

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1511th
MEETING**

Monday, 30 October 1967,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Organization of work	1
Agenda item 91:	
Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (<i>continued</i>)	
General debate (<i>concluded</i>)	1
Organization of work	5
Agenda item 33:	
The Korean question:	
(a) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea;	
(b) Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations;	
(c) Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea	5

Chairman: Mr. Ismail FAHMY
(United Arab Republic).

Organization of Work

1. The CHAIRMAN: Members will recall that on Friday [1510th meeting] I informed the Committee of my intention to give the floor this morning to the Ambassador of Mexico to clarify certain points mentioned during the general debate on item 91. The Committee agreed that we should proceed after that to take up item 33, the Korean question, with its three sub-items, if the draft resolution relating to item 91 was not ready. If there is no objection, we shall proceed in the way I have indicated.

AGENDA ITEM 91

Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (*continued*) (A/6663, A/6676 and Add.1-4; A/C.1/946)

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

2. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): In spite of the length of the statement with which I had the honour to open the Committee's debate on the item before us, I have ventured to ask permission to speak again in order to explain and to clear up some of the points referred to by the representative of the Soviet Union in his statement at the 1509th meeting.

3. I think the data I shall produce on this occasion may be helpful, not only to many of the delegations here present but also to the Soviet Union delegation itself, since

unfortunately the Soviet Union did not follow the lead of the twenty-two States of four different continents, including three of the nuclear Powers, and send an observer to the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America, though the secretariat of the Commission did nevertheless send all the pertinent documents to the Soviet Government through its Embassy in Mexico.

4. There are four points I referred to earlier that I shall take up in order again now: the non-participation of Cuba in the preparatory work on the Treaty;¹ transport and transit of nuclear weapons; zone of application of the Treaty; and nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

5. On the first of these points, Mr. Mendelevich made a statement which we consider most unjust, since it is altogether incorrect to say, as he did (I quote his own words as given in the verbatim record):

"In conditions when the Republic of Cuba was not able to take part in negotiations for the transformation of Latin America into a denuclearized zone, those negotiations, as is well known, were being carried on by some of the Latin American States."

6. As I say, this is quite incorrect: not only the Government of Mexico, which has throughout maintained cordial relations with Cuba, but the Preliminary Meeting for the Denuclearization of Latin America first, and the Preparatory Commission and its organs subsequently, did all in their power to secure Cuba's participation. The following facts bear this out:

7. First, the approach by the Mexican Foreign Office to the Foreign Ministries of the other Latin American States following the approval of General Assembly resolution 1911 (XVIII) naturally included the Foreign Ministry of Cuba.

8. Second, when the Preliminary Meeting for the Denuclearization of Latin America took place in November 1964, it expressly agreed in resolution II that the Preparatory Commission thereby set up should carry out negotiations with a view to enlisting the co-operation in the work of the Commission of those Latin American republics, including Cuba, which had not been represented at the Preliminary Meeting.

9. Third, with the agreement of the Preparatory Committee given during its first session, I myself, as Chairman of the Mexican delegation, sent a telegram to the Foreign Minister of Cuba on 19 March 1965 inviting the Cuban

¹ Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, signed at Tlatelolco, Mexico City, on 14 February 1967 (A/C.1/946).

Government to participate in the work of the Commission or at least to appoint an observer.

10. Fourth, at that same session the Commission set up three working groups, instructing Working Group A to take steps to secure the collaboration in the work of the Commission of any Latin American republic still not taking part in it.

11. Fifth, as is clear from its report, Working Group A, with headquarters in New York, conscientiously carried out the tasks entrusted to it, taking up the matter a number of times with the representative of Cuba in the United Nations.

12. Sixth, at its second session in August 1965 the Preparatory Commission, in resolution 7 (II) [A/5985], set up a Negotiating Committee with instructions, *inter alia*, "to expedite to the utmost" during the twentieth regular session of the General Assembly of the United Nations the initiatives taken earlier by Working Group A.

13. Seventh, following the adoption of that resolution, the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission sent a note dated 8 September 1965 to the Cuban Foreign Minister requesting him, on behalf of the Negotiating Committee, to designate a representative "to discuss with the Committee the questions entrusted to it by the Preparatory Commission".

14. Eighth, at its third session, which opened in April 1966, the Commission once again brought up the issue and requested the Chairman to transmit the Proposals for the Preparation of the Treaty on the Denuclearization of Latin America to the Governments of the States with which the Negotiating Committee was in touch [A/6328, resolution 14 (III)], including, as I have said, the Government of Cuba, and to urge Cuba to participate in the work of the Commission.

15. Ninth, in pursuance of the above-mentioned resolution, the Chairman of the Commission sent a note dated 20 May 1966 to that effect to the Cuban Ambassador in Mexico.

16. The above account of the formal action taken to secure the participation of Cuba in the preparatory work which culminated in the Treaty of Tlatelolco, and reliably corroborated in the documents of the Preparatory Commission, some of which were reproduced as United Nations documents, not to mention the countless informal approaches made to the same end, seems to me to constitute conclusive proof of the accuracy of what I said earlier on this matter. Naturally, no one can impugn the sovereign right of the Government of Cuba, then or now, to take whatever stand it sees fit to take. But equally, no one can argue that Cuba was not given an opportunity to take part in the preparatory work in question. The door was always open, and in virtue of article 25, paragraph 1 of the Treaty, it is still wide open, to participation by Cuba.

17. With regard to the second point I mentioned, namely transport and transit of nuclear weapons, I think it might help to clarify the point if I quoted one of the paragraphs of the Final Act of the fourth regular session of the Preparatory Commission (A/6663) which reads as follows:

"At its fortieth plenary meeting on 7 February, the Preparatory Commission decided to place on record the

correct interpretation of the omission, from Article 1, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (b), of the Treaty, of the term 'transport', which had appeared in one of the alternative texts included in the 'Proposals for the Preparation of the Treaty on the Denuclearization of Latin American' (COPREDAL/36). The Commission accordingly decided to include the following statement in the Final Act:

"The Commission deemed it unnecessary to include the term 'transport' in article 1, concerning 'Obligations', for the following reasons:

"1. If the carrier is one of the Contracting Parties, transport is covered by the prohibitions expressly laid down in the remaining provisions of article 1 and there is no need to mention it expressly, since the article prohibits 'any form of possession of any nuclear weapon, directly or indirectly, by the Parties themselves, by anyone on their behalf or in any other way'.

"2. If the carrier is a State not a Party to the Treaty, transport is identical with 'transit' which, in the absence of any provision in the Treaty, must be understood to be governed by the principles and rules of international law; according to these principles and rules it is for the territorial State, in the free exercise of its sovereignty, to grant or deny permission for such transit in each individual case, upon application by the State interested in effecting the transit, unless some other arrangement has been reached in a Treaty between such States."

18. Let me add that there was a consensus among the members of the Preparatory Commission which dealt with this question that the "transit" referred to in the preceding paragraph meant sea and air transit and not transit by land, which must be considered as excluded; and that transit by sea in those cases where the riparian State allowed it must be subject to the provisions governing "the right of innocent passage" laid down in the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone adopted at Geneva in 1958.²

19. Finally, with regard to the question of the Panama Canal, specifically mentioned in the speech to which I am referring, it may be well to recall that the representative of the United States on the Negotiating Committee, Mr. William C. Foster, in a letter to the Chairman of the Preparatory Commission dated 10 December 1965, the contents of which were included in the first report of the Committee, expressly stated that the United States would be ready to agree to the inclusion of the Panama Canal Zone, although established transit rights would not of course be affected by the establishment of the proposed denuclearized zone.

20. With regard to the question of the zone of application referred to in article 4, paragraph 2, of the Treaty, it is important to remember that the zone will only have a meaning when, according to the article, the requirements of article 28, paragraph 1, have been met, including not only the signature and ratification of the Treaty by all the Latin American Republics, but the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II by all the Powers possessing nuclear weapons.

21. Thus there is no question, as has been contended here, of a group of States attempting unilaterally to alter the

² United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 516, 1964, No. 7477.

legal status of international waters, since by signing and ratifying Additional Protocol II the Powers possessing nuclear weapons—the only ones with an interest in and the possibility of installing or using nuclear weapons in those sea areas—would be freely accepting the obligation to refrain from doing so, just as since 1963 the three Powers which are parties to the Treaty of Moscow³ have pledged themselves not to carry out nuclear tests in the area and in other environments.

22. It seems to us that this pledge would be very little to ask in return for the decision adopted by the signatories of the Treaty of Tlatelolco to prohibit nuclear weapons in perpetuity in a densely populated territory of more than 20 million square kilometres. It would be a very modest step, designed “to embody an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers”, the principle stated by the General Assembly in resolution 2028 (XX).

23. Finally, with regard to nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, it seems to me that the way I dealt at length with this point in my statement on 23 October at the 1504th meeting of this Committee is a clear indication that the States signatories to the Treaty of Tlatelolco had the opportunity to assess the complexity and the delicate technological aspects of this question. My delegation's unwavering and consistent stand on this question is set forth in full in the statements I made on 21 February and 21 March 1967 in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, and in my very recent statements of 11 and 23 October in the General Assembly [1587th plenary meeting] and in this Committee [1504th meeting]. Hence I think it would be superfluous and redundant for me to try to explain it again.

24. I shall merely repeat our conviction that, for reasons which the nuclear Powers are in a better position to judge than anyone else, the pertinent provisions of the Treaty of Tlatelolco will not raise any difficulty as regards their scrupulous practical observance, nor will they allow of any possibility of evasion of the absolute, unrestricted and unreserved prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America as spelled out clearly in article 1 of the Treaty.

25. I would like before ending my statement to say how gratified we are at the encouraging statement made at the 1508th meeting by the United Kingdom representative to the effect that his Government is willing to sign both Additional Protocols to the Treaty and proposes to do so shortly at Mexico City, and subsequently to deposit its instrument of ratification as soon as the Agency provided for in the Treaty comes into existence. At the same time I cannot conceal our disappointment—we hope short-lived—at the statements made at the 1507th, 1509th and 1510th meetings by the representatives of the other three nuclear Powers which are Members of the United Nations. Let us hope that the wish expressed by the United Kingdom representative to see his statement followed by similar declarations by the other nuclear Powers will be fulfilled before the end of the present session of the General Assembly. Granted that neither the Treaty nor Additional

Protocol II admit of reservations, the satisfaction that such declarations would give my delegation would not be affected by their similarity to that of the United Kingdom, i.e. by being accompanied by an interpretation of the kind given by Lord Caradon at the 1508th meeting.

26. The position of the Netherlands Government, which according to its representative [1506th meeting] is ready to assume the obligations defined in the Treaty on behalf of Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles should also serve as encouragement to other States having international responsibility for territories within the geographical zone covered by the Treaty.

27. In conclusion I should like to take this opportunity to offer my delegation's sincere thanks, and my own, to all the representatives who have participated in the debate—since I was unable to do so individually as I would have wished—for the generous remarks in their statements concerning the contribution made by Mexico and that which I personally was able to make to the task of prohibiting nuclear weapons in Latin America.

28. The twenty-one States which requested the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly have agreed on a draft resolution, to be sponsored by the delegations of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela. The text of this draft, which I now submit to the Committee on behalf of those twenty-one delegations, reads as follows:⁴

“The General Assembly,

“Recalling that in its resolution 1911 (XVIII) of 27 November 1963 it expressed the hope that the States of Latin America would carry out studies and take appropriate measures to conclude a treaty that would prohibit nuclear weapons in Latin America,

“Recalling also that in the same resolution it voiced its confidence that, once such a treaty was concluded, all States, and particularly the nuclear Powers, would lend it their full co-operation for the effective realization of its peaceful aims,

“Considering that in its resolution 2028 (XX) of 19 November 1965 it established the principle of an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers,

“Bearing in mind that in its resolution 2153 A (XXI) of 17 November 1966 it expressly called upon all nuclear-weapon Powers to refrain from the use, or the threat of use, of nuclear weapons against States which might conclude regional treaties in order to ensure the total absence of nuclear weapons in their respective territories,

“Noting that that is precisely the object of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, signed at Tlatelolco, Mexico, by twenty-one Latin American States, which are convinced that the Treaty will constitute a measure that will spare their peoples the squandering of their limited resources on nuclear armaments and will protect them against possible nuclear

³ Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water. Signed in Moscow on 5 August 1963 (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 480, 1963, No. 6964).

⁴ Subsequently issued under the symbol A/C.1/L.406.

attacks on their territories, that it will be a stimulus to the peaceful use of nuclear energy in the promotion of economic and social development and that it will act as a significant contribution towards preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and as a powerful factor for general and complete disarmament,

"*Taking note* of the fact that the Treaty contains two additional protocols open, respectively, to the signature of States which, *de jure* or *de facto*, are internationally responsible for territories which lie within the limits of the geographical zone established in the Treaty and to the signature of States possessing nuclear weapons, and convinced that the co-operation of such States is necessary for the greater effectiveness of the Treaty,

"1. *Welcomes with special satisfaction* the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, which constitutes an event of historic significance in the efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to promote international peace and security and which at the same time establishes the right of Latin American countries to use nuclear energy for demonstrated peaceful purposes in order to accelerate the economic and social development of their peoples;

"2. *Calls upon* all States to give their full co-operation to ensure that the régime laid down in the Treaty enjoys the universal observance to which its lofty principles and noble aims entitle it;

"3. *Recommends* States which are or may become signatories of the Treaty and those contemplated in Additional Protocol I of the Treaty to strive to take all the measures within their power to ensure that the Treaty speedily obtains the widest possible application among them;

"4. *Invites* Powers possessing nuclear weapons to sign and ratify Additional Protocol II of the Treaty as soon as possible."

29. The fact that I am now presenting this joint draft resolution, Mr. Chairman, does not of course in any way imply a desire on our part to modify the time-table you outlined at our last meeting.

30. Mr. THACHER (United States of America): My delegation welcomed the initial statement on this item by the representative of Mexico [*1504th meeting*] and we continue to share the hope expressed by him at that time that Assembly action on this matter will continue to enjoy the unanimity with which resolution 1911 (XVIII) was adopted at the eighteenth session of the General Assembly. We will, of course, study very closely the draft resolution which he has just introduced on behalf of twenty-one delegations. With the assumption that the goal of the sponsors of that draft resolution is unanimous support for it, my delegation wishes to express the hope that the present draft will remain open for modification.

31. Mr. MENDELEVICH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation would first like to thank the representative of Mexico, Mr. García Robles, for undertaking today to clear up a number of points mentioned by the Soviet delegation in its statement in the general debate on the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. We are especially grateful that this statement was not couched in

polemical terms but was made, rather, in the same businesslike manner in which we made our own statement when we pointed out various ambiguous features in the Treaty.

32. It goes without saying that the Soviet delegation will give careful study to the statement made today by the representative of Mexico.

33. At the same time I should like to make only one comment about a matter which may be due to a misunderstanding. The representative of Mexico, Mr. García Robles, said at the beginning of his speech that the Soviet delegation had made the unfounded statement that the Republic of Cuba had not been permitted to take part in the discussions on the creation of a denuclearized zone in Latin America. This may be due to an error in interpretation, for the Soviet delegation made no such statement. We expressed quite a different idea which, in our view, remains valid. We said that such a state of affairs, in which the only nuclear Power situated close to Latin America, the United States, had refused to agree to the inclusion in the nuclear-free zone of the territories of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and the Panama Canal, that is, territories which were part of Latin America, presented serious obstacles to normal progress in the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in Latin America. We also stated that the United States had also refused to liquidate its military and naval base in Guantanamo, which is retained illegally on Cuban territory, despite the clear demands of the Cuban people for the removal of that base and other military bases in Latin American countries.

34. We further stated that the United States had also refused to take such a step towards normalizing the political situation in the Caribbean and thus in the whole of the Latin American area, as ending its aggressive policies against the Republic of Cuba. We went on to say that it was well known that recently the United States of America had intensified its hostile policy towards Cuba.

35. In view of these facts and circumstances, our delegation went on to say that we fully understood and shared the attitude of the Republic of Cuba to the plan to create a nuclear-free zone in Latin America—an attitude which the representative of Cuba, Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, had again confirmed a few hours before we made our statement. Thus we did not allege that, or express any surprise because, Cuba was not invited to take part in the negotiations. We do not at all gainsay the facts stated today by the representative of Mexico, Mr. García Robles, but we understand and share the position of Cuba, which, in view of the policy of the United States of America towards it and of the attitude adopted by the United States towards the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Latin America, was not able to take part in the negotiations. Further on we said that in conditions when the Republic of Cuba had not been able to take part in negotiations for the transformation of Latin America into a denuclearized zone, those negotiations, as was well known, were being carried on by some of the Latin American States. That was how the Soviet delegation expressed its point of view. I repeat that we were not discussing the procedural aspects of the matter. We did not in the least doubt the sincerity of the Government of Mexico or of other Latin American Governments as far as

their desire to create the widest possible nuclear-free zone in Latin America was concerned. We understand their aspirations and we mentioned that also in our statement. But we realize too the position of the Government of Cuba which, because of the policy of the United States, was not able to take part in the negotiations.

36. I think that these comments of the Soviet delegation will dispel the misunderstanding which would seem to have occurred on this matter, and I repeat that the Soviet delegation will carefully study the statement made today by the representative of Mexico concerning those aspects of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America which, as we had said, were not clear to us.

37. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): I wish merely to express my thanks to Mr. Mendelevich for the explanation he has just given. In my own defence I would like to point out that I based my comments on the Spanish verbatim record, which as we all know is only provisional. I trust it will be duly corrected. The Spanish record reads as follow:

“In conditions when the Republic of Cuba was not able to take part in negotiations for the transformation of Latin America into a denuclearized zone, those negotiations, as is well known, were being carried on by some of the Latin American States.”

38. Reiterating my thanks, I think the point has now been properly cleared up.

Organization of Work

39. The CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed further I may say that it is clear from the statement of the Ambassador of Mexico that the mere introduction of the draft resolution will not for the time being change our programme. We will take up the draft resolution proposed by the twenty-one Latin American countries when the Chair, after consultations with the members of the Committee, feels that it is the proper time to do so.

40. Before we turn to item 33 I believe it would be helpful to members if they were informed of the next item which the Committee will take after the current item in order to enable them to prepare their statements. I propose that the Committee should agree to take up item 9 of the First Committee's agenda, that is item 92 of the agenda of the General Assembly, namely: Examination of the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind.

41. If there is no objection I shall take it that the Committee agrees to the proposal of the Chair.

It was so decided.

42. The CHAIRMAN: I believe the Committee would agree with the Chair that it might be desirable at the appropriate time during the discussion of the Korean item to allow the representative of Malta, the sponsor of item 92, to make a statement introducing his item so that

delegations might know the purport of it. Thereafter, we would continue the discussion of the Korean question. If there is no objection I shall take it that the members of the Committee agree to this proposal also.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 33

The Korean question (A/6696/Rev.1, A/6696/Add.1-3, A/6712, A/6836, A/C.1/947 and Corr.1, 949, 950, 951; A/C.1/L.399, L.400 and Add.1, L.401 and Add.1, L.404, L.405):

- (a) **Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea;**
- (b) **Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations;**
- (c) **Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea**

43. The CHAIRMAN: We come now to item 33, the Korean question. It has three sub-items, and as the relevant documents are clearly specified in today's Journal I do not intend to read them.

44. Members of the Committee will recall that on Monday, 23 October, during the afternoon meeting, I proposed and the Committee agreed “that the logical procedure is that when that item”—namely the current item—“is reached the early stages of the discussion should be devoted to the procedural aspect, namely, the invitation to the parties to the dispute” [*1504th meeting, para. 57*].

45. On this particular aspect the Committee has received one draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.399 and co-sponsored by Australia and eleven other countries. The Committee has received certain proposed amendments to that draft resolution, and they are contained in document A/C.1/L.400 and Add.1, co-sponsored by Cambodia and six other States.

46. Before calling on the first speaker on the procedural aspect I should like to recall that experience in the Committee has shown that during the discussion of the Korean question, in order to substantiate certain arguments, representatives refer to other issues which do not come under the Korean question. In this connexion the Chair intends to follow a very flexible course in the hope that we agree from the very beginning that delegates should refrain from raising too many points of order, on the understanding that I intend to give the floor to every delegation to exercise its right of reply as many times as it feels necessary. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Committee agrees with the procedure proposed by the Chair and that representatives will try to abide by it.

47. Mr. OULD DADDAH (Mauritania) (*translated from French*): I apologize, Mr. Chairman, for taking the floor once again on a point of order, even though I have just heard what you said and my delegation is firmly resolved to co-operate as closely as possible with the Committee and with the Chair.

48. The fact is that my delegation would like to recall that when this question of extending an invitation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was raised and a motion was put forward to that effect, it was clearly understood that it was being withdrawn with the proviso that when the Korean question did come before it, the Committee would immediately take up this matter of invitation, the solution of which will, in our opinion, enable the Committee to embark upon a discussion of the question in a fruitful and equitable manner. We should like, therefore, to voice this reminder and to propose that the Committee begin by considering the question of the invitation, which we feel to be basic for a fruitful discussion since it involves the presence here of the two parties concerned in the item which the Committee now intends to take up.

49. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Mauritania for his co-operation. I should like to add that that was exactly what I had said. I even quoted a part of the statement which I made on Monday, 23 October, and there is no problem so far as this procedure is concerned.

50. Now I call upon the representative of the Philippines as the first speaker on the procedural aspect of the Korean question.

51. Mr. JIMENEZ (Philippines): The Korean question is of vital concern to the peoples of Asia in particular and to the world community in general. The hard-won peace in Korea and its environs, as well as the general security of the Asia-Pacific area, is at stake. My delegation therefore welcomes a debate on the Korean question, especially at this time when the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has launched a new series of dangerous and provocative actions.

52. The objective of the United Nations, as repeatedly reaffirmed by the General Assembly, is to achieve by peaceful means the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of government. As a loyal member of the United Nations, the Philippines is committed to support this objective.

53. It is to be regretted, however, that this objective has not been achieved because of the defiant and intransigent attitude of the North Korean régime. The history of the Korean question shows that while the Republic of Korea has consistently and wholeheartedly supported all the United Nations efforts for an early achievement of unification, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has consistently rejected any United Nations role or responsibility in helping to find a solution of the Korean problem. The objective of the United Nations has thus been thwarted by the North Korean régime, which has revived its aggressive war against the people of Korea and its charges of "imperialism". Knowingly or unknowingly, those who advocate the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Reunification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK) and the withdrawal of United Nations forces from South Korea might have encouraged the North Korean régime to maintain its posture of defiance and intransigence.

54. The question of whether an invitation should be extended to the representatives of the Republic of Korea

and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take part in the discussion of the Korean question is again before the Committee.

55. While my delegation subscribes to the view that the participation of interested parties could contribute to a more fruitful discussion of a question with which they are concerned, it is of the utmost importance to look into their motives or intentions. We cannot afford to allow the participation of a party which comes to this Committee with unclean hands, and to equate it with the other party which is motivated by noble intentions and a sincere desire to find a just solution of the question.

56. To forestall such a manoeuvre, Australia, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Japan, Madagascar, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Togo and the United States on 14 October introduced draft resolution A/C.1/L.399, which I am now privileged to submit formally to the Committee.

57. The first preambular paragraph recalls the view taken by this Committee that representatives of the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea may participate in the discussion of the Korean question, provided they first unequivocally accept the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the question. We believe that this is the most balanced and equitable approach towards an invitation.

58. The co-sponsors have agreed to include in our draft resolution a second preambular paragraph worded as follows, and which I am now formally submitting to this Committee:

"Considering that such participation of the interested parties would contribute to an equitable and effective discussion of the Korean question,"

While we believe that equity demands the participation of interested parties, we expect both parties first to recognize the competence and authority of the United Nations. Such a condition, which is applicable to both parties, would not be discriminatory.

59. While the third and fourth preambular paragraphs in the revised draft speak for themselves and are factual, we wish to invite the attention of the Committee to the statement of the Republic of Korea dated 3 October 1967 [A/C.1/947 and Corr.1] reaffirming its unequivocal acceptance of the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the Korean question, and to the statement of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea dated 21 August 1967 [A/6696/Add.2] to the effect that the United Nations has neither competence nor authority to concern itself with the question.

60. In view of the unequivocal acceptance by the Republic of Korea of the competence and authority of the United Nations, the co-sponsors in the first operative paragraph would have this Committee invite a representative of the Republic of Korea to participate without vote in our discussion. In the second operative paragraph, the First Committee would reaffirm its willingness to invite a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take part in our discussion provided it also unequivocally accepts such competence and authority, as

has been done by the Republic of Korea. The co-sponsors have not bracketed together the representatives of the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, because it would be illogical and absurd to equate the two parties under the present circumstances. We shall be glad to welcome the participation of the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea if that régime will accept the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the question, as the Republic of Korea has done.

61. So long as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea persists in its belligerent attitude and open defiance of the authority and competence of the United Nations, my delegation has no other alternative but to oppose its participation in our discussion. My delegation sees no useful purpose in inviting the Democratic People's Republic of Korea if the authority and competence of the United Nations are not recognized.

62. In my intervention last year, I said that the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea could not be bracketed together in the same category for the following reasons.

63. First, while the Republic of Korea has consistently recognized the competence and authority of the United Nations, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has, on the other hand, persistently refused to accept and has even challenged the competence and authority of the Organization.

64. Second, the Republic of Korea is the only legitimate government of Korea recognized by the United Nations under United Nations resolution 195 (III) of 12 December 1948.

65. Third, since its establishment, the Republic of Korea has religiously and whole-heartedly co-operated with the United Nations for the attainment of its objectives—the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Korea—while the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has consistently obstructed the efforts of the United Nations and has not abandoned its militant posture towards the Republic of Korea and its defiant and negative attitude towards our Organization.

66. The same reasons continue to be valid now.

67. The attention of my delegation is drawn to document A/C.1/949 circulating a statement of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea concerning the question of participation in the discussion of the Korean question.

68. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea states that the Korean question is to be again discussed illegally. If that régime continues to hold the view that the discussion of the question in the United Nations is illegal, why should it want to participate in what it considers an illegal discussion, and why should this Committee allow it to do so? Perhaps, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has no other reason for wanting to participate except to convert this forum into a propaganda stage where it could hurl invectives and insults to the United Nations. It is our obligation to protect

the integrity and uphold the dignity of our Organization; otherwise, its effectiveness as an appropriate forum for peace and orderly discussion would be greatly impaired and endangered.

69. Moreover, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea now imposes a condition to its participation. The last paragraph of document A/C.1/949 states that:

“The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will consider null and void and will not recognize whatever ‘resolution’ the United Nations may adopt arbitrarily without the participation and consent of its representative.”

I underline the word “consent”. Since when has the United Nations been confronted with a situation whereby a party invited to participate in the discussion would impose beforehand the precondition that a decision of the United Nations should have its *imprimatur*? Article 18 of the Charter provides the manner of taking decisions, and no State or party can change it. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea has announced in advance its intention to veto a decision of the United Nations. How could there be an effective and fruitful discussion of the question under these circumstances?

70. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea alleges that it is an unlawful act entirely contrary to the United Nations Charter to force any condition beforehand upon the party concerned in inviting it to take part in the discussion of this question. This allegation is without foundation. If we are to examine Article 32 of the Charter, we will find a situation where a State not a Member of the United Nations, if it is a party to the dispute, shall be invited by the Security Council, and the Council shall lay down such conditions as it deems just for the participation of that State.

71. And yet the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has the temerity to say that it: “... has constantly abided by the principles of the United Nations Charter”.

72. I will conclude this statement with an expression of confidence, on behalf of its co-sponsors, that our draft resolution will receive the widest support in this Committee.

73. The CHAIRMAN: Before giving the floor to the next speaker I should like to inform the Committee that the delegation of the Central African Republic has expressed its desire to be a co-sponsor of document A/C.1/L.399. The total number of co-sponsors is now thirteen.

74. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan) (*translated from French*): The representative of the Philippines has just submitted a draft resolution dealing with the invitation to representatives of the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of the Korean question without the right to vote.

75. The Japanese delegation shares the Philippine point of view. Japan is a near neighbour of Korea, and the Japanese delegation is one of the sponsors of the draft resolution in question. For both these reasons I should like briefly to explain my Government's position on the draft.

76. First of all, I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the decisions it has taken in this matter on various occasions. Both in the past and again quite recently at the last regular session of the General Assembly, the Committee invited the representative of the North Korean Government to take part in the discussion without right of vote,⁵ but the invitation was not an unconditional one. On the contrary, the Committee made the invitation subject to the express condition that the North Korean Government unequivocally acknowledge the competence and authority of the United Nations to deal with the Korean question. The Japanese delegation sees no reason why the General Assembly should alter its stand this year on that specific point, for if we are to believe the statement made by the North Korean Minister for Foreign Affairs as recently as 21 August 1967 [A/6696/Add.2], North Korea still appears to hold that the United Nations has neither competence nor authority to concern itself in the Korean question.

77. Nevertheless, as indicated in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, its sponsors are prepared once again to invite the North Korean representative to take part in our discussions, always provided that the aforementioned conditions are met.

78. The sponsors of the draft resolution further feel that the representative of the Government of the Republic of Korea should be unconditionally invited to take part in our discussion without the right to vote, for the simple reason that, unlike North Korea, the Government of the Republic of Korea clearly and unequivocally recognizes the competence and authority of the United Nations to deal with the Korean question. The letter addressed to the Secretary-General by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea [A/C.1/947] furnishes irrefutable proof of that.

79. That difference in attitude towards the United Nations between the Republic of Korea and North Korea is a very important factor, and it accounts for the difference in form between the invitation addressed by the United Nations to the Republic of Korea and that addressed to North Korea. It would be illogical and indeed unjust to couch the invitations in identical terms.

80. I am convinced that the thirteen-Power draft resolution submitted by Australia, Bolivia, the Central African Republic, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Japan, Madagascar, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Togo and the United States of America, will be solidly supported by the Committee, as in the past, when the vote is taken.

81. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): At previous meetings, the attention of the First Committee was already drawn, through the initiative of the representative of Cambodia, Mr. Sambath, to the importance of reaching a decision without delay on the question of inviting the representatives of both parts of Korea to participate in the debate on the question of Korea at this session of the General Assembly. In accordance with an agreement reached in the Committee, we must before we start the debate on the substance of the Korean item, settle without delay the question of an unconditional and simultaneous invitation to

the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea to take part in the discussion, in order that they may have the necessary time to come to New York. The Soviet delegation has already had occasion to state its views on the question of inviting representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea, but deems it necessary to reaffirm its position now. The Soviet delegation fully shares the view expressed by many delegations that the participation of representatives of both parts of Korea, when the questions relating to Korea are examined, is not only an important but an essential prerequisite for the creation of normal conditions which will ensure an objective and businesslike discussion on this matter.

82. Can we consider it admissible to adopt the discriminatory attitude towards the Democratic People's Republic of Korea which has been imposed year after year by the United States when the United Nations has examined the question of Korea? Each time we come to the Korean question, Washington uses its whole arsenal of means of pressure to prevent the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from coming here and putting forward their views and proposals on questions of direct concern to all Koreans both in the north and the south of that temporarily divided country. Quite obviously United States representatives are not in the least concerned at the fact that, by imposing on the General Assembly their one-sided attitude to the question of sending of an invitation to representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, an attitude which is hostile to the Korean people, they are depriving the delegations present in this room of the possibility of hearing the representatives of both sides in Korea, and are thereby infringing the elementary rules governing discussions in the United Nations, the principles of the Charter and the dictates of justice and common sense. Washington does everything possible to make the United Nations content itself with the completely distorted and one-sided picture of the state of affairs which, year in, year out, is provided here by American diplomats and South Korean puppets, and to avail itself only of information manufactured under American dictation in the reports of the so-called Korean Commission.

83. As can be seen from statements made by the United States delegation on 23 October, the United States intends at this session too to put obstacles in the way of an invitation to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in the debate on Korea. That is the intention of draft resolution A/C.1/L.399 submitted by the United States and some other delegations. This is clear from the absurd demand made in that resolution that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea accept as a condition of its invitation the unilateral decision of the United Nations, which was in any case adopted in its absence. In other words, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is expected to endorse the arbitrary and unlawful actions, accepted in the past and still accepted now, against the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the people of Korea. It is characteristic that, at a time when American diplomats in the United Nations resort to various manoeuvres in order to prevent delegations from hearing from North Korean representatives the voice of truth about the real state of

⁵ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda items 31 and 93, document A/C.1/942.

affairs in the Korean peninsula and the desires and aspirations of the Korean people, the United States occupation forces and South Korean puppet authorities have greatly expanded the number of instances of armed provocation against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea along the armistice line—the thirty-eighth parallel. That may be why the United States delegation is working so hard to deprive North Korean representatives of the possibility of appearing before us.

84. If the United Nations and all its Members really wish to act in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter, it is essential that there should be no delay in putting an end to this intolerable discrimination in the matter of inviting the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea follows a peaceful policy and enjoys the full support and confidence of the Korean people.

85. Like many other delegations, the Soviet delegation has already drawn the attention of the General Assembly to numerous constructive proposals of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea aiming at a peaceful solution of the Korean problem in the interests of the people of Korea.

86. In its activities, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea adheres to the principles of the United Nations Charter and it has never gone against its purposes or done damage to the authority of the United Nations. Those who continue to falsify the position and policy of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in this connexion are acting against the interests of the Korean people and of the United Nations itself.

87. Today, as on previous occasions, some speakers dealt at length with the attitude of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations and its Charter. In doing so they indulged in all sorts of arbitrary interpretations. But how is one to explain their obdurate refusal to take into account not what they present as the truth, not their own impressions, but what actually exists, what the responsible representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea say.

88. Indeed, in the cable dated 20 October 1967, thus only a few days ago, from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Pak Sung Chul, addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, it is again stressed that:

“The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has constantly abided by the principles of the United Nations Charter.”

89. Is it not that a sufficiently responsible and important statement which convincingly shows that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea respects the principles of the United Nations Charter and is ready to apply them? It shows how worthless and false is the sophistry to which the representatives who are hostile to and biased against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea have recourse in order to prevent justice from being done and to help Washington carry out the decisions which are to its liking.

90. The Soviet delegation insistently demands that representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

and South Korea should be invited without any preconditions. Such a decision on the question of invitations would be in keeping with the letter and the spirit of the Charter. That is why we have decisively supported the amendment of the delegations of Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia and Romania to the draft resolutions of the United States and some other countries on the question of the invitation [A/C.1/L.400 and Add.1]. We ask all members of the Committee to show goodwill and objectivity and to support the simultaneous and unconditional invitation of the representatives of both parts of Korea.

91. The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the next speaker I should like to inform the Committee that the delegation of Syria has expressed its desire to become a co-sponsor of the amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.400 and Add.1, bringing the number of sponsors to eight.

92. Mr. AZZOUT (Algeria) (*translated from French*): Past practice within this Committee has been based on the premise that the Korean question consists of two separate aspects of a single problem. On the one hand, there is the problem of procedure, bound up with the invitation to representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take part in our discussions, and on the other hand, there is the substantive problem.

93. At this juncture, the Algerian delegation would like to confine its remarks to the procedural issue.

94. First of all, elementary logic would suggest that if any discussion on the Korean question within this Committee is to have a chance of success, the participation of the representatives of both parts of Korea is essential. How can we conceive that the future of one and the same nation can be dealt with in the absence of representatives from both the North and the South? To act as in the past, to make shift with only the representatives of Seoul present at our discussion, is to turn our backs on reality and in fact to acquiesce in maintaining the division imposed on the Korean people. Under no circumstances can the Organization allow itself to be a part of such a venture.

95. As in the past, there are those who persist in concealing their opposition to any participation by the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in our discussions by the expedient of imposing conditions unacceptable to any sovereign State. They make the invitation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea conditional on that Government's agreeing to recognize the competence and authority of the United Nations. In other words, they expect North Korea to ratify and legitimize the direct intervention of foreign Powers, led by the United States, in the domestic affairs of the Korean people. That is still taking place under the banner of the Organization and it has been denounced not only by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, but also by the vast majority of the States Members of this Organization.

96. There can be no prior conditions attached to the invitation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate in our work. Under no circumstances can this Organization, which at a particular moment in its history was used as a screen by certain Powers, allow itself once

again to do hurt to the dignity of a young, sovereign State. Besides, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has constantly proclaimed its faith and its belief in the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, as is revealed by the letter addressed by its Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Secretary-General on 20 October 1967 [A/C.1/949]. How can we today expect the North Korean Government to accept resolutions arising from the current contingency, the outcome of an automatic majority which for many years was characteristic of the Organization?

97. My delegation considers that the participation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the discussion of the Korean question is an act which both logic and justice demand.

98. The CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform the Committee that Burundi has become a co-sponsor of the amendment contained in document A/C.1/L.400 and Add.1, bringing the total number of sponsors to nine.

99. Mr. CHIMIDDORJ (Mongolia) (*translated from Russian*): The First Committee is again beginning to discuss a simple and clear-cut matter, for a decision on which, as many members of the Committee have said, no lengthy debates are needed.

100. The United States of America and its supporters again wish to revive in the United Nations the former spirit of discrimination, which has already been condemned, the practice of the flagrant violation of the principles of justice, and the denial of the elementary rights of peoples who for various reasons have not yet taken their lawful place in the United Nations. It is this kind of attitude, which is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, that obliges our Committee to discuss whether or not representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of South Korea, the interested parties, should be present when the questions relating to the Korean problem are discussed. That the United Nations cannot engage in any fruitful discussion of questions relating to the regularization of the situation in Korea and the peaceful unification of that temporarily divided country without the participation of both parts of Korea, and especially without the participation of the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, is evident from the whole course of the debate on the question of Korea in the United Nations. We all know that the participation of representatives of one of the parties concerned, South Korea, whom the United States, in complete disregard of reality, would like to pass off as representing the entire Korean people, has not only produced no constructive results in the discussion, but has prevented the creation of a climate propitious to an objective discussion of the problem. And it could not have been otherwise, for South Korea is occupied by United States troops, and the régime there is nothing but a puppet of the United States, which has betrayed the vital interests of the Korean people and, helped and encouraged by its American protectors, constantly provokes the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and openly nurtures plans for a fratricidal internecine war and does its utmost to prevent the peaceful unification of Korea.

101. Those who are not devoid of common sense must see the absurdity of a situation where the representatives of a

régime supported by foreign bayonets are admitted here, while the representatives of that part of Korea where for many years there has not been a single foreign soldier are denied the right and possibility of presenting here the position of their Government on a question which concerns the fate of all Korea and its people. Anyone who is not envenomed by a biased or discriminatory approach to the socialist Democratic People's Republic of Korea, can easily understand the need and importance of a simultaneous and unconditional invitation to representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of South Korea, and can adopt a clear and fair position on this matter.

102. Those who oppose the invitation of representatives of both parts of Korea, who call black white and try to delude the Committee, resort to all sorts of inventions concerning the alleged aggressive designs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, its alleged refusal to recognize the competence of the United Nations and to abide by its decisions, and so on and so forth. However, even a superficial knowledge of the contents of the decisions on the Korean question, taken by the United Nations at the dictation of the United States of America, and of the many constructive peace proposals of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as well as its statements of its readiness to take part in the consideration of the Korean question at the United Nations, refutes the arguments of the authors of such inventions and shows how inconsistent are the manoeuvres of those who wish to perpetuate the division of Korea and the occupation of its southern part for the strategic and military purposes of the United States.

103. This was obvious earlier, and was even confirmed during the debate in the Committee on 23 October 1967 in connexion with the proposal made by the representative of Cambodia that invitations should be addressed to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of South Korea. We were able to see that the representatives of various States whose Governments, together with the South Korean régime directly or indirectly participate in the American war of aggression in Viet-Nam, spoke exactly as the representative of the United States had done and opposed the admission of representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

104. We must assume that those who take part in such aggression have cause to fear the appearance in this room of representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, a country which pursues a consistently peaceful policy, and the unmasking of the aggressive policy of the United States in Korea and the Far East.

105. Whatever efforts the representatives of the United States and of some of their allies make, however clever they try to be, the United Nations, which must support peace and security and approach all problems impartially, guided only by the letter and spirit of the Charter, does not have the right to give way to the obstructionist attitude and dictation of one country or of any group of countries. It is high time to end an abnormal situation where, because of the policy of some States, the lawful rights of peoples, and especially of small peoples, are brutally trampled underfoot and where the principles are violated on which the activities of the United Nations should be founded.

106. The adoption by the Committee of a decision to invite simultaneously the representatives of the parties concerned—the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea—would not only have importance in principle but would also have a practical importance, since it would facilitate the Committee's work and could make a real contribution to the solution of a most pressing problem, thereby reducing international tensions and helping to preserve peace.

107. For that reason the delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic, together with other delegations, has presented amendments (A/C.1/L.400 and Add.1) to draft resolution A/C.1/L.399. On behalf of the sponsors, I am presenting these amendments to the Committee in the hope that the majority will vote in favour of them and thus make a valuable contribution to a just solution of this question.

108. Mr. HSUEH (China) (*translated from Chinese*): Since the Committee is discussing only the question of invitation concerning the Korean question, I shall confine myself to this procedural aspect at the present stage, reserving my right to speak on the substance when the proper time comes.

109. However, I should like to take this opportunity to express the satisfaction of my delegation with the decision of this Committee to give high priority to the Korean question in the order of discussion of the items on the agenda. In the view of my delegation, the importance of this item cannot be over-emphasized, for there are at stake the destiny and freedom of 40 million people in Korea, to whom the United Nations has a solemn responsibility. Moreover, the Korean question also affects the peace and security of the whole world, especially of the countries in the Asian and Pacific area.

110. For twenty years now the Korean question has been with the United Nations. During the consideration of the item in the First Committee, a representative of the Republic of Korea has always been invited to take part in the discussion. The constructive views and accurate information which the Government of the Republic of Korea has thus been able to give to the Committee on the question are essential to its consideration of the item. It is only proper that the Committee should adhere to this precedent. My delegation is pleased that there appears to be general agreement among the members of the Committee on this point.

111. On the other hand, my delegation sees no reason why an invitation should also be extended to the régime in the northern part of Korea. The record of the United Nations contains all the evidence that that régime had been imposed on the people by foreign forces occupying the northern part of Korea at the end of the Second World War. That régime has no authority to speak, and does not speak, for the Korean people under its control. There is no need for me to cite that evidence in the records of our Organization before this Committee. Suffice it to mention only, as the representative of the Philippines has done, resolution 195 (III) of the General Assembly, by which the United Nations recognized the Government of the Republic of Korea as the only lawful government in Korea.

112. It has been said in this debate that invitations should be extended to the Government of the Republic of Korea

and to the régime in the northern part of its territory on an equal basis. But how can there be an equal basis between the two? Whatever may be the individual positions of the Member States, the United Nations has never given to the régime in North Korea a status equal to that of the Government of the Republic of Korea. It is certainly not appropriate for the First Committee, by means of an invitation, to change the resolution of the General Assembly and to give to someone a status that has never been given by the General Assembly.

113. Even if we choose to ignore this point, which is a vitally important one, we should at least examine what practical purpose would be served by an invitation to the régime in North Korea. The statement made by that régime clearly expresses its view that "the Korean question is by no means a question to be discussed at the United Nations" [A/6696/Add.2], and that "... the United Nations has neither competence nor authority to concern itself in the Korean question" [ibid.]. Let us therefore ask ourselves: Is it our purpose to invite a representative of the régime in North Korea to the First Committee to take part in the discussion of the Korean question or for him to tell us to stop discussing the Korean question and to go on with the next item on our agenda? The absurdity of the situation is obvious.

114. For these reasons, my delegation regrets that it cannot fully support the thirteen-Power draft resolution. We have difficulty with the first and the third preambular paragraphs and with operative paragraph 2. If they are voted upon separately, my delegation will vote against those paragraphs. If my delegation votes in favour of the draft resolution as a whole even containing those paragraphs, it is only because by its adoption the representatives of the only lawful Government in Korea will be invited to take part in our discussion of the Korean question.

115. The proposed amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.400 and Add.1 appear to my delegation to be strange, to say the least. If adopted, these amendments would completely change the sense of the original draft resolution. It is highly doubtful whether they can be properly called amendments. However, my delegation finds merit in point 4 listed in that document and is prepared to vote for it. My delegation will vote against all the other points in that document.

116. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR would like to set out its position in more detail on the question of the invitation of the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take part in the debate on the items of the agenda which are primarily of interest to the Korean people.

117. The so-called "Korean question", imposed on the United Nations as the result of United States interference in the internal affairs of the Korean people and the aggression against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, has been debated in our Organization for many years without the slightest sign of progress. There are now on our agenda two important questions which are in the interest of the Korean people—the proposal concerning the withdrawal of the United States and all other foreign forces from South

Korea and the question of the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

118. In the opinion of my delegation, the fact that the United Nations not only has not contributed to the solution to the Korean question but, on the contrary, has made it more difficult by its intervention and its one-sided decisions, is largely due to the fact that in the past this reprehensible practice of systematic discrimination against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was imposed on our Organization and that that country was kept from expressing its views on questions of interest to it.

119. Year after year resolutions have been rubber-stamped which were prepared in the Mission across the road. Inequality was maintained, no objective view was taken of the state of affairs, and the interests of peace and security in the Far East were not taken into account. As a result, tension persisted; in fact, it grew more acute. The time has come to change this unjust and discriminatory approach towards the solution of matters concerning Korea and the participation of its representatives in the discussion of those matters.

120. We are told here by some speakers that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not recognize the United Nations. Through inventions of this kind attempts are made to distort the true state of affairs. The cable of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of 20 October 1967 states that "the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has constantly abided by the principles of the United Nations Charter".

121. The trouble is that certain forces in the United Nations would like to impose upon the Korean people and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea their imperialist will and force upon them conditions incompatible with the independence and sovereignty of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Obviously no sovereign State whatsoever can tolerate this. The question of the unification of the temporarily divided nation of Korea and of how that is to be accomplished are internal matters to be dealt with by the Korean people, and all that is required of the United Nations is that it should take such measures as will assist the Korean people finally to express their views for themselves, free from all interference and pressure from abroad.

122. The resolution submitted here by the United States and other countries is a flagrant violation of the principles of equality and justice and is in direct contradiction to the provisions of the United Nations Charter. Let us analyse the draft resolution submitted by these countries in document A/C.1/L.399, of 14 October 1967.

123. Let us take the first paragraph of the preamble. This paragraph stands in open violation of United Nations principles and has no legal basis whatever. As it stands, the text which states that the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the Korean question must first be unequivocally accepted, when viewed in the light of its well-known practice for many years of adopting illegal resolutions, is bound to give rise to serious objections. The

Democratic People's Republic of Korea is in fact being asked to recognize, in advance and unconditionally, any decisions that the United Nations may take on the Korean question. But everyone knows that for many years the decisions have been taken in violation of all justice and in disregard of the interests of the Korean people. Inspired and promoted by the United States, those resolutions took no account of the true state of affairs. To the Korean people, those decisions were acts of direct interference in their internal affairs, acts of falsification and pressure.

124. We must also note the hypocritical nature of the appeals by the United States and certain other countries that the competence of the United Nations should be recognized. Such appeals sound strange indeed coming as they do from States which ignore and violate United Nations decisions, even Security Council decisions, in matters such as the maintenance of peace, the prohibition of the use of force in international relations, the liquidation of colonialism, and other important matters.

125. The United Nations cannot condone any discrimination against States that are not Members. This is clearly set out in the Charter. Interference in matters that lie within the national competence of States is intolerable, and attempts to lay down preconditions are in fact forms of such interference.

126. There is no need to speak of the absurdity of the second paragraph of the preamble, which produces the statement, dictated from Washington, made by the United States puppet in Seoul. We must, however, note the third paragraph of the preamble, in which the United States and its co-sponsors who infringe upon the rights of Korea misrepresent the substance of the document of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In the statement of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, mentioned in this paragraph of the draft resolution, the definitely illegal so-called "Korean question", imposed upon the United Nations by the United States aggressors many years ago, is discussed, in other words the activities of the United Nations Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, which a number of States now propose should be dissolved.

127. It is no coincidence that the Afro-Asian countries, in their amendments in document A/C.1/L.400, have drawn attention to the discriminatory nature of the draft resolution of the United States and certain other countries. The statement of the Foreign Ministry of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea [document A/C.1/949], completely unmasks these falsifications. It states that "since the question concerning Korea is being discussed, the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, a party directly concerned therein, should take part in it". It goes on to say that "the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea maintains that the United Nations, if it really wants to act in conformity with its Charter, should unconditionally invite the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the party concerned, to participate in the discussion of the Korean question".

128. Thus the premises on which the draft resolution of the thirteen countries is based are in no way consonant

with the facts, and the document is therefore of no real use at all; it merely conceals the desire of the United States to continue its military occupation of South Korea, to prevent the unification of the Korean people, and to deprive us of the possibility of hearing the true representatives of the Korean people, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

129. In view of all this, the delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the First Committee would be carrying out its task in the proper way if it decided to invite simultaneously and unconditionally the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of South Korea, as the parties concerned, to take part in the discussion of the Korean question. In our opinion, the amendments of the delegations of Burundi, Guinea, Cambodia, the Congo (Brazzaville), Mali, Mongolia, Mauritania, Romania and Syria would bring this about. Their whole purpose is to put an end to the discrimination practised against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and thereby lay a new basis for a realistic approach when the United Nations discusses Korean matters. The

Byelorussian delegation will therefore vote in favour of those amendments and asks other delegations to support them, since we cannot go on endlessly repeating the same mistake, adopting unilateral decisions that have never produced and never can produce anything that would help us find a useful solution to the problems we are discussing.

130. My delegation is convinced that the presence of all parties concerned in the discussion of matters of direct interest to them is an elementary and recognized principle in any democratic order. It would be unreasonable indeed for the United Nations to seek to cast any doubt on that principle.

131. The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform the Committee that I intend to close the list of speakers on the matter of the invitation at 6 p.m. today, unless there is any objection.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.