



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 103: The strengthening of international security (<i>continued</i>) . .	1
Agenda item 99: Invitation aspects of the consideration of item 99: Ques- tion of Korea	5

Chairman: Mr. Agha SHAHI (Pakistan).

AGENDA ITEM 103

**The strengthening of international security (*continued*)
(A/7654; A/C.1/L.468)**

1. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): Before addressing myself to the substance of the item before us, I would express our deep fraternal sympathy and condolences to the friendly State of Yugoslavia, its Government and people and the Yugoslav delegation here present in connexion with that tragic cataclysm—the earthquake at Banja Luka—and would request the Yugoslav delegation to convey the heartfelt condolences of the USSR delegation to the inhabitants of that town and to the families of the victims.

2. The USSR delegation has followed with the closest interest the discussion in the First Committee of the item entitled “The strengthening of international security” [A/7654], submitted by the USSR. We feel that this broad discussion, in which some 80 delegations took part, has yielded a positive result. It can definitely be said that with very few exceptions—not more than two or three—the Members of the United Nations have been unanimous in agreeing that the time has indeed come for the United Nations to undertake a serious and detailed examination of the question of strengthening international security. The basic theme of nearly all statements was that it has become urgently necessary thoroughly to investigate and evaluate the extent to which the United Nations has been coping with its principal task—preserving mankind from the threat of another world war, maintaining world peace and strengthening international security—and at the same time to analyse the reasons why, in quite a number of cases, the United Nations was doomed to inaction, found itself, as it were, in a state of paralysis, and proved incapable of pursuing these lofty purposes of the Charter. I might add that nearly all speakers emphasized that it would be particularly important and opportune to make such an analysis and to envisage further measures in this important matter on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the creation of the United Nations.

3. Significantly, the overwhelming majority of the 80 or so speakers stressed the importance and timeliness of the problem of strengthening international security, and expressed their satisfaction and gratitude to the USSR for raising the question.

4. The USSR delegation sincerely thanks all these delegations for their kind words and for supporting and approving the action taken by the USSR towards a strengthening of international security, as well as for making their own contribution to that worthy cause.

5. I would note that even those few delegations which had doubts regarding some aspects of the draft Appeal to All States proposed by the USSR were forced to recognize that it would be useful for the General Assembly to discuss the strengthening of international security, and to discuss it on the broadest scale. The USSR’s proposals are of great significance in that they provide an opportunity for a meaningful and thorough discussion by the States of the world of the most burning international questions of our day.

6. I must note with satisfaction that, first, an overwhelming number of Member States have explicitly recognized the importance and timeliness of the question of strengthening international security and, secondly, that in submitting this item for the consideration of the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session, the USSR has thereby isolated from the vast number of contemporary international problems the most important, urgent and vital problem of all, whose solution is of paramount importance to the peoples of the world.

7. The discussion in the First Committee has clearly demonstrated that the overwhelming majority of States and all peoples without exception want the United Nations to play a more active and vigorous part in the maintenance of peace and the strengthening of international security. The fact that so large a number of delegations took part in the discussion is proof manifest of the general understanding of the perils of thermonuclear war for all States, great and small, economically developed and still developing, socialist and capitalist, States of the west and the east, States of the north and the south.

8. The practical result of the discussion is that many delegations are in favour of the adoption by the General Assembly at the current session of an agreed document on the strengthening of international security. It would therefore appear that the fundamental ideas and principles contained in the USSR proposals have been favourably received by many States and that the USSR draft Appeal to All States of the World on the strengthening of international security offers a good basis for a General Assembly decision on this question, the most important of our day.

9. A number of comments on the proposals in the draft Appeal were made in the course of the discussion. My delegation can only welcome so workmanlike and constructive an approach. A joint effort on the part of all States to strengthen international security is precisely what is needed. Discussions such as this one not only present new ideas and considerations to the participants, but also help to find the most effective and practical ways of meeting the concerns of the world's States and allaying the fears of the world's peoples in the instrument the adoption of which by the General Assembly will crown its consideration at the current session of the strengthening of international security.

10. My delegation has already offered some explanations concerning the USSR position on those extremely important matters to which many delegations have drawn particular attention. It has said that the Soviet Union would give the most favourable consideration to the suggestion of a number of delegations that the United Nations document on the strengthening of international security should include provisions concerning the need for an early solution of disarmament problems.

11. The position of the USSR on the question of disarmament is well known. Its peoples can be justly proud that never in history has any State, especially a militarily strong one, has done so much to translate into reality mankind's age-old dream of a world without armaments, a world without wars, as has the Soviet Union—the first socialist State in the world, created by the great Lenin.

12. The Soviet Union is in favour of the prohibition of all types of nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons, of general and complete disarmament, and of the strengthening of international security. It is also taking a most responsible approach to the forthcoming talks with the United States on the limitation of the strategic arms race. The following report was published in Moscow two days ago: "Confirming their earlier agreement to undertake negotiations on containing the strategic arms race, the Governments of the USSR and the United States have agreed that special representatives of the two countries will meet at Helsinki on 17 November 1969 for a preliminary discussion of related questions".

13. Such is the clear, consistent and fundamental position of the Soviet Union on the question of disarmament.

14. My delegation has also explained that the Soviet Union fully understands the great desire of the developing countries to overcome their economic backwardness and bridge the gap between themselves and the developed countries, a gap which is a legacy of centuries of exploitation of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America by foreign colonizers. My delegation is ready to consider specific proposals to state in the United Nations instrument on the strengthening of international security that this problem is closely related to that of the economic development and improved well-being of peoples. In this connexion, I would once again emphasize that, in our view, the strengthening of international security would result in the release of large funds to be spent on improving the well-being of all peoples and promoting the economic progress of the developing countries.

15. I would now comment on a few other points that were raised during the discussion on the USSR proposals.

16. I shall first deal with comments on section III of our draft Appeal [*A/C.1/L.468*], setting forth the general principles by which States should be guided in their foreign policies.

17. Several delegations have wondered how the principles of peaceful coexistence were to be understood and interpreted and how they were to be reconciled with the idea of maintaining and developing friendly relations among all States in accordance with the United Nations Charter. The answer is very simple: there is no contradiction between the principles of the peaceful coexistence of States, irrespective of their social system, and the principles of friendly relations among all States. No distinction should be made between them.

18. The principle of peaceful coexistence, posited by V. I. Lenin, is the cornerstone of the relations of the Soviet Union and the other socialist States with the countries of the capitalist world. Peaceful coexistence of socialist and capitalist States is a law of history; it is what human society needs at the present stage for its further development. The alternative would be a nuclear world war with all its dire consequences. Those are the terms of the problem before us.

19. That the principles of peaceful coexistence are now being widely recognized is a great achievement on the part of the socialist countries and of all progressive forces everywhere, obtained after a long and arduous struggle against imperialism and aggression. Unfortunately, however, even today there are those among us whose views were frozen solid in the coldest days of the cold war and who cannot reconcile themselves to peaceful coexistence with the socialist countries. Hence their unceasing sorties against the States of the socialist confraternity. Hence their imperialist discriminatory practice with regard to the socialist countries which are not Members of the United Nations—a practice which, against all logic and common sense, to say nothing of the Charter and the principle of universality, is still current in the United Nations.

20. It will be remembered that only a few days ago my delegation was compelled to mention this matter once again in its remarks at the United Nations Pledging Conference on the United Nations Development Programme and in the meeting at which the Security Council considered the question of inviting States Parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice—Liechtenstein, San Marino and Switzerland—to take part in the discussion of the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly of questions relating to the Court's activities. My delegation felt obliged to ask such questions as: Why are such capitalist non-member States as Western Germany, South Korea and South Viet-Nam able to take part in the Pledging Conference, while sovereign socialist States—the German Democratic Republic, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam—are not admitted? Why can such States as Liechtenstein, San Marino and Switzerland, which are not Members of the United Nations, be parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice and take part in the General Assembly's discussions

of questions concerning the Court's activities, while socialist non-member States are still deprived of that opportunity because of pressure from the Western Powers? No unbiased observer could regard this United Nations practice as normal.

21. Equally devoid of foundation either in international law or in the Charter are the objections made by a few—a very few—delegations to the proposals in section VII of the draft Appeal that its text, as adopted by the General Assembly, should be transmitted to the Governments of all States of the world—I repeat, all States—and that all States of the world should inform the General Assembly and the Security Council of the steps they undertake in connexion with this Appeal.

22. The Soviet Union takes the view that the strengthening of international security is of equal concern to the peoples of the socialist and developing States and to the peoples of economically developed capitalist countries, and that the threat of thermonuclear war with its dreadful consequences affects equally the peoples of all the countries in the world. That is why all States, regardless of their social system, must take part in the strengthening of international security.

23. For this reason, the Soviet Union deems it desirable to include in the United Nations instrument on the strengthening of international security a provision to the effect that all the States of the world should strictly abide in their international relations by the principles of peaceful co-existence of States, irrespective of their social system. Peaceful coexistence presupposes and demands respect for the principles of sovereignty, equal rights, the territorial integrity of all States, great and small, without exception, non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, the rights of all peoples freely to choose their social, economic and political system, and the settlement of international disputes by means of diplomatic negotiation.

24. At the same time, the Soviet Union has of course always held that all States without exception should be guided in their relations by the principles of the United Nations Charter, i.e., should base these relations on the principles of equality, respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial inviolability, non-interference in domestic affairs, elimination of the use of force, and the self-determination and equality of all peoples.

25. It will be clear from what I said that any contradistinction between the principles of peaceful coexistence and the principles of friendly relations among States can be drawn only by those who wish to dissociate themselves from both.

26. I now turn to the comments on section IV of the USSR draft Appeal, dealing with regional security systems. My delegation has already expounded its proposals on this question.

27. Speaking recently in Moscow, L. I. Brezhnev, the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union emphasized once again that the USSR has been giving primary attention in its foreign policy to the question of ensuring a lasting peace in Europe. He said: "It is no accident that we so consistently

and persistently raise the question of a system of collective security in Europe. To us this is more than an attractive slogan. It is a problem of vital significance—a problem which directly affects the future of hundreds of millions in Europe, and not in Europe alone. We hold out our hand to all European States in the struggle for peace and security."¹

28. My delegation would like to make it abundantly clear that, with regard to Europe or Asia, or any other part of the world, the USSR proposal on regional collective security systems has nothing to do with aggressive military blocs and is in no way directed against any group of countries or individual countries, great or small. It is also obvious that only the States situated in a given geographical area can take the final decision on the feasibility and usefulness of setting up regional security systems. It is their inalienable right to make judgements on the circumstances prevailing in their area. No country in the world, including those which seek "world leadership" and "world domination", is entitled to impose its will on other States.

29. Naturally, regional security systems must be created in strict conformity with the United Nations Charter.

30. My delegation is gratified that an overwhelming majority of the delegations here present have supported our proposals to enhance the role of the Security Council, as set out in section V of the draft Appeal. In full understanding of the fact that the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security has been conferred by the Charter on the Security Council, nearly all delegations agreed with the USSR proposal that the General Assembly should recommend to the Security Council to consider the general state of international security at its periodic meetings convened at the level of members of Governments or other specially designated representatives, with a view to elaborating urgent measures to strengthen it. Many delegations also supported the proposal that the Security Council should, where necessary, make use of the full powers vested in it by the United Nations Charter. Application of these important provisions of the Charter, which have thus far lain dormant, is long overdue.

31. Virtually everyone has also recognized that it would be desirable for the General Assembly to urge the special committees dealing with the definition of aggression, the principles of friendly relations and co-operation of States, and United Nations peace-keeping operations to intensify their efforts. This subject is, of course, dealt with in section VI of our draft Appeal, which, like all the other USSR proposals, looks to the future and is aimed at increasing the effectiveness of the United Nations as an instrument for the maintenance of international peace and security.

32. I would now say a few words concerning the reaction of certain delegations to the proposals regarding the withdrawal of troops from territories occupied as a result of action by the armed forces of some States against other States and peoples defending the independence they have won as a result of the collapse of the colonial system and their territorial integrity; the cessation of colonial wars; and the completion of decolonization—matters dealt with in

¹ Speech made by L. I. Brezhnev at the Meeting of Soviet-Czechoslovak Friendship in the Kremlin Congress Palace.

section II of the USSR draft Appeal to All States of the World.

33. I have the impression that some people are displeased and possibly even irritated by the fact that these matters are being raised at all, and that they are spoken of in the USSR draft. But irritation is a poor counsellor. It is conducive to bias, which can hardly help in solving these problems, so vital for the strengthening of international security. Where these matters are concerned, one cannot, like an ostrich, hide one's head in the sand, nor is it wise to create a conspiracy of silence around the USSR proposals, for the United Nations cannot avoid a consideration of these acute and urgent problems, which, as has been recognized by many delegations, represent a danger to peace. It is unfortunately a fact that foreign troops, in violation of the United Nations Charter, continue to hold by force of arms territories seized as a result of action by the armed forces of some States against other States and peoples. Again, barbarous colonial wars are still going on, in this second half of the enlightened twentieth century, and millions upon millions are still being held in colonial enslavement for the sole reason that their skins are not white. As my delegation has said before, everyone here knows perfectly well where these things are happening and who is responsible for them.

34. We fully understand the legitimate wrath of the African States at imperialism and racism, and their request that the "Manifesto on Southern Africa"² should be discussed as an important and urgent item at the current session of the General Assembly.

35. We also understand and share the views expressed in the discussion by Arab delegations that the States of the Middle East will not know security so long as the territories of some of them are occupied by an aggressor.

36. The Soviet Union has always been and always will be in favour of eradicating colonialism and racism and putting an end to the criminal acts of those who seize foreign territories, expelling the indigenous inhabitants and robbing them of freedom and independence. This is consistent with the entire course of Soviet Union foreign policy from the creation of the Soviet State to the present day. Our policy will remain unaltered in the future. This is guaranteed by the truly popular socialist system prevailing in our country and by the faithful adherence of the Soviet State and its peoples to the principles laid down by V. I. Lenin on maintaining and strengthening the peace and to the great doctrine of Marxism-Leninism.

37. Peace is and will be the banner of USSR foreign policy. That policy is equally dedicated to the struggle against imperialist aggressors, those who were punished by the tribunal of nations at Nuremberg, who unleashed the Second World War in their mad ambition to rule the world and who are today cherishing the equally mad idea of altering the consequences of the war.

38. It is not the fault of the Soviet Union that after the peoples won their great victory over nazi aggressors and their allies, conditions were not created for a lasting peace.

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7657.*

It is not we who are responsible for the world being divided into military blocs and for the long presence of foreign troops in the territories of certain States. The Soviet Union has made every effort to correct this abnormal situation, to effect an improvement of the international atmosphere and the liquidation of all foreign military bases. It is not our fault that, because of the resistance of certain Powers, these questions still remain unsettled.

39. I should like to say a few words on the form of the document which, in our opinion, should emerge from the discussion of the USSR proposals on the strengthening of international security. I would emphasize once again that it is particularly important to have the Appeal addressed to all States and not merely to States Members of the United Nations. The Soviet Union has consistently held not only that the principle of universality should obtain in the United Nations, but that all States of the world should take part in the strengthening of international security. Those who during the discussion emphasized the need for a universal approach to the problems of world security are right, and we fully agree with them.

40. In conclusion, I have a few general remarks to make. One of the speakers who criticized our proposals alleged that they were based on Marxist-Leninist ideology and philosophy. Supposing that to be so, what then? The majority of delegations recognized in the course of the discussion that the USSR proposals stemmed from a desire to maintain peace and strengthen international security. Consequently, these proposals are based on concern for international peace and security. The inescapable conclusion is that a policy based on Marxist-Leninist philosophy is a policy for peace and for the strengthening of international security, and therefore a policy aimed at universal tranquility and happiness. That is a point we ourselves have emphasized time and again. Consequently, our "critic" in fact gave us his support, although, to judge by the general tenor of his statement, that was not his intention.

41. The Soviet Union did not propose new action for the strengthening of international security in order to cause disputes or polemics, or in order to accuse or censure anyone whatever. Certainly not. Our aim is disinterested and constructive. The Soviet Union is motivated by a desire to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations, maintain peace throughout the world, strengthen international security, and help to improve relations among all States. Grievously mistaken and deeply deluded are those who see in our proposals an attempt to give a special interpretation to the principles of the Charter or to conceal selfish or, to use the word of Mr. Pazhwak of Afghanistan, "Machiavellian" aims and purposes.

42. If there are representatives here who oppose our proposal for the simple reason that it has been put forward by the Soviet Union, they ought to understand that this is not the best way to achieve a transition from one era in international relations to another that is more rational and more in keeping with the wishes of the world's peoples.

43. Instant rejection of anything proposed by the Soviet Union is a practice too long and annoyingly applied during the years of the cold war, during the epoch of confrontations. It has brought neither glory nor success to those who used it.

44. The time has come to renounce this approach. It is inapplicable and inadmissible today, if there is really a sincere and serious intention to make this period an “era of negotiation”.

45. Some delegations have said that perhaps consideration of the USSR proposals should be divided into two parts, some “interim document” being adopted at the current session, while a final decision on the strengthening of international security is postponed to the following, or twenty-fifth anniversary, session. The Soviet Union is not opposed to continuing the discussion of the problems of international security at the twenty-fifth session. In fact, section VII of the draft Appeal provides that all States of the world should inform the General Assembly and the Security Council of the steps undertaken by them in connexion with the Appeal. Furthermore, the Soviet Union has proposed that now, at this twenty-fourth session, the General Assembly should resolve to include in the provisional agenda of its twenty-fifth session an item entitled “Progress in the implementation by States of measures for the strengthening of international security”. Thus, the Soviet Union does not feel that consideration of the strengthening of international security should be confined to the present session of the General Assembly.

46. It is surely obvious that the adoption by the General Assembly, at its twenty-fourth session of a detailed and specific Appeal to All States of the World, rather than a purely formal “interim document”, would better prepare the ground for further measures by the United Nations to strengthen international security, including consideration by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth anniversary session of further measures to that end.

47. The general debate on the USSR proposals for the strengthening of international security is ending today. My delegation is ready to continue exchanges of views with other delegations concerning its proposals, so that a definite decision can be taken on them.

48. In conclusion, the USSR delegation would once again express its gratitude to the many delegations which supported its proposals on one of the major questions of contemporary international relations—the strengthening of international security.

49. The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has now concluded the general debate on the item: The strengthening of international security. In accordance with the decision taken at its 1666th meeting on 27 October, the Committee will return to the consideration of this item immediately following the conclusion of the consultations to which I referred at that meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 99

Invitation aspects of the consideration of item 99: Question of Korea (A/C.1/L.467 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.1/L.469 and Add.1 and 2)

50. The CHAIRMAN: In addition to the 14 sponsors, Swaziland had also joined as a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/L.469 and Add.1 and 2.

51. Members of the Committee are, no doubt, aware that the substantive aspects of the question of Korea will be taken up as the fourth item on the agenda of the Committee.

52. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): In any serious consideration of a question concerning two parties, their participation is a necessary condition if a just and equitable solution to the question is to be found. We are now examining the question of the invitation to be sent in connexion with the question of Korea, namely, the invitation of the two parties concerned in the reunification and rehabilitation of Korea—the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea, the latter represented by the puppet Government of Seoul. Under the title of the Korean question which appears in the agenda three distinct and separate items are to be discussed. First, the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations; second, the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea; and third, the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

53. This is the sixteenth consecutive time that the question of Korea has come up before the various bodies of the United Nations and it is quite understandable that a time comes when some of the arguments and some of the positions are repeated by the delegations, particularly as regards solving the problem of the participation in the debate of the parties concerned.

54. The reports of the Commission for the so-called reunification and rehabilitation of Korea have always had a most unfortunate effect on the work of the General Assembly. They have served to bring in and maintain an atmosphere of cold war. Whenever certain circles have become interested in creating tensions and reviving the atmosphere of the cold war in United Nations discussions, they have resorted to the Korean question—to be discussed, of course, in the light of the reports of the so-called Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

55. The delegation of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria would like to point to certain facts that touch upon the activities of the Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and certain considerations which form the background of the question before us.

56. Having brought before the General Assembly the item entitled: “Dissolution of the United Nations Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea”, the 16 countries, including my own, which submitted the memorandum on this matter [*A/7643 and Add.1-3*], wanted to help the United Nations once and for all to do away with an instrument whose final purpose is to revive international tension, particularly in the Far East, thus serving the interests of some imperialist circles, and more particularly the military circles of the United States of America.

57. Any discussion of the report of the so-called Commission and the adoption of resolutions similar to those that were adopted in previous years could serve only the

interests of the imperialist circles and not those of the United Nations or the Korean people.

58. The harm done to peace as well as to international security by that Commission is only too well known. The Commission's activities have had as their aim—and thus far as their result—the maintenance and perpetuation of the division of the country on the pretext of alleged concern for the reunification of Korea. To arrive at such results, namely, to keep the country divided—which is the aim of certain American military circles—it has endeavoured to ensure the continued occupation of South Korea by the armies of the United States and some of its allies under the flag of the United Nations. Instead of promoting the reunification of the country, which is supposedly the aim of the Commission, it has, by interfering in the domestic affairs of Korea, constantly upheld the policies of rotten régimes of the South, disowning them only when they were no longer useful to certain circles in the United States. The Commission has endeavoured to prevent the Korean people from achieving its vital aim, which is the unification of its country.

59. In the memorandum annexed to the letter to the Secretary-General and the President of the General Assembly (A/C.1/987) from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, it is quite rightly stated that the Commission

“... has described the United States imperialist acts of aggression and war provocation against the northern half of the Republic as ‘defence’, the United States imperialist colonial rule enforced in South Korea as ‘protection’ and ‘assistance’, the fascist puppet régime rigged up by the bayonet of United States imperialism as ‘representative’ government, the fascist suppression of the South Korean people by United States imperialism and its stooges as ‘democracy’, and the economic ruin of South Korea as ‘growth and prosperity’”.

60. Furthermore, we should not forget that in turn the Commission praised the abject régime of Syngman Rhee as long as he could serve the sinister plans of the United States, then threw him over as outworn and welcomed the régime set up under foreign bayonets by another American agent, Park Chung Hee, as the expression of perfect democracy.

61. In all its reports to the United Nations the Commission has done its best to show up in an unfavourable light the constructive proposals and the constant efforts of the Government of the Korean Democratic People's Republic to bring about the reunification of the country by the means and possibilities which the Korean people themselves have without the intervention of other countries, and particularly without the intervention of foreign troops stationed in South Korea under the flag of the United Nations.

62. In so acting, the so-called Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea has merely tarnished the reputation of the United Nations in the eyes of the entire Korean people. It has shown our Organization to be an instrument for the establishment of a new colonial system for the benefit of the United States, a more subtle, more effective and therefore more dangerous system.

63. All those nefarious activities of the Commission are reflected in its reports to the General Assembly and the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The representatives of the puppet régime in Seoul, obviously in agreement with the general line of the Commission, defend all its operations, since their only aim is to perpetuate the colonial régime in their country.

64. An invitation addressed to only one of the parties concerned, as once again is proposed to us this year in the draft resolution submitted by the United States and certain other countries [A/C.1/L.469 and Add.1 and 2] would have as its sole aim to prevent the participation in our debates of the true representatives of the Korean people and to bar the way to the invitation to our discussions of the true representatives of the Korean Democratic People's Republic.

65. The representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are to be prevented from participating in the discussion of the Korean question in order to avoid the unmasking of the military operations of the United States and of their allies, set up as they have been as lords and masters of South Korea. However, that activity has resulted only in an increase in tension and in the establishment of conditions conducive to new interventions and new aggressions by the United States military circles. All that is very clear when we reread carefully the Commission's reports which, instead of growing fewer, have increased in number this year.

66. Therefore that Commission has now become guilty, in the eyes of the Korean people and of world public opinion, as well as of the United Nations, of having taken on the thankless task of covering up the crimes committed by United States military circles against the unification of Korea, of covering up the warlike operations and the increase in tension in a region which is already sufficiently beset by problems inherited from its colonial past. In fact, if we take the trouble to review even cursorily the reports of that Commission, we realize that its only aim is to slander and denigrate all the efforts of the Government of the Korean Democratic People's Republic to defend the integrity and the honour of its people and to mask the crimes and the manipulations of the military circles of the United States, as well as the complicity of the puppet Government of Seoul.

67. In view of these circumstances, it is not difficult to understand that that Government must glorify the Commission and defend its evil activities. It is also perfectly understandable that the United States delegation and the Commission itself do not want to see representatives of the Korean Democratic People's Republic participating in discussion of the question of Korea, since, as true representatives of the Korean people, which is the victim of the dangerous and pernicious activities of that delegation in the Commission, they would be bound to expose the crimes and misdeeds committed against the people of Korea, could not pass over in silence the aggressive acts committed by the United States armed forces and would be bound to expose what is being done in that region where peace is constantly endangered by feverish military activity. Those would seem to be the reasons why the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is being barred from participating in the debate on the Korean question.

68. The circles involved in these dangerous activities are not merely afraid of the exposures that might be made about the activities endangering peace and security in the region and the unity of a country which in the past has undergone foreign domination, but also, and above all, they fear the personal, human contacts which such a delegation could establish here with States Members of the United Nations. The protagonists of this game which endangers peace in the Far East are in fact afraid that their harmful activities might be unveiled far more through this human, personal contact than through any statements that might be made. They fear that delegations of Member States might realize the sincerity of men who come to defend the interests of their own people. It seems that this is precisely what the delegation of the United States and its lackeys in Seoul do not want to allow. From such personal contacts with the true representatives of the Korean people, representatives of States Members of the United Nations would come to realize fully—particularly in the light of the long experience with decolonization that has taken place in the Organization—what was the true situation in that region. It is these contacts of man with man and people with people that can best reveal the truth. It is through such contacts that the eyes of those that seek the truth would be opened, and we feel certain that the delegations present in this room want to know the truth.

69. What is therefore even more necessary is that delegations of the parties concerned should be enabled to attend from the very first, as soon as the item is included in the agenda of the session, and this has not been done. It goes without saying that that would be bound to lead to a better understanding of the problems that must be solved in the United Nations, namely, the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the United Nations flag.

70. However, this is certainly not the view held by those responsible for the dangerous and tragic situation created in and around Korea. Their main concern is to impede the presentation of the truth before members of this Committee. They do not wish to have their activities, which endanger international peace and security, exposed in too blatant and glaring a manner. They do not want their innumerable acts of provocation and aggression to be revealed in their worst light. They do not want the espionage activities of the United States intelligence services in and around Korea uncovered as they were by the incident of the spy-ship *Pueblo*.

71. In the report of the so-called Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea that incident, as well as the incident concerning the spy-plane EC 121 and the very recent incident of an espionage helicopter, are passed over in silence or else presented in a light that is favourable to the aggressor. The same applies to many other incidents provoked by American troops in South Korea and along the frontiers of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

72. Yet the Commission had available all the necessary documents on the subject at its disposal. In the memorandum annexed to his letter to the Secretary-General of

the United Nations [A/C.1/987], the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Korean People's Democratic Republic has in fact cast light on those activities that were carried on to the detriment of peace. He reproduced part of the letter of apology of the United States Government regarding the *Pueblo* incident in which the following revealing statement was made:

“The Government of the United States of America, acknowledging the validity of the confessions of the crew of the USS *Pueblo* and of the documents of evidence produced by the representative of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the effect that the ship, which was seized by the self-defence measures of the naval vessels of the Korean People's Army in the territorial waters of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on January 23, 1968, had illegally intruded into the territorial waters of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on many occasions and conducted espionage activities of spying out important military and state secrets of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

“Shoulders full responsibility and solemnly apologizes for the grave acts of espionage committed by the U. S. ship against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea after having intruded into the territorial waters of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

“And gives firm assurance that no U. S. ship will intrude again in future into the territorial waters of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.”

We shall see what activities the United States military circles subsequently engaged in.

73. It is characteristic, however, of the so-called Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea that in its reports it has consistently passed over in silence this revealing declaration of the United States Government as well as other incidents provoked by American imperialists, and this is not mere chance. The Commission was created precisely for that purpose by the circles interested in preparing aggression against Korea. By acting thus it has, moreover, revealed its true face as an executive agent of the United States.

74. All these reprehensible activities, which endanger the Korean people and international peace and security, would be exposed in a more vivid light if the parties to this conflict—the United States and the people of Korea—could be present during the examination of this question. These convincing facts could be put forward as evidence by the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the true representative of the Korean people. Those who have been its victims must not pass over in silence all the crimes committed against peace in that region.

75. We do not, of course, have any objections to participation in this discussion by representatives of the puppet régime. They have, as a matter of fact, always been present, thanks to their master's will, at the United Nations headquarters. Their presence would in any case have no effect on the development of the examination of the question, since the members of the First Committee know perfectly well with whom they are dealing. In any case, their masters take care of them.

76. The draft resolution submitted by the United States reveals that it wants, this year again, to prevent the presence of a delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Obviously the accused refuses to allow the victim to denounce the acts of aggression, and yet the peoples of the world and their representatives want to know the truth in order to safeguard more effectively international peace and security and to form an accurate opinion on the questions being discussed. That is also the aim of the United Nations. It is therefore essential that a delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should be allowed to come to present the facts of the situation. If we refuse to invite a delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the debate held here will be completely devoid of meaning and content: it will not serve the interests of peace and of the reunification of Korea, but on the contrary the interests of those who wish to perpetuate the occupation of South Korea and the division of the Korean people.

77. That is why we hope that the draft resolution submitted by a group of delegations, including my own [*A/C.1/L.467 and Add.1 and 2*] will be adopted so that a delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will be able to come here to put the true facts before us and to have contacts with all the members of the First Committee.

78. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan): Before addressing myself to the question now before us, I should like to express the great sorrow and deep sympathy of the delegation of Japan to the people of Bosnia in Yugoslavia at the terrible fate which has befallen them. The sympathy of my delegation is the greater because we know from our own experience how terrible the destructive force of an earthquake can be. My delegation wishes, through you, Mr. Chairman, to request the delegation of Yugoslavia to transmit to the Government and the people of Yugoslavia the heartfelt sympathy of the Government and the people of my country to the people of Bosnia at this most unfortunate calamity that has befallen them.

79. On behalf of the fifteen co-sponsors, including my own country, which is the closest neighbour of Korea, I now have the honour to introduce the draft resolution contained in document *A/C.1/L.469 and Add.1 and 2*. The problem of extending an invitation to the representative of North Korea to take part without right of vote in the consideration of the Korean question in the First Committee has long been discussed in the United Nations. In the view of my delegation the problem is very simple. We, the co-sponsors of draft resolution *A/C.1/L.469 and Add.1 and 2*, are quite ready and willing to invite the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take part in the discussions of the Korean question in the United Nations without right of vote, provided that it first unequivocally accepts the competence and authority of the United Nations within the terms of the Charter to take action on the Korean question.

80. Some delegations would appear to pretend that it is unfair to extend an invitation to one party on a conditional basis, while extending an invitation to the other on an unconditional basis. At first glance, this argument might appear to be objective but let us not be misguided by it, because it is a deceptive argument.

81. What is the condition we are talking about? It is not a condition which sets up one standard for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and another, more favourable standard, for the Republic of Korea. Precisely the same standard is applied to both. We are not asking for more from the one than we are asking from the other. All we are asking from both parties is the unequivocal acceptance of the competence and the authority of the United Nations within the terms of the Charter to take action on the Korean question.

82. As is noted in the preamble of draft resolution *A/C.1/L.469 and Add.1 and 2* the Republic of Korea has already accepted this condition. What we are asking in our draft resolution is that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea do precisely the same thing. This it has not done. On the contrary, as is noted in the fourth paragraph of the preamble of the draft resolution it continues to hold the view that the United Nations has neither the competence nor the authority to concern itself in the Korean question. Thus, to quote only one of the numerous examples of such statements by the North Korean authorities, the memorandum of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, dated 8 October 1969 and contained in document *A/C.1/987*, asserts that the United Nations resolutions on Korea are "entirely illegal and null and void", and that "the United Nations has originally no ground to meddle in the question of Korean unification". It then concludes with the following remarks: "Thus the United Nations should revoke all the illegal 'resolutions' on the Korean question adopted so far . . . and put an end to the illegal discussion of the 'Korean question' at the United Nations once and for all."

83. Furthermore, in the cable dated 15 October 1969, from their Minister of Foreign Affairs, addressed to the Chairman of this Committee and to the Secretary-General and contained in document *A/C.1/986*, the North Korean authorities seem to take the view that ". . . it is an utter violation of the United Nations Charter to talk about any 'condition'."

84. My delegation cannot accept this statement. Surely, it is well within the competence and authority of the United Nations to consider and to decide under what conditions a State or an entity not a Member of the Organization is to be invited to participate in discussions within the United Nations. How can one expect the representative of North Korea to play a constructive role in our discussion of the Korean question, when the authorities in Pyongyang deny the competence of the United Nations with regard to that question? It seems only logical to my delegation that those who are not Members of the United Nations and yet wish to participate in the discussion in the Organization may be required, as a condition for such participation, to accept the competence of the United Nations.

85. It might also be asked why such a condition, though reasonable, has to be stated in specific terms in the present case. The answer to that can be found if we look back to the day when the United Nations took up this question for the first time in 1947, in order to make it possible for the Korean people to reunify themselves.

86. Those efforts were unsuccessful and South Korea became the victim of aggression from the North in 1950.

After the Armistice Agreement, the seventh session of the General Assembly reaffirmed the United Nations objectives for the achievement, by peaceful means, of a unified, independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of government, and the full restoration of peace in the area. But the North Korean authorities rejected any role by the United Nations in the settlement of the Korean question along such peaceful lines. Since then, North Korea has constantly maintained a hostile attitude towards the United Nations with regard to the Korean question, as is clearly evidenced by the memorandum of the North Korean authorities.

87. The same cable from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the North Korean authorities claims that "The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has always respected and respects the Charter of the United Nations and its objectives."

88. It should be pointed out, with regret, that North Korea has carefully avoided stating that it accepts the competence of the United Nations to consider the question of Korea. Moreover, according to the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea [A/7553], the number of incidents south of the military demarcation line, including infiltration into the interior of the Republic of Korea, increased in the late summer of 1968 and continued at a high level throughout the remainder of the year. After a lull during the first two months of the current year, incidents have resumed. Thus North Korea has shown by its actions its disregard for the Charter of the United Nations, despite its avowals to the contrary.

89. The negative position taken by North Korea marks a sharp contrast with the position of the Republic of Korea, which has consistently accepted competence and authority of the United Nations with regard to Korea. Recently, in a statement submitted by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea, dated 1 October 1969 and contained in document A/C.1/982, the Government of the Republic of Korea has reconfirmed its position. The statement reads in part as follows: "... the Republic of Korea continues to accept unequivocally the competence and authority of the United Nations within the terms of the Charter to take action on the Korean question."

90. This basic difference in the attitudes of the two parties, the one negative and obstructive, the other positive and constructive, is obvious to everyone. The first step towards a satisfactory solution of the problem, then, is for North Korea to accept the competence and authority of the United Nations, as the Republic of Korea has already done. It is precisely on those terms that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.469 and Add.1 and 2 is formulated, extending invitations to both parties for participation in our discussion.

91. By contrast, in view of what I have already stated it hardly needs to be added that Japan will vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.467 and Add.1 and 2, introduced by the representative of Bulgaria, who spoke before me. It is wholly inequitable in that it takes no account at all of the respective attitudes of the two parties, the one positive and the other negative, towards the United Nations.

92. I trust that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.469 and Add.1 and 2, co-sponsored by Australia, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Gambia, Greece, Madagascar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Philippines, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, the United States of America and Japan, will be adopted by the vote of an overwhelming majority of this Committee.

93. Mr. ARYUBI (Afghanistan): First of all, on behalf of my delegation, I should like to associate myself with all the previous speakers in this Committee who have extended sympathy to the delegation of Yugoslavia with regard to the tragic earthquake which has recently occurred in that country. I wish to express the most profound feelings of sympathy of my delegation to the friendly Government and people of Yugoslavia.

94. On the question under consideration, the delegation of Afghanistan has repeatedly expressed its views over the past years. We have always been and are still of the opinion that the maintenance of international peace and security and the promotion of friendly relations and mutual confidence among nations call for a speedy solution to the unfortunate and deplorable situation resulting from the divisions of certain nations. That state of affairs not only is of concern to the divided nations themselves but also has given rise to serious tensions involving other countries.

95. The delegation of Afghanistan shares the view that the Korean question has already reached a stage which requires a new approach. This new approach presupposes the issue of inviting the representatives of both Koreas with a view to taking part in the debates of the United Nations. By advocating this kind of approach, we merely reaffirm and underline a principle which puts the aspirations of peoples above all other considerations. We firmly believe that the imposition of any solution contrary to the popular will of the divided nations would only lead to a further deterioration of an already grave situation.

96. For the reasons I have just stated, the delegation of Afghanistan will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.467 and Add.1 and 2, which is in keeping with our position.

97. Mr. CERNIK (Czechoslovakia): First of all, may I be permitted to join the delegations who have expressed their deep sorrow over the tragic consequences of the earthquake in Banja Luka, Yugoslavia. I would like to take this opportunity to ask the Yugoslav delegation to transmit to the Government and the people of Yugoslavia our condolences and our deepest sympathy in their hour of sorrow.

98. I should like to express briefly, on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation, our position concerning the question with which our Committee is again confronted, namely the matter of the invitation of representatives of the two parts of Korea to the debate concerning both of them directly and equally.

99. The previous discussions in our Committee concerning Korea have for years been diverted in a direction which we knew in advance could not yield any positive results. After all, has the history of those discussions not sufficiently proved that the reiteration of old positions on the part of

the United States and its allies cannot contribute in the least to a true settlement conducive to a peaceful unification of Korea? Has it not been more than evident from our discussions that the situation in the Korean Peninsula cannot be consolidated until all foreign troops are withdrawn and until the people of Korea itself has the opportunity to decide, with no foreign interference, on the unification of its own country?

100. The Czechoslovak delegation, as a co-sponsor of the proposal directed at the withdrawal of United States and other foreign troops occupying South Korea under the United Nations flag [A/7642 and Add.1-5], as well as of the proposal to dissolve the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea [A/7643 and Add.1-3], will have the opportunity to express its position in principle pertaining to this matter during the discussion concerning the substance of the question.

101. The Czechoslovak delegation considers the present practice under which representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea have been prevented from taking part in such deliberations as ignoble disrespect for our Organization. Year after year the number of delegations which believe that the participation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and statements by its representatives here could greatly contribute to overcoming the existing impasse in the debate on programmes relating to Korea, has been on the rise.

102. In a number of its official declarations, dating even from the time that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea began to be subjected to provocation and aggressive threats from South Korea, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has reaffirmed its readiness to bring about a peaceful unification of Korea on a just and democratic basis. Consequently, the Czechoslovak delegation fully identifies itself with the statements of those delegations which support the position that representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should be invited to take part unconditionally in the discussions in our Committee. This requirement, which is just and in full accordance with the spirit of the Charter, is contained in draft resolution A/C.1/L.467 and Add.1 and 2, submitted by a group of socialist, Asian and African delegations, among them that of Czechoslovakia. Only the adoption of this draft resolution can ensure objective consideration of a programme serving the vital interests of all the Korean people. The General Assembly should finally confirm the principle that any debate on Korea in this Organization should be attended by the representatives of the two parts of the country, and an end should be put once and for all to the unacceptable discrimination against one of the parties directly concerned.

103. It is for these reasons that the Czechoslovak delegation rejects the procedural manoeuvre contained in draft resolution A/C.1/L.469 and Add.1 and 2. That draft is a new attempt to lead our Committee's discussion to a fruitless conclusion, and represents a violation of the principles of the Charter. The Czechoslovak delegation will therefore vote against it.

104. Mr. BITSIOS (Greece) (*translated from French*): May I join the speakers who have preceded me in expressing to

the delegation of Yugoslavia the most profound sympathy of my delegation for the disaster that has befallen its country, a neighbour and a friend of ours. We share in their grief.

105. Once again the question of an invitation to be addressed to Korean representatives is being debated in this Committee in accordance with a ritual practice which we hardly think constructive. The Greek delegation would like, therefore, very briefly to explain its point of view, at the same time reserving its right to speak to the substance of the problem at a later time.

106. Since last year, when we debated this matter at great length, there has been no tangible change in the facts of the problem. We are therefore confronted with the same situation which last year led this Committee to vote in favour of a resolution identical in text to draft resolution A/C.1/L.469 and Add.1 and 2.

107. In the draft resolution of the 14 countries, the sponsors, including Greece, far from denying the merits of a possible participation by a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the discussion of the question now before us, reaffirm once more, in operative paragraph 2, their willingness and indeed their desire to address such an invitation to the authorities of Pyongyang. Of course, this could not and should not be done as long as North Korea obstinately refuses to recognize the competence and authority of our Organization, in the deliberations of which it nevertheless claims to have the right to participate. It is paradoxical indeed to claim that one can come before an international organization and take part in its debates while at the same time announcing very clearly the contempt one feels for its authority and declaring any discussion of the substance of the problem to be illegal.

108. No one should seriously gainsay that, under the Charter, the United Nations not only has the right but also the duty to deal with the serious question of Korea. To claim the contrary would be to deny the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace, and that would mean opposing the need for strengthening international security, which we have been discussing here up to this very afternoon.

109. Therefore, we fail to see how the representatives of Pyongyang could make any positive contribution to our debate as long as their régime persists in following the intransigent and indefensible policy it has chosen.

110. It is indeed surprising that that unqualified defiance of the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly seems to be encouraged by certain delegations. We fail to understand why in other cases we rightly criticize and condemn the refusal of certain countries to respect United Nations resolutions, whereas, when it comes to North Korea, we are asked not only to treat the aggressor and the victim of aggression on the same footing, but even to give a privileged position to the aggressor by according him the right of defying or ignoring, as he sees fit, the authority of our Organization.

111. Such an attitude can only weaken the moral pressure that the United Nations should be able to bring to bear in

order to ensure respect for its decisions and is bound to encourage those who flout its authority.

112. To claim that we are trying to impose conditions for the participation of the North Korean representatives in our debate and adopting a discriminatory attitude is to turn things upside down and to refuse to admit patent truths. What, in fact, we want to avoid is applying a double standard and discriminating against South Korea, which has always and unequivocally recognized the competence and authority of the United Nations.

113. On the other hand, if we were invited to deduce from the contents of the statement of the Foreign Minister of the

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which is to be found in document A/C.1/986, that Pyongyang now accepts the authority and competence of the United Nations, my delegation, wishing to contribute in the most effective way to the solution of this problem, would be the first to welcome an unambiguous statement along those lines on the part of the North Korean authorities.

114. The CHAIRMAN: There are no other speakers on the list for this afternoon. Thirteen speakers have inscribed their names for tomorrow. Therefore there will be two meetings tomorrow.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.

