

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIRST SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE, 1483rd
MEETING

Monday, 12 December 1966,
at 3.20 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 96:

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty (concluded)</i> | |
| <i>General debate (concluded)</i> | 359 |
| <i>Consideration of draft resolutions</i> | 360 |

Agenda items 31 and 93:

| | |
|---|-------|
| <i>The Korean question: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea</i> | } 363 |
| <i>Withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea</i> | |

Chairman: Mr. Leopoldo BENITES (Ecuador).

AGENDA ITEM 96

Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty (concluded) (A/6397, A/C.1/938-940, A/C.1/L.367, A/C.1/L.388/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Corr.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 and 2)

GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

1. The CHAIRMAN said that several representatives wished to speak in exercise of the right of reply.
2. Mr. AUGUSTE (Haiti) wished to assure the Cuban representative that the Haitian Government had too much respect for the principle of non-intervention to permit its territory to be used as a base for attacks on Cuba.
3. Mr. TINOCO (Costa Rica) said that the Cuban representative's allegations that the United States had organized training camps for mercenaries in Costa Rica were entirely false. No attacks on the territory of other States were organized in Costa Rica by his Government or by foreign Governments. The organization of such military training camps by a foreign Power would constitute a violation of national sovereignty which Costa Rica would not tolerate. That sovereignty was safeguarded by the Costa Rican Constitution, which was based on the principles of democracy, self-determination and non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other States. On the other hand, Costa Rica had always welcomed

newcomers and refugees who shared its love for freedom. At the end of the nineteenth century, for instance, it had given refuge to some of the pioneer fighters for Cuban independence, who had sought to build a republic based on true freedom and democracy. However, the Cuban representative's unfounded accusations were no doubt attributable to the extreme nervous tension which he had noted on previous occasions as characterizing all Cuban representatives abroad, because of their apprehension about the repercussions their conduct might have on their relatives in Cuba.

4. Mr. GROS ESPIELL (Uruguay) said that the Cuban representative's allegation about a so-called recent case of United States intervention in Uruguayan affairs was totally unfounded. Uruguay condemned all intervention in the domestic affairs of States and had always respected the principle of non-intervention. The alleged letter from the United States Ambassador in Montevideo, which the Cuban representative had denounced as an attempt to interfere in the political situation in Uruguay on the eve of the elections, was a clumsy forgery, as a careful examination of the paper and signature had proved, and the Uruguayan Government had already made a public announcement to that effect. Had the letter been genuine, the Uruguayan Government would have defended its country's national sovereignty and interests against any such intervention. It was, however, merely a base and unworthy manoeuvre, the origin of which was still untraced.

5. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand) wished to refute a number of the Cambodian representative's allegations. On the subject of border incidents, he referred the Committee to the official records of the Security Council, where a number of provocative acts committed by Cambodia on Thai territory were duly noted. No such radio station as that referred to by the Cambodian representative existed in Thailand.

6. At the time of the historic events of 1940, Cambodia had not yet existed as an independent State, and Thailand had been engaged with France on the issue of colonialism in former French Indo-China. He was happy to note that Thailand now had close and cordial relations with France.

7. Only that week-end, Thailand had drawn the attention of the Security Council^{1/} to incidents of mine-laying by Cambodians, which had resulted in the death of villagers, teachers and children on the Thai side of the border. He hoped that an appreciation of those

^{1/} See Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-first Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1966, document S/7627.

incidents would help the Committee to recognize the falseness of the Cambodian charges.

8. He reaffirmed the Thai Government's readiness to resume diplomatic relations with Cambodia without any prior conditions. He appealed to Cambodia to cooperate with Thailand in creating a positive atmosphere to help the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to find a lasting solution. The two countries' request for such a mission had constituted a binding commitment to do all in their power to facilitate its work. He regretted that the Cambodian representative persisted in making public attacks on Thailand. The present head of the Cambodian Government had sought refuge in Thailand when he was working for Cambodian independence, and Thailand had supported Cambodia's struggle for independence and had been the first country to establish diplomatic relations with it. He hoped that that traditional friendship would not be obstructed by one-sided charges.

9. Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras) said that, out of respect for Hungary, he had not identified himself with the remarks by the Cuban Foreign Minister which he had quoted in the Committee (1481st meeting). The quotation related to events that had taken place ten years ago, and there appeared to be some confusion about its context. In fact, Mr. Roa had used the same words to insult both Hungary and the Organization of American States. If the Hungarian representative felt that the statement was a slur on his country, he should take the matter up with the Cuban Foreign Minister.

10. Mr. YOUDE (United Kingdom) regretted the allegations against his country which the representative of Burundi had made on the subject of Southern Rhodesia, and he categorically rejected them. The question of Southern Rhodesia was being considered by the Security Council, which was the organ best qualified to deal with it.

11. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia) said that he wished to correct the Thai representative's statement that Thailand had contributed to the independence of Cambodia and that the Cambodian King had taken refuge in Thailand. It had been the people of Cambodia and their King who had restored Cambodian independence, without the help of Thailand. When the King of Cambodia had gone to Bangkok in 1953, it had not been to take refuge, but to alert world public opinion and acquaint it with Cambodia's national claims; he had stayed only one week in Thailand, for the purpose of contacting the foreign missions there.

12. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary) said that the Cuban Foreign Minister's statements which the Honduran representative had quoted had been made before the victory of the revolution in Cuba. The Honduran representative had not taken account of later statements by the Cuban Foreign Minister, which were quite clear and unambiguous. The confusion arose because before the revolution the only source of information in Cuba had been American news agencies, which was still the case today in many countries of Latin America. The one-sided and distorted accounts of such agencies were the sources of many misunderstandings. He hoped that representatives who wished to discover the facts would go to Hungary and see for

themselves how the principle of non-intervention and self-determination of States was respected in that country, as the Honduran representative had been invited to do.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (A/C.1/L.367, A/C.1/L.388/REV.1 AND REV.1/CORR.1 AND REV.1/ADD.1 AND 2)

13. The CHAIRMAN called on representatives who wished to explain their votes; he reminded the Committee that he had decided to limit statements in explanation of vote to five minutes.

14. Mr. PASHA (Pakistan) said that he had not made a statement in the general debate because Pakistan's viewpoint had already been expounded at the twentieth session, while the Declaration was being drafted. His delegation had welcomed the Soviet proposal for the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the current session. The Declaration was a landmark in the annals of United Nations achievement and ranked in significance with other declarations adopted by the United Nations in the fields of decolonization and human rights.

15. It was essential that any stock-taking resolution the Committee adopted should not neglect any aspect of the question and he welcomed the amendments (A/C.1/L.388/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Corr.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 and 2), which reaffirmed all the principles in the Declaration and filled in the gaps in the Soviet draft resolution (A/C.1/L.367). The Pakistan Government attached great importance to all the principles in the Declaration, and in particular paragraphs 3 and 6, condemning colonialism. All States should refrain from interpreting the draft resolution and the amendments to it in any way that might impair the implementation of any of the provisions of the Declaration, which should be observed in good faith and in all its aspects. His delegation would therefore vote in favour of the amendments.

16. Mr. BROWN (New Zealand) said that he would vote in favour of the amendments and of the draft resolution as so amended, as an expression of his delegation's support of the political principle of non-intervention. He had, however, some legal doubts and reservations on the subject. As his delegation had pointed out in the debate the previous year, some of the language used in resolution 2131 (XX), which had been used again in the draft resolution and the amendments, was unclear. For example, the expression "intervention... in the... external affairs of States" might be interpreted as a condemnation of international diplomacy. Resolution 2131 (XX) could not be regarded as an adequate or complete statement of the legal principles involved, and documents A/C.1/L.367 and A/C.1/L.388/Rev.1 perpetuated its obscurities. Nor could his delegation accept the suggestion in the draft resolution and the amendments that resolution 2131 (XX) entailed legal obligations comparable to those imposed by the Charter. Such a misrepresentation of the character of General Assembly resolutions was unjustified and might weaken the Charter. Moreover, any document seeking to elaborate on the principles of the Charter should be drafted with great care. His delegation would have preferred at the previous session that the task of

drafting resolution 2131 (XX) be referred to the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States and felt, now as then, that the fervour of political argument was not the best context for the elaboration of the principles of the Charter, even if no legal obligations were entailed. With those reservations he would support the amendments and the draft resolution as amended by them, as a gesture of political sympathy, but he felt that the principle of non-intervention should be further considered and elaborated in an appropriate legal forum.

17. Mr. IJEWERE (Nigeria) said that the present debate had given rise to much mutual accusation, but one fact had emerged clearly: all the countries which were victims of intervention were developing countries. They provided the developed countries with laboratories for political experimentation, thus destroying their national identity. The developing countries' need for external support was being used by some as a pretext for hindering their political development. While cultural and economic aid produced mutual benefits, all forms of intervention for the overthrow of legal governments or support of unrepresentative governments must cease, and the right of the developing countries to have the governments of their choice must be respected. Most of the previous speakers had neglected the very important aspect of the Declaration that it condemned all forms of racialism and colonialism. It was ironical that the principle of non-intervention was used, by Portugal in particular, as a pretext for the continuance of shameful and inhuman policies in Africa and elsewhere. He hoped that the Members of the United Nations would renew their resolve to observe the principles in the Declaration. He would therefore vote in favour of the amendments and of the draft resolution as amended, and hoped that they would be unanimously approved.

18. Mr. ATASSI (Syria) said that, as a sponsor of the amendments, his delegation wished to stress the importance of implementing the Declaration. Although the Arab peoples had awakened to independence, they were still subject to political and economic pressures, threats, visits of the United States Sixth Fleet and provocations and terrorism from Israel.

19. The amendments rightly condemned all forms of intervention and imperialism and stressed the right of peoples to fight for their national liberation, thus endorsing the struggles of the people of Palestine and Aden and of suffering peoples everywhere which had puppet States imposed upon them by force. Sub-paragraph (a) of the operative part of the draft resolution, as proposed in the third amendment, urging "the immediate cessation of all intervention in the domestic or external affairs of States"—of which the United States action in Viet-Nam was a blatant example—was particularly gratifying to his delegation. It was extremely important to implement the Declaration in resolution 2131 (XX), paragraph 3 of which asserted the right of peoples to be free to organize themselves in order to claim their legitimate rights.

20. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution, as amended, would be adopted unanimously.

21. Mr. YOUDE (United Kingdom) repeated, as he had said in the general debate (1475th meeting), that the principle of non-intervention had the United Kingdom Government's full support. The draft resolution was both incomplete and unbalanced, and he welcomed the amendments, and especially sub-paragraph (c) of the operative part—the fifth amendment—which dealt with subversion and other forms of indirect intervention. However, his delegation would abstain in the vote on the amendments and on the draft resolution as a whole. The language used gave rise to difficulties. The unqualified reference to intervention in the "external" affairs of States was difficult to reconcile with international diplomacy. Sub-paragraph (c) as proposed in the fifth amendment should take account of the right of States to seek assistance in cases of internal strife, particularly if such strife were promoted from outside. He had reservations about the wording of the sub-paragraph, which implied that the Declaration imposed obligations on a level with those imposed by the Charter. The United Kingdom agreed with delegations which held that the codification of the principle of non-intervention should be referred to the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States; heated and hurried political debate led to imprecision and uncertainties. His abstention from the vote was due to questions of procedure and language, and not to any doubts about the principles concerned.

22. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) noted that there was unanimous agreement that all States must adhere to the fundamental principle of non-intervention, but regretted that almost all the representatives who had spoken in the debate had intervened in one way or another in the domestic affairs of other States. The first rule of implementation of the principle of non-intervention was to abstain from judging or condemning other peoples and States and to exercise tolerance. The Ivory Coast, which regarded the principle of non-intervention as one of the foundations of its policies, refrained from intervening in the domestic affairs of other States and from judging their economic or political systems and alliances, and asked to be accorded the same tolerance. It had always condemned all forms of intervention, especially the fomenting of subversion. Failure to observe the principle of non-intervention had led to such wild ventures as the Tricontinental Conference held at Havana in January 1966. As the President of the Ivory Coast had said on 23 September 1965, his country would never tolerate the use of its territory as a base for intervention in the affairs of other States. Each State should be free to choose the form of government suited to it and should strive to settle all disputes by peaceful means.

23. He thanked the Soviet delegation for reaffirming the principle of non-intervention in the draft resolution it had submitted, but hoped that it would accept the amendments so that the Committee could vote on a single text. His delegation would support the draft resolution and the amendments thereto.

24. Mr. ALI (Sudan) said that the adoption without opposition of General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) had underlined the supreme importance all countries attached to the question of non-intervention. The Committee's debates had reflected the anxiety of all

countries that the Declaration should be observed. The world continued to change and many countries had regained their freedom and thrown off the yoke of colonialism. The new States, particularly in Africa and Asia, found themselves open to intervention in their domestic affairs. United States intervention in Viet-Nam was a flagrant example: it should cease and the Geneva Agreements of 1954 should be observed.

25. A particular means whereby intervention was practised was through the installation of military bases. The Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cairo in October 1964, had stressed that foreign military bases were a gross violation of the sovereignty of States and a threat to peace. They were a means of maintaining colonialism and of exercising pressure on the countries where they were installed. Military expeditions could be undertaken from them, as was happening, for example, in Angola and Mozambique.

26. The principle of non-intervention was in jeopardy and it was important for nations to be especially vigilant. Therefore his delegation supported the draft resolution and the amendments and hoped that they would be adopted unanimously.

27. Mr. BEAULIEU (Canada) said that his country considered the principle of non-intervention extremely important. That was why his delegation had supported the adoption of the Declaration in General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX). It maintained the position it had taken at the twentieth session (1404th and 1422nd meetings), namely, that it considered that all decisions on non-intervention should have unanimous support. They should stress the most significant types of intervention which were characteristic of the present day, such as clandestine and subversive activities.

28. Any formulation of the principle of non-intervention should contain precise definitions of the types of intervention which would be valid in international law. Such a formulation needed a more thorough study; that was a more appropriate subject for the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, which could give the principle a legally valid formulation which would be universally accepted.

29. With those considerations in mind, his delegation would vote in favour of the amendments. If they were adopted, it would vote in favour of the draft resolution. But that would be a political decision, taken to meet the needs of the time, and must not be considered to prejudice any legal definition of the principle.

Mr. Fahmy (United Arab Republic), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

30. Mr. HADDAD (Algeria) said that the Declaration in resolution 2131 (XX) stated certain fundamental principles affecting international peace and security. The practical question facing the international community was how to adjust international politics to it. He agreed with the Soviet representative that the question was of great importance at the present stage. During recent years, intervention in the domestic affairs of States had contributed to world tension. Whether such intervention was brutal or muted, open or disguised, it was contrary to the

principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples on which the United Nations was based. Threats of any kind, and especially the use of force, were an attack on the sovereignty of States.

31. The United Nations must create conditions in which the developing countries would be able to choose their own political, economic and social institutions in accordance with their national genius. Some speakers had sought to excuse certain acts of intervention on the ground that they had been undertaken in response to others, but his delegation could not accept that view. The United Nations must take a stand against intervention in laying the foundations of a world order in which nations would co-operate in freedom and mutual respect. For those reasons his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution as amended.

Mr. Benites (Ecuador) resumed the Chair.

32. Mr. CADENA HERNANDEZ (Guatemala) said that his country had constantly been subjected to political pressure which had slowed down its progress. It sought to establish peace and freedom on a democratic basis so that the economic and social benefits obtained from the full use of its natural resources could be extended to all. But, even since the adoption of the Declaration, minority groups had attempted to secure power and subject its people to domination and a denial of freedom and human rights. They were encouraged by States outside which he begged to cease such interference. As a peace-loving State, Guatemala adhered to the Declaration and would vote in favour of both the draft resolution and the amendments.

33. Mr. TINE (France) said that, as with General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX), his delegation did not consider that the draft resolution had legal validity. It was rather a subject for the Sixth Committee and the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States. In particular, his delegation could not accept the implication in the text of subparagraph (c) of the operative part as proposed in the fifth amendment, that the Declaration contained obligations for States which were similar to those of the Charter. He requested a separate vote on that amendment.

34. Miss BROOKS (Liberia) said that her delegation supported the amendments but would have preferred to see the words "and peoples" retained in the text of sub-paragraph (a) of the operative part of the draft resolution.

35. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that he had drawn attention in the general debate to all aspects of the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.367). His delegation still thought that it most closely reflected the present world situation and was in the best interests of States and peoples. His delegation would have preferred to see the Committee and General Assembly adopt it as it stood. The omission of the words "and peoples" from sub-paragraph (a) was due to the Latin American countries, which had submitted the amendments in A/C.1/L.388/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Corr.1.

36. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the amendments (A/C.1/L.388/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Corr.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 and 2) to the draft resolution. The French representative had requested a separate vote on the fifth amendment.

The fifth amendment was adopted by 91 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

The amendments as a whole were adopted by 100 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

37. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/L.367), as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 99 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.

38. Mr. SHAW (Australia) said that, as with General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX), his delegation regarded the draft resolution as a political and moral expression of the principle of non-intervention and a useful reminder of the duties of States. The combined views of so many delegations could not find perfect expression in a resolution. Rather, the debates had been, as the Peruvian representative had said, an exercise in intellectual co-operation. He agreed with the French representative that the Declaration did not impose obligations on States of the same category as those contained in the Charter and had therefore abstained in the separate vote on the fifth amendment.

39. His delegation considered that it remained the task of the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States to undertake the definitive formulation of an acceptable legal text on the principle of non-intervention. In the meantime, by voting in favour of the draft resolution just adopted the Australian delegation joined all Members in expressing a determination to support the principle of the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States. He hoped all Members would give that intention concrete form in their policies.

40. Mr. MAJID (Afghanistan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the revised amendments to the draft resolution, but also considered that the words "and peoples" should have been retained in sub-paragraph (a).

41. Mr. BANCROFT (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, as amended, because it believed that it suitably emphasized the danger to peace from the less direct forms of intervention such as subversion and terrorism. He stressed that the new sub-paragraph (c) called upon all States to refrain from intervention. That referred to the subversive activities of the Tricontinental Conference and the plans of its permanent organization. The draft resolution was also addressed to Hanoi and Peking, whose armed intervention in the internal affairs of South Viet-Nam was illegal in both its clandestine and overt forms. He reminded the Committee that United States forces were in South Viet-Nam in answer to its appeal for help in deciding its own future freely and without outside intervention.

42. The United States delegation considered the draft resolution just adopted to be a valuable political

statement of attitude and policy and not an elaboration of international law. The rights and obligations of the United Nations Charter remained the clear statement of international law on non-intervention.

43. Mr. VINCI (Italy) recalled that his delegation had voted in favour of the Declaration in General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) although it considered that the Declaration emphasized only some aspects of the principle of non-intervention. The Committee's debate during the current session had strengthened the Italian delegation's view that an objective statement of the principle of non-intervention would be more likely to emerge from a study by the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States. His delegation had abstained in the separate vote on the fifth amendment, as it did not consider that the Declaration should be placed on the same level as the United Nations Charter. It felt that the wording of sub-paragraph (c) might weaken rather than strengthen respect for the Charter, to which all had acceded. It considered, however, that the revised amendments had substantially improved the Soviet draft resolution and had therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution as amended.

44. Mr. PARDO (Malta) said that his delegation had not been able to vote for the draft resolution.

45. It believed in the principle of non-intervention. But, until the United Nations had acquired sufficient authority to render the existing conflicts of ideology in the world obsolete, he had serious doubts whether any useful purpose would be served by calling upon all States—including the State which had sponsored the original draft resolution—to observe the provisions of the Declaration in resolution 2131 (XX). Furthermore, there was some vagueness in the wording of certain preambular paragraphs and of sub-paragraph (c) of the operative paragraph. The exact meaning of the paragraphs concerned had not been clarified in the course of the discussion.

46. His delegation looked forward to the day when the General Assembly would be able to adopt a precisely-worded resolution on non-intervention, with some reasonable expectation that its provisions would be strictly observed by all States.

AGENDA ITEMS 31 AND 93

The Korean question: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/6312, A/6370, A/6375, A/6416, A/6417, A/C.1/934-937, A/C.1/L.383/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1, A/C.1/L.391, A/C.1/L.392)

Withdrawal of all United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (A/6394, A/C.1/935-937, A/C.1/L.383/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1, A/C.1/L.389, A/C.1/L.391)

47. Mr. ACHKAR (Guinea) recalled that at the 1470th meeting his delegation had asked the Committee to give immediate consideration to a draft resolution by which it would invite representatives of the two parties directly concerned to take part in its discussion of the Korean question.

48. In previous years, the debates on the Korean question had been unfruitful, as they had been overshadowed by "cold war" considerations. For much too long, the Committee had been accustomed to hear representatives of only one of the two parties concerned. At the current session, some of the non-aligned countries had joined with others in submitting a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.383/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1) whose sole purpose was to enable the Committee to hear representatives of both parties. The sponsors of the draft resolution had done their utmost to eliminate any controversial elements from it. They hoped that it would be adopted as soon as possible, so that the First Committee would not become the laughing-stock of the world by waiting until the very end of the session before it invited representatives from the two Koreas to attend its discussions.

49. The statement in the preambular paragraph was indisputable. Under the terms of the operative paragraph, the invitation would not be subject to any prior conditions or reservations. In previous years, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had been invited to take part in the discussion on certain conditions only. But it had not been able to accept the conditions, which would have placed it at a disadvantage even before it had had any opportunity of expressing its views.

50. He urged delegations not to impede the course of the Committee's work by injecting "cold war" arguments into the discussion on the draft resolution, which was purely procedural and should be put to the vote as soon as possible.

51. Mr. FEDORENKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that it was essential to invite representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea to take part in the discussion of the Korean question. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.383/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1 was simple and clear and should be adopted without delay.

52. Hitherto, artificial obstacles had been placed in the way of inviting representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It was clear that some delegations were afraid of hearing the voice of socialist Korea in the First Committee. They wanted the Committee merely to "rubber-stamp" proposals which suited their own interests, regardless of the wishes and demands of the Korean people. But their attitude was directly at variance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

53. The United States and other sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.391 were evidently trying once again, as they had done in earlier years, to prevent representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from taking part in the Committee's discussion. The one-sided and discriminatory character of the draft resolution was clear from the fact that the sponsors were proposing to invite a representative of South Korea forthwith, while the invitation to representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was accompanied by conditions which would make it impossible for it to participate in the Committee's discussion.

54. The United States was trying to justify its attitude on the grounds that the Democratic People's Republic

of Korea did not accept the competence of the United Nations to take action on the Korean question. But that was a flagrant distortion. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea rejected any interference in the domestic affairs of the Korean people and believed that the Korean question should be solved by the Korean people themselves without any foreign intervention. It had never opposed the principles of the United Nations Charter. It had never, by its actions, impaired the authority of the United Nations. Its approach to the Korean question was, in fact, the only one in keeping with the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty.

55. The proposal to invite representatives from South Korea only, and to prevent representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from taking part in the Committee's discussions, could only be regarded as an attempt to perpetuate the existing abnormal situation and to prevent the Committee from discussing the Korean question in an objective manner. In the General Committee, in the General Assembly itself and in the First Committee the Soviet delegation had repeatedly expressed its views on the practice of discussing the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK). But as a result of pressure by the United States and other delegations, the Committee was now to discuss the report of UNCURK once again. That being the case, the Soviet delegation insisted that representatives of both the parties directly concerned should be invited—unreservedly and simultaneously—to take part in the discussion, particularly because the Committee was now for the first time discussing the question of the withdrawal of United States and other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and the question of the dissolution of UNCURK.

56. By inviting both parties, the Committee would avoid discriminating against either of them. The United States, as was clear from the text of draft resolution A/C.1/L.391, was trying to justify its attitude by referring to the Committee's past decisions. But the Soviet delegation could not accept that argument. Wrong decisions in the past could not be invoked to justify new errors.

57. He hoped that all delegations would support draft resolution A/C.1/L.383/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1, and thereby enable the Committee to discuss the Korean question in an objective manner.

58. Mr. MATSUI (Japan) said that the question of inviting representatives of both the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take part in the discussion was closely related to the substance of agenda items 31 and 93. At the fifteenth and sixteenth sessions, the Committee had invited the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to send representatives to take part in the discussions, and had asked only that it should accept the competence and authority of the United Nations in regard to the Korean question. On both occasions, the invitation had been received with defiance by the North Korean Government, which had not accepted the legitimate conditions imposed by the Committee.

59. Korea was—through no fault of its own—divided into two parts. It was clear, therefore, that the Democratic People's Republic had an essential part to play as a party directly concerned. The arguments for extending invitations both to the Republic of Korea and to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were appealing to some extent. But his delegation did not believe that unconditional invitations should be extended to both parties.

60. The attitude of the Republic of Korea toward the United Nations was clearly quite different from that of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The former had always accepted the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the Korean question. Its position had been reaffirmed in a letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea (A/C.1/935). The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the other hand, had consistently rejected the competence and authority of the United Nations with regard to the Korean question. The memorandum of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of 21 July 1966 stated that "the United Nations was not entitled from the outset to deal with the Korean question even in the light of its Charter" (A/6370). Even in the more recent statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (A/C.1/937) his delegation could find nothing to suggest that it was now prepared to accept the competence and authority of the United Nations to deal with the Korean question. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had expressed its willingness to take part only in the discussion of agenda item 93. In other words, it was willing to send representatives to the United Nations only to insist on the complete liquidation of the entire United Nations effort in Korea.

61. Since the Republic of Korea had accepted the competence of the United Nations, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had flatly rejected it, it would be illogical, inequitable and discriminatory to extend invitations to both parties on exactly the same terms and without conditions. Accordingly his delegation, representing an Asian country which was a near neighbour of Korea, had joined with several other delegations in submitting draft resolution A/C.1/L.391.

In the first preambular paragraph, it was stated that representatives of both parties might participate in the discussion of the Korean question provided that they first unequivocally accepted the competence of the United Nations. Operative paragraph 2 reaffirmed the Committee's willingness to invite a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, provided that the latter accepted the competence of the United Nations.

62. He hoped that draft resolution A/C.1/L.391 would command wide support in the Committee.

63. Mr. AJAVON (Togo) recalled that at the twentieth session the Committee had decided to invite a representative of the Republic of Korea only, since the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had rejected the right of the United Nations to consider the Korean question at all. It was clear from the documents before the Committee that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had not modified its hostile attitude toward the United Nations. There was no reason, then, why the Committee should depart from the procedure it had adopted in earlier years.

64. For all those reasons, his delegation would be unable to vote for draft resolution A/C.1/L.383/Rev.1 and Rev.1/Add.1. Like other delegations, it realized that there was much merit in the proposal to hear representatives of both parties. If the North Korean authorities, like those of South Korea, had stated that they recognized the competence and authority of the United Nations and were prepared to accept a United Nations decision on the question of reunification, he would gladly have supported that draft resolution. But in view of the intransigent attitude of North Korea, the Committee should reject it. There was no point in inviting a delegation from North Korea merely to hear it tell the Committee that it was not competent to deal with the Korean question at all.

65. In the circumstances, his delegation had decided to join in sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/L.391 and hoped that the Committee would adopt it.

The meeting rose at 6.5 p.m.