fundamental principle of the United Nations Charter.

The other draft resolution, in document A/C.1/L.677, which has not been amended, seems to us somewhat rash, and, if it is to be put to the vote we regret that we shall have to vote against it. I have said, "if it is to be put to the vote" because my delegation continues to believe that consensus is the only appropriate way in which the world community can render effective assistance in the settlement of the problem which divides the Korean peninsula.

Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) (interpretation from French): I am speaking on the Korean question after most aspects of the problem have been discussed at length by the speakers who have preceded me, and I had occasion myself, in the course of our debate last year, to deal with all its aspects -- the historical, the military and the political. What, in fact, is at stake? For many years the United Nations has been seeking to attain the objectives which it set for itself on the Korean peninsula, namely, the re-establishment by peaceful means of a unified, independent and democratic Korea within the framework of the restoration of international peace and security in the region. Our Organization has adopted resolutions all of which reaffirm those objectives.

In our debate today, while not losing sight of those objectives, the Committee must also take account of recent developments in the situation in Korea, that were clearly described to us by the head of the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, whose presence here we welcome. It is not my intention to describe those developments in detail once more: they are known to all. I wish only to say that a major turning point was reached with the issuance on 4 July 1972, by North and South Korea, of a Joint Communiqué which laid the basis on which the reunification of the country should and could be achieved. It was because of the uprising of the progressive forces in South Korea that the régime installed in South Korea was compelled to accept the dialogue, which North Korea had been proposing for many years with a view to seeking ways and means likely to restore the unity of the country, to which the entire Korean people aspires.

Our Organization, in taking note of the Joint Communiqué at the Assembly's 2181st meeting on 28 November 1973, endorsed the three principles on the basis of which unification was to be achieved. Because those principles are so important in the search for a solution to and the settlement of the Korean problem, I should like to recall them briefly. They are:

First, that the reunification of the country should be achieved independently, without reliance upon outside force or its interference.

Secondly, that the reunification of the country should be achieved by peaceful means, without recourse to the use of arms against the other side.

Thirdly, that great national unity should be promoted.

(Mr. El Hassen, Mauritania)

The agreement of the two Governments, of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the Republic of Korea, on those principles constitutes a fundamental advance on the way to a settlement of the Korean question. Now that those principles have been established, my delegation believes that it is necessary to seek the means that will lead to the attainment of the objective we seek, namely, the unification of Korea, whose people have for more than a quarter of a century been living in expectation of the restoration of their union. The way that is to lead to reunification has been mapped out by the Joint Communiqué of North and South Korea. Our duty, that of our Organization, is to assist that people to become the master of its own fate and to work out its destiny in all freedom. As is stated in the Joint Communiqué, the unification must be achieved peacefully, without foreign interference, by the Korean people themselves and through dialogue.

In its first phase the dialogue led to the publication of the Joint Communiqué of 4 July 1972. That result crowned long efforts unceasingly exerted by the revolutionary Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the progressive forces in the South. For the dialogue to be continued and to produce results, an atmosphere of détente between the two parties in Korea is needed. All obstacles to reunification must be removed, along with all elements likely to revive and perpetuate the climate of belligerency.

The withdrawal of American troops now stationed in Korea is, in our opinion, an important condition for creating that atmosphere of détente, which is the only atmosphere in which the Korean people can solve their own problems. My delegation sees no justification for the presence of these troops in South Korea. Their presence can really not be justified by the fear of a military invasion from the North because, quite obviously, if there is an invasion, it will be in the opposite direction, precisely because of the large numbers of troops in South Korea. No one among us can any longer have any doubt as to the nationality of those troops: they are American, since the United States delegation itself has said so in this Committee and that of South Korea has confirmed it. How, then, can we allow our Organization to lend its flag and its name to the mythical organization which is called the United Nations High Command? Members of this Organization

EH/jg/skg

A/C.1/PV.2035

48-50

(Mr. El Hassen, Mauritania)

cannot agree to the continued use, against all common sense and in so obvious a manner, as the instrument of the policy of a single State, in defiance of the interests of the international community and of the ideals of our Charter.

Thus the attitude of the South Korean authorities seems to me even more incomprehensible. When they strive for those troops to be maintained, we wonder whether they are sincere in their desire to achieve the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea and whether they wish to comply with the spirit and the letter of the Joint Communiqué of 4 July 1972, which states in paragraph 7:

"The two sides, firmly convinced that the aforementioned agreed items correspond with the common aspirations of the entire people, who are anxious to see an early unification of the fatherland, hereby solemnly pledge before the entire Korean people that they will faithfully carry out these agreed items." (A/8727, p. 40)

The attitude of the South Korean authorities in regard to the withdrawal of foreign troops and their silence regarding the new proposals in the five-point programme of 23 June 1973 is not in accord with their declared intentions. Those new proposals submitted on 23 June 1973 by the President of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea offer the possibility of coexistence within the framework of a confederation, which would be the melting pot for the reconciliation of all Koreans, the mechanism for the peaceful reunification of the country.

(Mr. El Hassen, Mauritania)

My delegation is convinced that a fruitful dialogue between the North and the South can have no chance of success under the shadow of cannon and guns. The least our Organization can therefore do in order to make possible a reduction of tension and the establishment of many-sided exchanges in every field between the North and the South is to call immediately for the withdrawal of foreign troops stationed in South Korea under the United Nations flag.

My delegation hopes that this measure, which is advocated in the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.677 of which we are a sponsor, will be approved by all those who are concerned with strengthening peace in that part of the world.

Mr. HUSSEIN (Somalia): We all know that the Korean question is one of the evil consequences of the cold war which made its impact on the 38th parallel of that much suffering country. My country, which has also suffered arbitrary division in the "scramble for Africa" by colonialists in the last part of the nineteenth century, fully understands the ordeals and disruption which the Korean nation has had to bear and wishes to express here its whole-hearted sympathy for the cause of their reunification.

I have read with keen attention the statements made before the First Committee at this session by the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea on 25 and 28 November 1974, respectively. In their statements each one of them deplored the plight of the Korean people in being divided and each one of them affirmed that the main objective in the policy of his Government and people was to realize the reunification of the Korean nation through peaceful means and without interference from outside. This is in keeping with the Joint Communiqué of the North and South Korean Governments which has been embodied in the General Assembly's consensus statement on 28 November 1973, at its 2181st plenary meeting, on the recommendation of the First Committee.

This was a praiseworthy landmark in the progress towards the peaceful unification of the Korean nation, and it is most important that further progress should be encouraged at this session. My delegation supported the above decision on Korea which was adopted by consensus at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, because we considered this to be a useful step

(Mr. Hussein, Somalia)

towards the United Nations goal of helping to create favourable conditions to accelerate the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea.

There are two major considerations which my delegation believes should guide the General Assembly in its further efforts to bring about a peaceful agreement and to promote the reunification of the North and South. One consideration is that the Korean question is essentially a legacy of the cold war -- an international condition which the world has outgrown and which has now been replaced by the spirit of détente. The assumptions which produced the Korean problem were never valid ones. It was never right for a foreign Power to intervene in the internal affairs of another country in order to further its own strategic and ideological aims. That the United Nations should have lent its name to such an operation has led to one of the most unfortunate political involvements of the Organization's history. For the United Nations to continue to act on the basis of invalid assumptions after 28 years of division and 20 years of the unsettled state of armistice in Korea would be to show itself shortsighted and obstinate in its commitment to a discredited and outmoded past. Instead, the world Organization should show itself capable of a constructive and imaginative change of attitude on the Korean question.

The other consideration is that the Koreans are an independent people who cherish their strong traditions of political and cultural unity. They are fully capable of solving their problems by their own efforts. It is because of the foregoing considerations that the General Assembly, in dealing with this matter, must also be guided by the tenet that the internal affairs of each country should be settled by its own people on the principle of self-determination, and without external interference, whether direct or indirect.

The draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676, which my delegation regrets that it cannot support because of its ambiguity, states the need fully to implement the consensus of the twenty-eighth session. Actually the consensus states in paragraph 1 (a):

"The reunification of the country should be achieved independently, without reliance upon outside force or its interference;"

My delegation believes that the full implementation of that consensus can best be achieved by the withdrawal of all foreign troops stationed in South Korea

MLG/gt

A/C.1/PV.2035
53-55

(Mr. Hussein, Somalia)

under the flag of the United Nations. The need for this withdrawal is illustrated in all three of the principles of the Korean Joint Communiqué of 4 July 1972, which the General Assembly has noted with satisfaction. The implications of the first principle are obvious. If reunification is to be achieved independently without reliance on outside force or interference, then all foreign troops must be withdrawn from Korean soil. There is no dispute about the fact that the troops stationed in South Korea under the United Nations flag are exclusively American and are directed and financed solely by the United States for its own purposes. This force undoubtedly constitutes "outside forces".

The second and third principles of the Joint Communiqué stress the need for peaceful means of reunification and call for great national unity. These principles are also undermined by the threatening presence in the South of foreign troops hostile to the North and its political ideology.

It has been claimed in the past that the presence of the American forces in South Korea under the United Nations flag is necessary to protect the South from invasion by the North, and yet it is the South which is militarily superior.

The United States has tried to produce a number of "arguments" in order to justify the presence in South Korea of its troops.

In this connexion, the representative of the United States has claimed that its troops stationed in South Korea are not the "United Nations forces" but that they are troops stationed there under a "bilateral agreement", concluded between the United States and South Korea, and that the troops under the "United Nations Command" number no more than a few hundred. This statement implies that the United States troops stationed in South Korea are not bound by the Korean Armistice Agreement. In other words, the attempt by the representative of the United States to separate the United States troops stationed in South Korea from the "United Nations forces" seems to us unjustifiable from both the legal and the practical viewpoints. It further indicates that the United States tries to enable its troops to act at will in complete disregard of the Korean Armistice Agreement.

The United States also insists that the question of the dissolution of the "United Nations Command" must be referred to the Security Council for consideration.

If the United States troops, which can act at will, unbound by the Armistice Agreement, are left alone to remain in South Korea after the dissolution of only the "United Nations Command" -- which, as the United States representative stated, has no more than a few hundred personnel -- such a presence of United States troops will constitute a threat and will aggravate the tension in Korea.

The road to guaranteeing peace and security in Korea and accelerating the independent and peaceful reunification of that country lies not in lip service to the necessity of the Armistice Agreement or mere dissolution of the "United

Nations Command", but in the withdrawal of all the foreign troops under the name of the "United Nations", so that the Korean question may be left to the Korean people themselves.

The draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.677 fully reflects this logic and provides practical and useful elements for a peaceful and ever-lasting settlement of the Korean question.

Furthermore, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has put forward reasonable proposals for converting the unstable armistice into a durable one in Korea, including these proposals aimed at concluding a peace agreement with the United States and the establishment of a North-South joint military commission. Convinced that the United States Government is interested in seeing that peace should one day prevail in that area, we can hardly conceive why such proposals should not be acceptable to it as well as to the other sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676.

It should be noted that it is North Korea which has made the major overtures towards the conclusion of a peace agreement and is pressing for the discussion of the basic political and military questions, whereas South Korea has proposed to tackle humanitarian problems and exchanges in sports and in the cultural, economic and social fields. My delegation hopes that the Government of the Republic of Korea will realize that the presence of an "outside force" is a major legacy of the "cold war" measures which has to be removed first if the legitimate right of the Korean nation to reunite is to be fulfilled.

My delegation is confident that the adoption of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.677 and its speedy implementation would facilitate the dialogue between North and South, widen their many-sided exchanges and expedite the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea. By recognizing the necessity of withdrawing all the foreign troops stationed in South Korea under the flag of the United Nations, the General Assembly would be supporting the removal of a major impediment to the realization of the aspirations of the Korean people. It would also be acting to support the integrity of the United Nations and to ensure the commitment of the world Organization to its own principles, thus rectifying the unfortunate situation which was created in its name a quarter of a century ago.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I now call on the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Mr. LI JONG MOK (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) (spoke in Korean; English text furnished by the delegation): First of all, I wish to express my profound thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, for providing us with another opportunity to take the floor.

In our statement on 25 November, we demanded that the United Nations take appropriate measures to withdraw the foreign troops occupying south Korea under the flag of the United Nations, who have imposed on the Korean people the sufferings of national division for a quarter of a century, in order to enable the Korean people to solve the Korean question by themselves.

Our demand reflects the unanimous will and desire of the entire Korean people and the peace-loving peoples of the world. It is also in full accord with the trend of the present times advancing towards independence and fully conforms to the ideals of peace as well as to the principles of the United Nations Charter, which is based on respect for equality and self-determination.

Therefore the representatives of various countries that treasure peace and justice have expressed active support for our just position to realize the independent and peaceful reunification of the country after the withdrawal of all the foreign troops from south Korea.

However, the representatives of the United States and some other countries and the "representative" of south Korea have schemed to maintain the occupation of south Korea by foreign troops, going against the current of the times. The representative of the United States insisted that the United States troops should remain in south Korea to preserve "peace" in Korea, saying that the presence of the United States troops in south Korea is the "sole basis ... of peace in Korea". What a hypocritical argument it is.

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

There can be found no instance in history of an aggressor who calls himself an aggressor when he invades other countries. All aggressors without exception have invaded other countries under the sign of "peace" and occupied other countries for domination under the name of "protection".

Such an aggressive logic could work in the international arena only in the past when the imperialists could handle the fate of small nations at will; but today, when hundreds of millions of people who were subjected to oppression and humiliation in the past have emerged on the scene of history as its masters, that sort of outdated sophistry can go down with no one.

The representative of the United States, reversing black and white as if we had provoked the war in 1950 to "invade" south Korea, clamoured that the United States troops were dispatched to south Korea to check "aggression" in defence of "peace".

But it is a stern historical fact which cannot be concealed by anything that the United States instigated the bellicose elements of south Korea into launching an aggressive war according to its premeditated plan and committed overt armed intervention under the name of the United Nations in an attempt to destroy the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in its cradle.

According to the logic of the United States representative, it was an act of "defence" on the part of the United States to dispatch tens of thousands of its troops to invade another's territory, whereas it was an act of an "aggressor" on our part to fight to repel the aggressive forces of a foreign country from our territory. What a gangster-like logic it is.

As for the United Nations Security Council "resolution" of 1950 which the representative of the United States mentioned in his statement, it was a "resolution" forged by the United States to camouflage, under the name of the United Nations, the aggressive war it had provoked with the design of dominating the whole of Korea and all the other consequent acts of aggression it committed in Korea.

Since the unwarrantedness of the "resolution" of the United Nations Security Council on sending the "United Nations forces" to south Korea has already been demonstrated by the representatives of many countries, I will not repeat it.

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

Is it really for the defence of peace that the United States troops remain in south Korea, as alleged by the representative of the United States? During the Korean war, the former commander of the United States Eighth Army issued an order: "Kill all who appear before you. Your hands should not tremble even if those appearing before you are children or old men. You ought to fulfil your duties as American citizens by killing more Koreans". The barbarous atrocities of massacre committed by the United States troops during the Korean war under the flag of the United Nations have been well exposed before the world.

The United States soldiers who are accustomed to vile racial discrimination are engrossed even today in all sorts of barbarous atrocities, such as killing the south Korean people for fun, shooting them to death as targets in firing training, assaulting the pedestrians, setting military dogs on them, raping and insulting women, raiding civilian houses to plunder the property of the inhabitants and so forth.

There remains a constant danger of war in Korea, that is far from being removed and that is also due to the United States troops who, occupying the half of our country, continue manoeuvres for aggression and war against the Korean people. Those are the true colours of the United States troops whom the United States representative tried to describe as apostles of peace.

The United States again insisted in this Committee that the "question of the future" of the "United Nations Command" must be referred to the Security Council for consideration. The real intention of this argument is, in fact, to prevent the current session of the United Nations General Assembly from taking measures for the withdrawal of all foreign troops stationed in south Korea under the flag of the United Nations.

In the past, the United States presented to the United Nations General Assembly proposals on maintaining the United States troops in south Korea under the name of the United Nations; and the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted annually its "resolutions" on keeping the "United Nations forces" in south Korea.

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

Since the General Assembly of the United Nations has so far been discussing and deciding on the continued presence of the "United Nations forces" in south Korea, it is natural that the question of dissolving those forces must also be discussed and decided in the General Assembly.

Such being the case, why does the United States stubbornly attempt to bring this question before the Security Council? The motive is very clear. The real intention of the United States is to check, by all means, the demand of the Korean people and the peoples of the world for the withdrawal of the "United Nations forces" by wielding its veto power.

The representative of the United States tried to convince this Committee that the United States troops in south Korea were not the "United Nations forces" but the troops stationed there under the "ROK-United States mutual defence pact".

I believe that the representatives present here may recall vividly previous arguments of the representatives of the United States who insisted in this forum of the United Nations that the United States troops could not withdraw from south Korea unless the United Nations adopted a resolution, because, they said, those forces were the "United Nations forces".

The United States insisted that its troops were the "United Nations forces" at one time when it thought it was advantageous to use the name of the United Nations for justifying the occupation of south Korea by its troops; but it argues that its troops are not the "United Nations forces" today when it finds it disadvantageous for its troops to put on the helmets of the "United Nations forces". This is a habitual method the United States is used to employing.

It is an undeniable historic fact that the United States troops came to south Korea under the name of the "United Nations forces" before the conclusion of the "ROK-United States mutual defence pact".

On no pretext whatsoever can the United States justify the occupation of south Korea by the United States troops.

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

The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has already put forward a concrete and clear-cut proposal for the subsequent settlement of the Armistice Agreement that may arise in connexion with the withdrawal of the "United Nations forces" from south Korea. However, the representatives of the United States and some other countries continue to talk about some sort of guarantee.

Our proposal that the questions arising in connexion with the withdrawal of the United States troops from south Korea be solved by way of concluding a peace agreement between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States and that the questions arising with regard to the implementation of the Korean Armistice Agreement and the preservation of a durable peace in Korea after the withdrawal of the United States troops be solved through the north-south joint military commission to be formed between the north and the south provides a solid guarantee.

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

What other guarantee is necessary?

If the Government of the United States has no other intention, why does it continuously talk about a sort of guarantee while keeping aloof from our clear-cut and concrete proposal?

If the United States sincerely wants peace, it should not waste time with empty talk but accept our proposal on concluding a peace agreement for converting the armistice into a lasting peace in Korea.

If the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States conclude a peace agreement and all the United States troops withdraw from south Korea thereafter, the military authorities of the north and the south will hold bilateral military talks to take measures for removing the military confrontation between the north and the south and, further, for accelerating the independent and peaceful reunification of the country.

The representative of France put forward before this Committee an amendment on dissolving only the "United Nations Command", while leaving the United States troops in south Korea. This is, in essence, to enable the United States troops to continuously occupy south Korea. Therefore, we categorically oppose his proposal.

Should the "United Nations Command" be dissolved, all the foreign troops stationed in south Korea under the name of the "United Nations forces" must also be withdrawn.

If the United States troops remain in south Korea, the dissolution of the "United Nations Command" will not make any difference in substance, for the danger of war will persist; the interference of the foreign troops in our internal affairs will continue and our nation will still remain divided.

The question of dissolving the "United Nations Command" and the question of withdrawing the United States troops bearing the flag of the United Nations are one and the same question, which cannot be separated.

It is also because of the presence of United States troops in south Korea, which instigate the south Korean authorities into confrontation, that no progress has so far been made to this day in the dialogue, despite the fact that at the twenty-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly, all the Member States of this Organization supported the North-South Joint Statement and expressed their hope that the reunification of Korea would be realized on the basis of that Statement.

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

In this Committee, the representative of the United States said that the United States fully supports the North-South Joint Statement and the resolution of the twenty-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly that supported the Joint Statement.

If so, let me ask him a question. Since the North-South Joint Statement provides that the reunification of our country shall be achieved independently without interference from any outside forces, why does the United States doggedly refuse to withdraw its troops from south Korea, only saying in words that it supports the North-South Joint Statement?

The representative of the United States tried to blame us for our statement that we cannot compromise with the splitters or join hands with the traitors to our nation.

To compromise with the splitters means that we take the same boat with those who divide the nation. We can never do that. We demand reunification and reject division. That being so, we oppose any attempt to divide our country permanently.

It is quite natural for us to state that we cannot join hands with the traitors to our nation.

How can we, the patriots, join hands with the traitors to our nation who are selling off our country, clinging to the sleeves of the outside forces?

The United States should be aware that it can never impose on us the road of division and treason which it has imposed on the south Korean authorities.

The representative of the United States has brought up again the proposal on the simultaneous admission of two Koreas in the United Nations that it suggested to the twenty-eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly last year, but that proposal only met with the denunciation of the representatives of many countries, before it became a totally rejected and bankrupt idea.

The proposal on the simultaneous admission of two Koreas into the United Nations is aimed at dividing the north and the south of Korea into two States permanently.

Here, again, one can see how persistent the United States is in its manoeuvres to divide Korea permanently.

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

It is an urgent problem the solution of which brooks no further delay, to withdraw all the foreign troops stationed in south Korea under the flag of the United Nations.

The United States is resorting to every conceivable machination to refuse the withdrawal of its aggressive troops occupying south Korea; but it is a futile attempt.

Today, it is the unanimous will of the entire Korean people and a demand of the peace-loving peoples of the world that the United States troops, carrying the flag of the United Nations with them, be withdrawn from south Korea.

We sincerely hope that the current session of the United Nations General Assembly will take fair measures to withdraw all the foreign troops stationed in south Korea under the sign of the United Nations, thereby to contribute to the acceleration of the Korean people's cause for national reunification.

We appeal once again to the representatives of various countries who love peace and justice to express active support for our just efforts for the withdrawal of all the foreign troops from south Korea, for termination of the interference of outside forces in the internal affairs of Korea, and for attainment of the independent and peaceful reunification of our fatherland.

Mr. CLARK (Nigeria): In the view of my delegation, three positive developments emerged from our consideration of the question of Korea last year. Firstly, the participation in the debate by the representatives of the two integral parts of Korea, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea.

For years, my delegation has argued that both parties had a stake in the matter and that therefore they should be given the opportunity to be heard without preconditions. For we believe that he who seeks equity must come with clean hands. The restrained manner in which the two delegations from Korea stated their cases convinced my delegation of the wisdom of the consensus which the General Assembly later adopted at its 2181st plenary meeting on 28 November 1973.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

It was clear to my delegation from their statements that the two Korean parties loved their country and that they had a deep and abiding interest in the reunification of their fatherland in peace and freedom. As we took the liberty of reiterating last year, the Korean people are one and indivisible, united by ties of common heritage, culture, language, and destiny that are incarnated by centuries of a common history and shared struggles against foreign domination. A united Korean nation of 50 million strong with an area of 85,000 square miles, rich in manpower and endowed with enormous material resources, a great Power in Asia and in the world, is to be desired rather than a divided nation as it is at present.

Secondly, the decision to dissolve the United Nations Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK). When an institution or body founded for a specific purpose becomes a casualty of time and circumstance, it becomes a disservice to its ideals to seek to perpetuate its existence. UNCURK was such an institution -- moribund and obsolescent. The South-North Joint Communiqué, issued by the authorities of North and South Korea on 4 July 1972, provided, inter alia, for the establishment of the North-South Co-ordinating Committee to discuss national reunification problems. This Korean initiative, which paved the way for the first time in a quarter of a century for a meaningful dialogue of reconciliation for reunification of both the North and the South is a much better machinery for attaining the goal of national unity of Korea than UNCURK. My delegation is glad to note that the purpose of this dialogue was, and still is, to achieve the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea.

The third important point that emerged from our consideration of the question last year was the consensus that I have already referred to. The consensus, which was based on the three principles embodied in the Joint Communiqué issued by North and South Korea, was remarkable as much for the hope and expectation it held for the continuation of the dialogue aimed at expediting the independent peaceful reunification of Korea as for the fact that the principles were enunciated by the Korean people themselves. All true friends of Korea wished that the talks would be given a chance to succeed on the basis of those principles. Those principles, we may recall, were that the reunification of the country should be achieved independently without reliance upon outside force or its interference;

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

that the reunification of the country should be achieved by peaceful means without recourse to the use of arms against the other side; and that great national unity should be promoted.

Yet a year has passed and we are seized of the same problem without the benefit of being advised by the parties concerned that they are nearer to their national goal of unity this year than last year. In the view of my delegation, two issues face the current session of the General Assembly with respect to the question of Korea, namely, first, determination of the United Nations Command in South Korea; and secondly, preserving the spirit and essentials of the Armistice Agreement so as to ensure that peace and security continue to be maintained in Korea and in order to facilitate the reunification talks on the basis of the principles of the North-South Joint Communiqué of 4 July 1972.

So much has happened since the Security Council resolution 84 (1950) of 7 July 1950 that my delegation does not propose at this stage to address itself to the legality of the so-called United Nations Command in South Korea. The cablegram dated 29 June 1950 from the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Secretary-General, and the cablegram dated 6 July 1950 from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to the Secretary-General of the United Nations challenging the legality of the said resolution, as well as the statements of the two great Powers and of others regarding their interpretation of the resolution since then cannot be ignored, bearing in mind the meaning of Articles 23 and 27 of the Charter of the United Nations. Yet, to go back in history is to reopen old wounds, to poison the atmosphere of détente that now exists between the two great Powers.

What my delegation would like to see is that the détente between the great Powers should also be extended to their policies towards Korea, but legal arguments as to the competence of the Security Council or General Assembly to determine the present status of the United Nations Command should not be used to defer an option that is ripe and opportune for us to take during the current session. In this connexion,

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

"Attention is called to paragraph 60 of the Armistice Agreements, which recommends to the governments of the countries concerned on both sides that within three months after the signature of the Armistice a political conference be held to settle through negotiation 'the questions of the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea, the peaceful settlement of the Korean question, etc.'". (S/3079)

The reference to paragraph 60 of the Armistice Agreement that I have just made is not in my words. They are the words of the Acting Representative of the United States of America in a note dated 7 August 1953, transmitting a special report of the United Nations Command on the armistice in Korea to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The United States acting representative went on to pledge on behalf of his own Government and of the 15 other United Nations Members, whose military forces were participating in the Korean action, that they would support the efforts of the United Nations to bring about an equitable settlement in Korea based on the principles which have long been established by the United Nations and which call for a united, independent, and democratic Korea.

That was 20 years ago... We think the time has come for the international community to rise above the rhetoric and policies of the cold war that have long bedeviled the Korean question, thereby recognizing that the Armistice Agreement, a military agreement between military commanders, was intended only to make possible a final settlement of the question of Korea. It had no other logic of its own.

Under the prevailing international situation, the presence of foreign troops in South Korea under the flag of the United Nations is an anachronism. The flag of the United Nations is a symbol of peace and amity between nations. It must not be used to perpetuate the cause of a broken sword, a cause the purpose of which is no longer evident to the Organization, a cause that is neither peace keeping nor peace-making.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

The representative of Tunisia raised a very important question the other day. In consistency with Article 47 of the United Nations Charter, the Ambassador of Tunisia wanted to know the United Nations military requirements in Korea, the employment of its forces, their composition and command and so on. If the Secretary-General's reply, as we suspect, turns out to be that the United Nations Command in Korea is only an expression, a cover for the United States troops in Korea under the provisions of the Mutual Defence Treaty between the United States and South Korea, as claimed by the South Korean authorities in paragraph 41 of document A/C.1/1049 of 1 November 1974; if the reply is to the effect that since 1970 the Secretary-General of the United Nations has not received even a routine report concerning the activities of the Command, it would be best to put an immediate end to the so-called Command and thereby withdraw the flag of the United Nations from the United States troops in Korea. This should be done without delay. It should be done at this session of the General Assembly.

The termination of the United Nations Command in Korea does not, in our view, mean the invalidation of the terms and conditions of the Armistice Agreement. The agreement was to ensure a complete cessation of hostilities and of all acts of armed force in Korea until a final peaceful settlement was achieved. The United Nations has a responsibility to assist the parties concerned to prevent the occurrence of incidents likely to lead to a resumption of hostilities between North and South Korea.

But the United Nations cannot impose unification on Korea or on any other country, for that matter. It has a duty to help. It is up to the parties concerned to exercise their right to self-determination and to resolve their domestic problems. It is up to the parties concerned to agree on the nature of assistance they require from the United Nations. Nigeria, as a faithful Member of the United Nations, stands ready to participate in any constructive programme in that eventuality.

(Mr. Clark, Nigeria)

It is against the above background that my delegation views the draft resolutions in documents A/C.1/L.676 and A/C.1/L.677, both of 7 October 1974. Both draft resolutions recognize the need for the reunification of Korea through peaceful negotiations and dialogue; the need for the maintenance of peace and security in that country; the need to terminate the current fiction of a United Nations Command in Korea.

My delegation, therefore, would have been happier if a consensus similar to that of last year had emerged from the two draft resolutions which would lead, on the one hand, to the immediate dissolution of the United Nations Command in Korea, and would at the same time, on the other hand, promote the dialogue between the South and the North of Korea that is so necessary for the attainment of the goal of peaceful reunification of Korea. My delegation does not see in this wish any contradiction of the resolution of the Conference of Non-Aligned States on the reunification of Korea, which we support.

Mr. DOSUMU-JOHNSON (Liberia): I have asked to speak to make a brief but important announcement on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676. I am happy to say that we have considered in a positive spirit and studied with considerable care the amendment (A/C.1/L.704 and Corr.1) to our draft resolution which has been put forward by the delegation of France.

It would alter our operative paragraph 2 so that the General Assembly would thereby express the hope that the Security Council will consider those aspects of the Korean question which are the responsibility of the Council, including the dissolution of the United Nations Command, in conjunction with arrangements to maintain the Armistice Agreement of 1953.

We the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676 acknowledge with appreciation the effort of France to suggest a text that can reduce the difference between our draft resolution and that in document A/C.1/L.677. Hoping to bring about a more constructive result, we have considered the French amendment sympathetically.

(Mr. Dosumu-Johnson, Liberia)

Now, I am authorized by the sponsors to say that we accept that amendment. Thus, I formally request that the Secretariat issue a revision of our proposal that will incorporate the corrected French amendment. This revision would be given the symbol A/C.1/L.676/Rev.1. We hope that the text of our revised draft resolution can be available in all the official languages tomorrow.

I want to add our strong hope that our agreement to the amendment of France will encourage even greater support for our draft resolution. We believe that our revised draft resolution seeks to harmonize different views on the question of Korea and that it is therefore in the best tradition of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee has taken due note of the statement of the representative of Liberia on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676 to the effect that they agree to incorporate in the text the amendment proposed by France in document A/C.1/L.704 and Corr.1. The Secretariat will try to fulfil the request made by the representative of Liberia to circulate the revised text of his draft resolution.

Mr. ASHTAL (Democratic Yemen): Last year the General Assembly adopted a consensus statement on the question of Korea expressing the hope that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea would continue their dialogue and widen their many-sided exchanges and co-operation. My delegation subscribes to that consensus statement in the belief that further dialogue could possibly create conditions for the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea and the peaceful reunification of that country.

Not surprisingly, the talks between the two parties were broken off in August with no tangible progress to be reported to the General Assembly. In short, we are now confronted with the same situation that has been prevailing in Korea for more than two decades.

AW/hcd

A/C.1/PV.2035
79-80

(Mr. Ashtal, Democratic Yemen)

It was the understanding of my delegation that the dialogue between the two parties was a matter concerning the Koreans themselves, that it should be undertaken without any foreign interference whatsoever, and that the dismantlement of American military bases in the south would guarantee the favourable outcome of the dialogue.

(Mr. Ashtal, Democratic Yemen)

However, by their very existence foreign military troops contributed to the disruption of the dialogue. If we are to move a step ahead and to encourage the Koreans to reach a peaceful solution through dialogue, we must focus on the main obstruction to a constructive dialogue -- namely, the stationing of foreign troops in South Korea.

It is naïve to accept the argument that American troops in South Korea constitute a stabilizing factor on the Korean peninsula and that they are there to preserve peace and security in the area. They certainly serve the so-called security interests of imperialists in the Far East, but they do not bring peace to the Korean people.

After the withdrawal of Soviet troops from North Korea, we cannot find any explanation for the continued occupation of South Korea by American troops. It is an established fact that South Korea is more populated and more armed than North Korea. If there is a threat to the Seoul régime it comes from the people of South Korea themselves. The American troops are therefore defending a repressive régime from internal upheaval. They are not keeping the peace in Korea. They are, rather, keeping the Government in Seoul.

The Foreign Affairs Daily, a United States intelligence publication, last week mentioned that from 1 July 1945 to 30 June 1973 the United States Government had extended to South Korea US\$ 6,420 million in direct military aid. Such tremendous military support has transformed South Korea into a garrison State able not only to defend itself but also to launch aggression on others. Yet the United States and its allies consider South Korea helpless prey to the so-called "southward aggression".

During the same period, 1945 to 1973, the United States pumped into South Korea some US\$5,551 million in economic aid, only to bolster a dictatorial régime imposed on the Korean people by force of arms. Even some American newspapers have nothing but condemnation for a puppet régime that muffles free expression and strangles the so-called democracy the United States is ostensibly defending.

(Mr. Ashtal, Democratic Yemen)

It is a discredit to the United Nations that its flag is used to shelter foreign occupation of South Korea. During the heyday of imperialism and the height of the cold war foreign troops were sent to Korea under the banner of the United Nations. Whatever the reason for dispatching foreign troops to South Korea, their continued presence is now unwarranted and, indeed, condemnable. Since the cold war, there has been a general relaxation of tension in some parts of the world. Major problems such as the Berlin crisis have been more or less defused. There is now loud talk about détente between the great Powers, yet Korea remains in the era of the cold war. Why is it that United States policy regarding Korea is unaffected by détente? If the United States is insensitive to the wishes of the Korean people for withdrawal, why should the United Nations become an instrument for foreign interference in the affairs of the Korean people? A so-called United Nations Command directly accountable to the Pentagon cannot be tolerated by our Organization.

We are confident that the Koreans can solve their problems without external interference. Actually, one of the important elements in last year's consensus was the non-involvement of external Powers. Foreign troops stationed in South Korea can only make it more difficult for the parties to reach a peaceful solution. Their withdrawal is therefore a necessary precondition for further progress in the dialogue.

The two parties in Korea have agreed to engage in a dialogue under the three principles of independence, peaceful reunification and great national unity. Let us enhance their mutual trust by removing the obstructionist foreign presence in South Korea, and then Korea can be admitted to the United Nations as a unified or confederated entity.

Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): My delegation would like to welcome once again the participation of the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the debate on the question of Korea. They are the parties most directly concerned whose participation in the debate last year had a positive influence in bringing about the consensus statement that was unanimously endorsed by the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly. It would be most regrettable if their participation in the debate this year were to revive a hostile political

(Mr. Panyarachun, Thailand)

atmosphere and lead to a detraction from the reasonable course charted by the 4 July 1972 Joint Communiqué we all welcome.

It is regrettable enough that as we meet here again only a part of the consensus first adopted by this Committee last year -- that concerning the dissolution of UNCURK -- has been fulfilled. It is apparent that the North-South dialogue to the continuation and revitalization of which we all attached so much hope has made little progress. Indeed, there have been disturbing incidents that served only to aggravate tensions on the Korean peninsula.

My delegation wishes at the outset to make two points clear in connexion with the position of the Thai Government on the question of Korea.

First, the political problems between the two Koreas must be solved by the Korean people themselves, peacefully, free from outside interference.

Secondly, the main responsibility of the United Nations in Korea has been the restoration and maintenance of the conditions of peace and security which would be conducive to the eventual realization of the cherished goal of peaceful reunification of Korea. The continuing role of the United Nations on the Korean peninsula can be justified only in so far as it contributes to the process of normalization. However, it would be difficult for peaceful settlement to proceed in conditions of insecurity and instability. Therefore any action which might jeopardize present cease-fire arrangements before practical alternatives can be found would be fraught with grave danger. Moreover, with regard to the United Nations Command in Korea, any decision to be taken on its future role must necessarily fall within the responsibility of the Security Council, whose original decisions and resolutions established the United Nations Command in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. The Commander-in-Chief of the United Nations Command was the signatory of the Armistice Agreement which brought to an end the fighting in Korea in 1953, and the Armistice Agreement remains an essential requisite for peace and tranquillity on the Korean peninsula.

The United Nations has had a long history of association with the maintenance of peace and security in the area. Thailand has participated in good faith in the United Nations actions in Korea in order to secure the legitimate right of the Korean people to decide their own destiny peacefully, free from coercion.

(Mr. Panyarachun, Thailand)

My delegation continues to believe that it is essential that the people of Korea be allowed to take up the responsibility and the challenge of carrying to a successful conclusion the task of peaceful reunification of their fatherland.

Thailand maintains a policy of peaceful coexistence and co-operation towards all States, irrespective of their political, economic or social systems. We believe that the legitimate security interests of each State can be safeguarded by strict compliance with the principles of peaceful coexistence as enunciated in the Bandung Declaration. For its part, Thailand has endeavoured to follow this policy without prejudice to the existing cordial relations with friendly States. In this connexion, our goodwill has been reciprocated and further strengthened. Earlier this year, a trade mission, headed by the Minister for External Trade from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, paid an official visit to Thailand. In return, an official trade mission is due to leave Thailand in the middle of this month, bound for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It is the earnest hope of my delegation that from this modest beginning will come a better understanding between the peoples of the two countries which will, in turn, pave the way for mutually beneficial co-operation for peace, harmony and progress in East Asia.

It may be recalled that the beginnings of contact between South Korea and North Korea in September 1971 were made possible in part by the emerging new era of accommodation and negotiation. It is imperative that this momentum towards the relaxation of tensions, in so far as it applies to Korea and the region, is not hampered or retarded.

It is in the foregoing spirit that the Thai delegation, together with other co-sponsors, have submitted the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676, which urges full implementation of the consensus of the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly on the Question of Korea, in order to maintain peace and security, as well as enhance tranquillity and harmony on the Korean peninsula.

(Mr. Panyarachun, Thailand)

My delegation believes this draft resolution, which would now incorporate the amendment submitted by the French delegation, to be a balanced one, as it is designed to move the consensus of last year a step further, in order to deal with those aspects of the Korean question involving the peace and security of the peninsula, including the dissolution of the United Nations Command, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, with alternative arrangements to maintain the Armistice Agreement. The draft resolution does not aim at confrontation but rather conciliation and accommodation. It does not seek to apportion blame or indulge in ideological pursuits. As such, my delegation believes that this draft resolution will serve to encourage an improvement in the climate which could facilitate any political settlement that the Korean people may ultimately work out for themselves to ensure a just and lasting peace for their country and region.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I have no more speakers on my list for this afternoon.

The Committee will recall that a few days ago the representative of Tunisia put a few questions to the Secretariat relating to the United Nations Command in Korea, and at today's meeting the representative of Cuba also put a few questions along the same lines. Now, to settle this question, I will call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. BANERJEE (Secretary of the Committee): On 7 July 1950, the Security Council adopted resolution S/1588 which established the Unified Command in Korea and requested the United States to designate the commander of such forces. The United States was also requested in that resolution to provide the Security Council with reports as appropriate on the course of action taken under the Unified Command. In response, the United States representative on 25 July 1950 transmitted to the Secretary-General for the attention of the Security Council a communiqué of the Far East Command announcing the establishment of the United Nations Command (Security Council document S/1629).

(Mr. Banerjee, Secretary
of the Committee)

Since then the United States has provided reports and notes verbales which have been circulated as Security Council documents. A list of these has been prepared by the Secretariat and is available for distribution after this meeting. These communications include information on the assignment of the successive American Commanders. The last was dated 13 November 1970. The United Nations Command, in addition, provided information on security developments in UNCURK until the dissolution of that body in 1973. This information was also incorporated in the annual UNCURK reports to the General Assembly, for example, the relevant sections of General Assembly documents A/6712, A/7212, A/7629, A/8026, A/8427, A/8727, A/9027.

The various reports submitted by the United States on behalf of the United Nations Command do not include information on specific matters such as unit commanders, current number and nationality of officers and other ranks about which the Permanent Representative of Tunisia inquired; nor do they include the points raised by the representative of Cuba this morning. Such information we believe would be available only from official United States sources.

Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to thank through you, Mr. Chairman, the representative of the Secretariat for the information which he has given us in response to the request made a few days ago by the representative of Tunisia and in response to my request this morning.

The situation is a little more confused now, it would seem, than it was a short time ago. All the representatives here on one occasion or another have, I am sure, visited the thirty-eighth floor of the Secretariat building, and they must have seen a room which is next to the office of the President of the Assembly, where there are, framed and hung on the walls, up-to-date statistics showing the breakdown by nations of all United Nations Forces in various parts of the world, such as, for example the Force in Cyprus, or the Observers in a certain part of Asia -- not Korea -- and in the Middle East too.

AP/jg

A/C.1/PV.2035
89-90

(Mr. Alarcon, Cuba)

From the Secretariat's information, am I to understand that the Secretariat does not have this information about Korea and that, if I understood correctly, the most recent information received about that country goes back to November 1970, that is, a little more than four years ago?

I fear that if the Secretariat is not able to give even the name of the Commander of those Forces, nor the breakdown by nations, it will naturally be unable also to reply to the questions I put this morning, which are linked with the statement that I made yesterday about what is being apparently discussed in the United States Congress, according to United States sources, about the possible integration of that mysterious United Nations Command with the United States Eighth Army, nor can we expect any information about what is being done by the Second Division of the United States Army in the demilitarized zone in Korea.

(Mr. Alarcon, Cuba)

It would seem that the last sentence of the Secretary of the Committee is accurate and that the only persons that would thus be in a position to give information about those singular United Nations forces are the members of the delegation of the United States. However, the situation is even more confusing now that we have just heard our friend, Ambassador Johnson of Liberia, who said that the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676 -- which I suspect also include the United States -- had accepted the French amendment. They have agreed to add the idea of the dissolution of the United Nations Command -- the head of which is unknown, the membership of which is unknown and information about which has not been received by the United Nations. Perhaps the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676 might be able to be of some help to the Committee by sorting out this mystery to some extent. Perhaps they could invite one of their colleagues, the representative of the United States, who holds the key to the mystery, to inform the Committee duly so that it can reach a decision in full knowledge of all the relevant facts. If that is impossible, it seems to us that perhaps the sponsors might be moved to withdraw their draft resolution, once they have agreed to add to it mention of this mysterious United Nations Command. However, if that is not the case, since in the General Assembly recently they gave a similar demonstration -- and I think it was all of them -- in connexion with another item having to do with the Asian region, perhaps the sponsors might also on this occasion vote against their draft resolution.

Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): First of all, I should like to thank the Secretary of the Committee for the information with which we have just been provided. I should like also to reserve my right to make comments regarding that information, after I have taken a closer look at it. At the present time it is very difficult for me to draw any conclusions from it. A lot of documents are quoted for our benefit, but I must say that I do not feel that I have made much progress since I asked the question. My intention when I asked the questions I did was to encourage the Committee to look into the matter somewhat more closely, to be somewhat more realistic,

(Mr. Driss, Tunisia)

and to study the questions which have been submitted to us for consideration with great care, so that decisions which we might reach would not necessarily be those with which we were presented when we began consideration of the question and so that we might demonstrate a certain sense of responsibility.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I did not ask to speak in order to participate in any squabble relating to the number of troops in South Korea, or any other part of the world for that matter. That is a question that does not directly relate to the search for a solution based on negotiations and conciliation between the parties but is the sort of detail that will bring more contention and more dissent I believe. We know very well that there are troops and though I am not a military man, I hear that they are American troops. There may be a sprinkling of other troops. There may be mercenaries or troops anywhere in the North or in the South. We are not concerned with the number of troops or whether we will get an accurate reply but we are concerned about finding a satisfactory solution based on negotiation and consultations. I lauded the French delegation the other day for having lent their hand in the introduction of an amendment, while I was trying to find perhaps a supplement to the solution or, rather, in part the solution of our French colleagues. I have been advised that the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676 have accepted that amendment with certain changes and with the words "to maintain the Armistice Agreement". All our trouble comes from armistice agreements I find because sometimes they are protracted. In our area there was an armistice agreement and many things did not happen after that. Armistice agreements, if they are not supplemented by good intentions on both sides, are a dead letter. They fossilize or freeze a situation. That is why I believe that even the French text that was accepted by the sponsors should itself be amended. This is not a subamendment to the amendment but is an amendment to the new text.

Our friend was mentioning something that had some bearing on the Cambodian question I believe when he said that some people would vote against their own amendment. Yes, I did vote against it but to solve the problem and

(Mr. Baroodi, Saudi Arabia)

I said that from the rostrum. No more needling. I also have big needles, so be careful what you say, whether you come from Cuba, the United States, China, the Soviet Union or anywhere else. I am working here trying to dedicate myself, as everyone else should -- and I am sure that there are people who are more dedicated than myself -- to negotiate and bring conciliation, not to widen the rift just because of petty national interests or strategic considerations, and I dare anyone to say that we have an axe to grind.

Now I shall calmly propose a Saudi Arabian amendment to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676 which has been amended and the amendment accepted with a certain revision -- corrigendum 1, I believe. If there is any mistake in the enumeration, it can be corrected by the Secretariat.

Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.676 reads:

"Expresses the hope that the Security Council, bearing in mind the need to ensure continued adherence to the Armistice Agreement and the full maintenance of peace and security in the area, will in due course give consideration, in consultation with the parties directly concerned, to those aspects of the Korean question, including the future of the United Nations Command, which fall within its responsibility."

Would the Secretariat please note: in operative paragraph 2 as amended replace the words "with arrangements to maintain the Armistice Agreement" by the following words -- and here is my amendment: "with appropriate arrangements calculated to preserve peace and security in the Korean peninsula pending negotiations and conciliation between the two Korean Governments". Why maintain the Armistice Agreement as if it is sacrosanct? There may be other ways, including the Armistice Agreement, if all parties agree to certain provisions that are not irritating.

If the members of the Security Council are agreed that there is a need, an exclusive need, for the Armistice Agreement, then there is no problem. But supposing some say that the Armistice Agreement could be interpreted in a different manner? Then the trouble starts again in the Security Council. Hence my amendment and the words "appropriate arrangements", which could include certain provisions of the Armistice Agreement. It does not rule out the Armistice Agreement, but there may be other ways of coming to some sort of agreement, and they could be adopted without any more contention in the Security Council, leave aside the two Governments, which certainly have divergent views on how certain provisions of the Armistice Agreement should be observed. It gives leeway. It is an amplification of the original French amendment.

We are all agreed that it is a fiction to say that it is a United Nations Command, and I believe our American colleagues admit that it is a fiction. Sometimes truth is stranger than fiction. How can you hoist a flag over the troops there and call it a United Nations flag, after 22 years when the United Nations has not needed to consider it its flag? But that does not mean that the Republic of Korea could not have special arrangements with the Americans, -- or with the Soviets, which is far-fetched, or with the Chinese, which is more far-fetched -- to have troops. There is the Warsaw Pact and there is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and there are American troops in Europe. I do not think the Russians object to that very much these days, not on account of détente but because they could make troops available within 24 hours in Eastern Europe, too. It is all deplorable, but it is a fact of life and we have to accept it. But do not say "United Nations Command" any more. That is a fiction.

That is why I brought my amendment to the attention of the Committee. And let me, through you, Mr. Chairman, advise the Committee. I said last year that the consensus would not work and I do not have to repeat what I said in my last statement; but I have spent two nights on this and tonight I am going to read this and present another draft resolution if the big Powers do not come to their senses and stop making us into false witnesses, rallying to one side or another in our votes. I shall present the Committee with another draft resolution unless both sides here -- both groups, if I may so call them --

come to some agreement and let us proceed in a peaceful manner to bring conciliation and understanding, through negotiation, to the two contending Korean Governments and, at this session, get rid of the stalemate that has bedevilled us since the Armistice Agreement was signed in 1953.

What is the alternative? The inscription of the question of Korea on the agenda of the thirtieth session. With what results? More propaganda, more contention, more dissent, unless by the good sense of the major Powers which are directly interested in the area we shall decide in the Security Council and prevail upon the two Korean Governments to negotiate again in a most serious way through the good offices made available to them by the major Powers, let us hope, and possibly also by the Secretary-General or by any body which they think can bring them together.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As announced in the Journal and in accordance with our decision there will be one meeting tomorrow, in the morning. There are still quite a number of speakers inscribed in the general debate on the question of Korea but I believe that delegations will prepare themselves for the possibility of a vote on Friday afternoon on the draft resolutions submitted to the Committee.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.