ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ **A**

ГЕНЕРАЛЬНАЯ АССАМБЛЕЯ

Distr.
GENERAL

A/HRC/5/G/11
18 June 2007

RUSSIAN
Original: ENGLISH

СОВЕТ ПО ПРАВАМ ЧЕЛОВЕКА
Пятая сессия
Пункт 2 повестки дня

ОСУЩЕСТВЛЕНИЕ РЕЗОЛЮЦИИ 60/251 ГЕНЕРАЛЬНОЙ АССАМБЛЕИ ОТ 15 МАРТА 2006 ГОДА, ОЗАГЛАВЛЕННОЙ "СОВЕТ ПО ПРАВАМ ЧЕЛОВЕКА"

Письмо Постоянного представителя Корейской Народно-Демократической Республики при Отделении Организации Объединенных Наций в Женеве от 18 июня 2007 года на имя Председателя Совета по правам человека

Свидетельствую Вам свое уважение и имею честь препроводить настоящим текст заявления[1] Корейской Народно-Демократической Республики на пятой сессии Совета по правам человека.

Буду весьма признателен Вам за распространение настоящего письма и приложенного заявления в качестве официальных документов пятой сессии Совета по правам человека по пункту 2 повестки дня.

[1] Приложение распространяется в полученном виде только на языке представления.

Annex

STATEMENT

THE DELEGATION OF
THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) to the 5th Session of the Human Rights Council categorically and resolutely rejects the renewal of the mandate of special rapporteur on DPRK (hereinafter referred to as "rapporteur") as contained in the draft decision of the Session.

The "rapporteur" is a product of the "resolution" enforced by the United States, Japan and EU member states in conspiracy, with a view to eliminating the state and social system of the DPRK.

As well known, in 2003 these countries prepared the draft "resolution" confidentially in disregard of sincere cooperation of the DPRK in the area of human rights, presented it in the form of surprise raid at the very last moment and enforced its adoption through pressure and blackmail behind the screen. This was carried out as an extension of their hostility to stifle the DPRK on the pretext of nuclear problem.

The "rapporteur" was used to pave the way for these countries to continue fabricating new "resolutions" one after another. Consequently, the "rapporteur" has no relevance with human rights and is no more than a tool of these countries in their pursuit of political and strategic objectives.

With the demise of the politicized former Human Rights Commission, the "rapporteur" should have also been eliminated but unfortunately still remains even after the establishment of the Human Rights Council.

Japan, EU member states and the United States, which are wire pullers of the "rapporteur", have made undisguised attempts to maintain him by all means through the renewal of his mandate at the current 5th Session of the Council.

For this to happen in particular, these countries enforced the adoption of a "resolution" A/RES/61/174 on the DPRK in GA in December 2006 asking the "rapporteur" to submit his report to GA in October 2007. However, pursuant to GA resolution 60/251 of 15 March 2006, all mandates of the special rapporteurs including this "rapporteur" must be reviewed by June 2007, with a view to determining whether to maintain or terminate them and, during this review period, it was discouraged to discuss about activities of the special rapporteurs that would be carried out after June deadline.

But the United States, Japan and EU member states, by asking the "rapporteur" to submit a report in October 2007, deliberately and imprudently prejudged the outcome of this review which had not yet been concluded, thus spontaneously denying resolution 60/251 which they supported in the GA.

Notwithstanding this, these countries came up with an absurd "argument" that the "rapporteur" had to remain because of last year's GA "resolution" on DPRK.

Unfortunately however, these countries have refused to comply with resolution A/RES/61/166 which was adopted at the same time and at the same forum as those of the last year's GA "resolution" on the DPRK. The resolution A/RES/61/166 calls for discontinuation of taking up politically motivated and biased country-specific matters.

What can not be overlooked, is the fact that these countries were so anxious to desperately maintain so far as the "rapporteur" is concerned, resorting to every possible means.

If these countries are genuinely impartial and objective in human rights matters as they often claim and have no ulterior motives against DPRK, there will be no justifiable reasons whatsoever for them to single out DPRK as a hostile target.

In defiance of resistance of many countries including the DPRK that oppose politicization of human rights, the United States, Japan and EU member states adamantly inserted the renewal of mandate of the "rapporteur" in the draft decision.

These acts based on illegitimate last year's GA "resolution" on DPRK remain illegitimate and unjust as well. This is a typical example of politicization, selectivity and double-standards selecting a specific country for purposes other than human rights and will inevitably lead the Council to a tragic fate of the former Commission.

This will also create an obstacle to the efforts of the DPRK for cooperation in the human rights area and further inflict severely negative impact upon peace and security in the Korean peninsular

The sovereignty and dignity constitute the lifeline of the DPRK.

The DPRK shall remain unmoved even if dozens or hundreds of such special rapporteurs as this “rapporteur” are to be fabricated and, under whatever circumstances, strongly strike back at these relentless maneuvers.

As long as the decision-making process of the 5th Session of the Human Rights Council has been turned into the one which justifies ill-minded political objectives of the United States, Japan and EU member states aimed at DPRK, the delegation of the DPRK does not feel necessary to remain in the most discriminate and most biased decision-making process where the renewal of the mandate of the “rapporteur” is to be forcibly enforced and, accordingly, declares resolutely that it shall not participate in that process.

If the decision-making processes of the Human Rights Council in the form of the resolution or decision continue to be abused for political and strategic objectives of the hostile forces against DPRK in the future, the DPRK, as a full-fledged member state of the United Nations, shall not participate in them at all.

The United States, Japan and EU member states should be held responsible for all the consequences arising out of our action, as these countries have compelled us to do so.

Geneva, 18 June 2007

- - - - - -