



UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED

A/C.1/PV.1298  
11 December 1962

ENGLISH

Seventeenth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWELVE HUNDRED AND NINETY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Tuesday, 11 December 1962, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. ADEEL

(Sudan)

1. International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space: reports of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the World Meteorological Organization and the International Telecommunication Union; report of the Economic and Social Council, Chapter VII, section IV [27] (continued)
2. The Korean question [28]

Note:

The Official Record of this meeting, i.e. the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.1298. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

62-28801

## AGENDA ITEM 27

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE: REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE, THE WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION AND THE INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION UNION (A/5181, 5229, 5237; A/C.1/879, 880, 881; A/C.1/L.320/Rev.1 and Add.1; REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL, CHAPTER VII, SECTION IV; A/5203) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: We meet this morning to continue consideration of the draft resolution submitted in connexion with agenda item 27, international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space (A/C.1/L.320/Rev.1/Add.1).

Before I call on the first speaker inscribed on my list for this morning, I would like to inform the Committee that the delegation of Nigeria has now become a co-sponsor of this draft resolution, thus bringing the total co-sponsorship to twenty-four delegations.

Miss GUTTERIDGE (United Kingdom): My delegation is glad to be one of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.320/Rev.1/Add.1. We are glad, in particular, that the third operative paragraph of this draft resolution:

"Requests the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to continue urgently its work on the further elaboration of basic legal principles governing the activities of States in the exploration and use of outer space and on liability for space vehicle accidents and on assistance to and return of astronauts and space vehicles and on other legal problems;"

As we said during the general debate on this item on 4 December, we are prepared to consider further the elaboration of basic legal principles governing the activities of States in the exploration and use of outer space. We therefore agree that the four proposals and draft declarations on this matter, referred to in operative paragraph 4 of document A/C.1/L.320/Rev.1/Add.1, should be carefully studied at an appropriate time and place.

Of equal, or perhaps greater importance, at the present time are two matters of practical and immediate concern: the questions of assistance to and return of space vehicles and liability for space vehicle accidents. We are glad to see

(Miss Gutteridge, United Kingdom)

that the draft resolution envisaged in operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of part A that these questions and the proposals already made thereon should also be referred to the Outer Space Committee with a view to their further study and consideration. We believe that, with goodwill and co-operation, substantial progress could be made at an early date on these two questions.

It is about these two questions that I should now like to say a few words.

The question of assistance to and return of space vehicles is by no means academic, and we believe that it is not too early for very careful consideration to be given to the possibility of concluding an international agreement on this matter. The draft agreement on this subject tabled by the Soviet Union and the draft proposal on the same topic tabled by the United States of America, both require, in our view, further study of a constructive nature.

(Miss Gutteridge, United Kingdom)

We think that this would be assisted by comparing these drafts with the provisions of existing international agreements regarding assistance to ships and aircraft.

To illustrate what I have just said, I should like to give one example. We believe it would be both useful and constructive to compare Article 4 of the draft agreement on assistance on return, tabled by the Soviet Union, the provision which relates to the obligation to search for a space vehicle in the case of a descent on the high seas, with Article 25 of the 1944 Chicago Convention and Regulation 15 of Chapter V of the International Convention on the Safety of Life at Sea.

We also consider that it will be necessary, as is contemplated in the draft proposal tabled by the United States, to take into account the possibility that space vehicles may be launched by international organizations as well as by States. These and other questions will need further study and consideration before it is possible to conclude an international agreement regarding assistance to and return of space vehicles. We consider that this study could, with adequate preparation, be usefully carried out by the Legal Sub-Committee of the Outer Space Committee as a first step towards the conclusion of such an agreement.

Similarly, we think that the question of liability for space vehicle accidents is a practical matter on which substantial progress could be made in the legal field. There are a number of questions here which need further consideration by legal experts before any attempt can be made to conclude an agreement on this matter.

To take one example, should liability for space vehicle accidents, in all circumstances, rest on the launching State? To provide this without any exceptions or qualifications might well lead to difficulties. For example, a space vehicle might be launched from a site provided purely on the ground of geographical suitability by a State not otherwise associated with the project; or a communications satellite, for instance, might be owned by an international consortium and launched from the territory of a particular State by an international organization.

(Miss Gutteridge, United Kingdom)

These illustrations serve to show the kind of legal difficulties which may arise, in the context of liability, in the case of joint projects. I do not wish, at this point, to suggest answers to these complicated legal questions. I have mentioned them only to give examples of the legal problems of an immediate and a practical nature, which it would be most useful for the Outer Space Legal Sub-Committee to consider at the next meeting, with a view to affording a satisfactory legal basis for a subsequent international agreement.

The questions of assistance and return, and liability for space vehicle accidents, are not essentially controversial ones. It appears to us that more rapid progress may be made towards their solution than to an extensive development of general legal principles regarding the use and exploration of outer space. The latter task should, of course, also be undertaken. Indeed we think that it might be materially assisted if agreement could soon be reached on the two questions of immediate and practical concern to which I have referred.

Sir Kenneth BAILEY (Australia): The delegation of Australia, as one of the co-sponsors of revision 1 of the draft resolution A/C.1/L.320, calls the attention of the Committee, in particular, to one or two points, in the material added to the resolution in the course of the revision, which relate to the development of international law.

The Australian delegation fully shares the belief, recorded in the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution as revised, that in the interest of friendly relations among nations, the activities of States in the exploration and use of outer space, or for that matter in all other fields, should be carried out in conformity with international law, including the Charter of the United Nations. Indeed, the Australian delegation believes that to establish and maintain and develop the rule of law among nations is one of the basic and essential conditions of friendly relations and co-operation among States, generally, and that the Charter of the United Nations is the fundamental statement of the relevant principles of international law in this field.

The delegation of Australia is in full accord, also, with the view expressed in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution as revised, that the conditions arising out of the activities of States in the exploration and use

(Sir Kenneth Bailey, Australia)

of outer space call for the progressive development of international law in the directions specifically mentioned in that paragraph. These are, first, the further elaboration of basic legal principles; second, the rules relating to liability for space vehicle accidents; and third, the question of regulating the giving of assistance to and the return of astronauts and space vehicles. There will be, no doubt, other legal problems to be considered as well, but the matters expressly listed are fully sufficient to show that there is much useful work of a practical character to be undertaken in the specifically legal field.

The number and scope of the papers on these three topics, which operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution proposes should be referred to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, are sufficient to show that already much constructive work has been done on all of them. They encourage the hope that the results of further work in the legal field will be as productive of agreed practical results as was the work earlier this year in the scientific and technical field.

(Sir Kenneth Bailey, Australia)

The three listed topics are loosely related to the activities of States in outer space, but are logically quite independent of one another. There is no reason at all why work on all three should not be brought to completion during the ensuing inter-sessional period. But no legal difficulty would be created if one or more of these topics proved less susceptible of early agreement than the others. The important thing, in the opinion of the Australian delegation, is to secure agreement wherever, and as soon as, possible. We have the feeling that it might be useful to get the two more limited practical matters out of the way first, because the area of common ground seems here already large.

I associate the delegation of Australia fully with what has just been so well said by the representative of the United Kingdom about the practical importance of these two limited subject matters: the liability for space vehicle accidents, and assistance and return of astronauts and space vehicles.

One of the points specifically mentioned by the representative of the United Kingdom has, indeed, special practical significance to Australia, itself a launching State, providing a site because of considerations of geographic suitability for vehicles belonging to other States and to international organizations. This point was mentioned by the chairman of the Australian delegation at an earlier meeting of the Committee; and I do not wish to repeat it, nor to do more than underline what has been said here a few minutes back by the representative of the United Kingdom.

Turning to the basic legal principles governing the activities of States in the exploration and use of outer space, the Australian delegation thinks that consideration will have to be given at the outset to the juridical form and character of the instrument or instruments which will embody the rules to be formulated. Both in its preamble and in the operative paragraphs in Section A, draft resolution L.320/Rev.1 clearly envisages the formulation of principles or rules of international law, strictly so-called, in all of the three listed topics. But even a superficial examination of the working papers referred, or in some cases referred back, to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, will disclose that, as presently drafted, some of them do, and some do not, possess this character.

(Sir Kenneth Bailey, Australia)

Differences in juridical form and concept are exhibited particularly in the draft instruments containing statements of "basic principles". The Draft Code for International Co-operation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, submitted by the United Arab Republic, for instance, is expressed as a draft resolution for adoption by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, itself, and containing a set of principles by which that Committee -- and I quote: "should be guided in its work". I quote from the report of the Committee, document A/5181, Annex III, page 6.

At the other end of the scale is the Draft Declaration of Basic Principles submitted by the Soviet Union, in the same annex III, page 1. This is drafted as a declaration to be signed by Governments, and open for accession by all States.

The United States working paper, A/C.1/881, circulated this week, falls, in point of juridical form, in between the other two types. It is drafted as a declaration, I think, as for adoption by the General Assembly, commending to States, for their guidance in the exploration and use of outer space, the declaration of principles set out in the paper. This United States text, as the Committee will recall, follows exactly, in that regard, the form adopted last year by the General Assembly on the recommendation of this Committee in the basic resolution 1721 (XVI).

The proposal, that the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space should formulate principles of international law on the three listed matters, leads naturally to some of the questions that have been extensively discussed in the Sixth Committee during the present session of the General Assembly, as to the place that resolutions of the General Assembly have, or can have, in the development of international law. Since the discussion has taken place in the Sixth Committee, and is already on record, there is certainly no need to repeat it here. Divergent views on some aspects have been expressed, but it is, I think, common ground that declarations by the General Assembly are not law-making in the sense that a treaty or a convention is, although a declaration universally adopted and adhered to in practice may be valuable evidence of international custom, and hence a most important source of law.

(Sir Kenneth Bailey, Australia)

The point I make is that general acceptance, both by vote and in practice, is the essential requisite, if a resolution or declaration by the General Assembly is to be valuable in this way as a step in the making of law. This is certainly one of the matters which the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space will have in mind in its work, the effectiveness of which will depend on the area of agreement secured. Very wisely, the Committee has striven, throughout its activities to reach agreement in its work without need for voting.

In concluding, may I illustrate by a single -- and simple, perhaps -- elementary example: the utility, and perhaps the necessity, of the legal work to be done in the field of general principles. Resolution 1721 (XVI) commends to States, for their guidance, two principles which are now very familiar to us all: first, that international law applies to outer space and celestial bodies; second, that outer space and celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all States, and are not subject to national appropriation.

There is complete general understanding as to what is meant here by these two principles. But from the point of view of international law, strictly so-called, the two principles are not altogether consistent. International law has well-known rules permitting, and regulating, the acquisition, by States, of unoccupied territory. But the second principle declares that celestial bodies and outer space are not susceptible of national appropriation. In a document therefore intended to have legal effect, it would be useful if not actually necessary, to tidy up that point, among others -- as, for example, is excellently done in the working paper submitted by the United Kingdom delegation, and circulated as document A/C.1/879.

The delegation of Australia, as its co-sponsorship implies, commends the draft resolution for adoption in its entirety by the Committee.

Mr. SANTOS MUÑOZ (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): Dealing with the question of outer space, specific reference was made to the need for international co-operation in the programmes of scientific and technical activities. The Argentine delegation is whole-heartedly in favour of such co-operation. We have proved this in certain cases, to which I shall refer later. Therefore, we consider it a great forward step that an agreement has been arrived at by the two most advanced countries in this field of activity: the United States and the Soviet Union, in uniting their efforts through co-ordinated launchings of satellites, for drafting maps of the terrestrial magnetic field, and, also, the experiments on space communications.

Draft resolution A/C.1/L.320/Rev.1, originally submitted by the delegation of the United States, and with the addition of part A on legal provisions, has been supported by twenty-three other delegations, and is, in general, accepted by us.

(Mr. Santos Muñoz, Argentina)

I propose to refer to the technical side of this draft resolution, namely parts B, C and D, and more particularly I wish to draw attention to paragraph 5 of part B, which reads: "Notes the recommendation that Member States consider the establishment under United Nations sponsorship of a sounding rocket facility, or facilities, on the geomagnetic equator in time for the International Year of the Quiet Sun;".

The setting up of sounding rocket bases is one of the clearest, most practical and positive aspects of international scientific co-operation in the field of space activities. As everybody knows, these are small rockets that can reach about 200 kilometres in height and are devoted to meteorological studies and surveys. Meteorological investigation and research is of great importance to all countries, and more specifically to countries such as my own, whose economy is directly influenced by atmospheric and climate variations. We are therefore extremely interested in the progress of weather forecasting, both on the short as well as the long range basis. A mistake in weather forecasting or the lack of forecasting can result in the destruction of an entire harvest, and the Committee can well understand the economic as well as the physical impact of this on a country whose exports of agricultural products make up more than 40 per cent of its total exports.

The information gathered with sounding rockets is not only of local interest to the country possessing the launching establishment, but is of practical interest to neighbouring countries, which, to a greater or lesser extent, are subject to the same weather conditions. It might even have a bearing on the life in other countries, since, by the co-ordination of launchings and the sharing of information, complete maps can be drafted of the weather which have a value for the present and which, in the future, may be used as a basis for general long-range forecasting.

Since launching facilities of an international nature might be used by all Members desirous of carrying out experiments, as the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space states, they would open new possibilities to nations wishing to participate in space investigations, they would allow the preparation of studies in this field, and they would allow space research to be carried out by States unable to carry out research programmes with sounding rockets because of economic or technological reasons or because of the conditions of the territory itself, except through international collaboration.

(Mr. Santos Muñoz, Argentina)

Furthermore, States already possessing these installations would be able to carry out scientific investigations for peaceful purposes in other fields. According to the proposal of the Committee, such installations would be planned by a State and the plans would be examined by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. Therefore, only after approval has been obtained and on the basis of a recommendation of the General Assembly would the United Nations sponsor a project. Only then would the host country request the specialized agencies of the Organization to supply assistance for carrying out this task. The host country could then in due course ensure the functioning of the launching facility.

It is in these circumstances that the Government of India expressed its interest in the international establishment of the equatorial rocket launching facilities.

The representative of WMO told us that investigation and research work, especially in the field of meteorology, did not necessarily have to be limited to the work done by the great Powers. All countries in the world should participate in these investigations, and it is the duty of the United Nations to extend financial and technical assistance to help those countries which desire to carry out these tasks, but which, while possessing trained personnel, are financially unable to do so. He said that the benefits accruing to the entire world would be very great as a result of these projects. Therefore, he said, there were wide oceans in the Southern Hemisphere as well as vast regions where meteorological observation was non-existent or very sparse.

My country has already undertaken work in this field within the limits of our financial resources. As the representative of Australia, Sir James Plimsoll, said, his country and my own, both in the Southern Hemisphere, despite the fact that we do not have outstanding technological facilities comparable to those of the great Powers, are nevertheless participating in space research. To this end the Argentine Republic has set up a launching facility in the Grandes Potencias. In co-ordination with the Aeronautical Administration in Washington, we have launched sounding rockets which produce sodium clouds, whose trajectory is able to be followed thanks to radar and photographic equipment. These launchings are co-ordinated with those of other

(Mr. Santos Muñoz, Argentina)

countries, such as the launchings at Wallops Island, the United States; Fort Churchill, Canada; Woomera, Australia; as well as at other places both in the Southern and Northern Hemispheres.

But the pioneering work carried out by our two countries in the Southern Hemisphere is a mere drop in the ocean when we consider the need for meteorological investigation all over the world, which cannot be limited to localized observations at a few points on the globe. To be truly useful, co-ordinated action all over the world is required. I wish to stress the point that the benefits will not be limited to the country from which these launchings take place, but will be extended to other countries far removed geographically. Therefore, United Nations sponsorship should not be limited to the equatorial facilities. So to limit the facilities would not be in accordance with the report of the Committee, document A/5181, which specifically extends the recommendation to the establishment of facilities in the Southern Hemisphere, where there are few launching facilities and where there is great need for them. In this way we would truly carry out international co-operation, with increased scientific effectiveness. To limit the facilities would also be contrary to paragraph 4 of part B of the draft resolution, which is of a wide nature.

The draft resolution recommends that the establishment of these facilities should be carried out in time for the International Year of the Quiet Sun. I want to point out that my own country has already organized its active participation in these programmes, in the same way as we participated in the International Geophysical Year. In order to carry out these programmes, we have set up an Argentine Scientific Committee, in which many public and private institutes will participate.

The position of the Argentine delegation on this matter is not new. At the meeting of the Technical Sub-Committee held in Geneva during May 1962, our representative, Mr. Tabanera, stated the following:

(Mr. Santos Muñoz, Argentina)

"With regard to chapter C of the report of the Sub-Committee, the Argentine delegation considers that the title and text of this chapter do not, from a scientific point of view, imply that the equatorial zone is to be the only one that can be recommended for the launching of sounding rockets. Furthermore, the Argentine delegation considers that neither the text nor the contents of the recommendations is intended to hamper or prevent consideration of any other international installations merely because they are not on geographic or magnetic equators."

(Mr. Santos Muñoz, Argentina)

This clear statement of the engineer Tabanera was fully accepted by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space since, as I pointed out earlier, that report put on an equal footing installations for sounding rockets in the southern hemisphere and in the equatorial zone. For these reasons, the delegation of Argentina has listened with gratification to the clarification given on points 4 and 5 of the draft resolution by the United States delegation yesterday. We were told by Mr. Thacher that these had to be taken into account in the light of the report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, and he added specifically:

"In the opinion of my delegation, nothing in this draft resolution would preclude the establishment of international sounding rocket launching facilities under United Nations sponsorship in other regions such as the southern hemisphere, for which scientific justification may exist."

(A/C.1/PV.1297, p. 52)

We believe that that statement is an accurate interpretation of the scope of this draft resolution on that point.

Thus having given our view on the technical side of the draft resolution before us now, I shall not dwell at length on the legal side of the draft resolution, namely, section A. The reason for this is that I am taking into account not only the lateness of the hour and the debate, but also our profound conviction that in this matter we must go slowly, step by step, including in the draft treaties for recommendations to be adopted by this First Committee only those principles on which there is a general consensus of opinion, and among these only those that have been given almost universal acceptance.

We therefore feel that these are the points that warrant this distinction: first, international law should be applied with the necessary adjustments to outer space and celestial bodies; secondly, outer space should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and under no circumstances for military purposes to the advantage of one State or States; thirdly, celestial bodies cannot be subject to appropriation or conquest by any State; fourthly, the use and exploration of outer space must be opened to all nations and those launching space vehicles or any type of craft to outer space must disseminate the information obtained and give the greatest publicity to all types of launchings or space exploration.



(Mr. Santos Muñoz, Argentina)

Since these principles are an explanation and amplification of those already contained in resolution 1721 (XVI) and since they entirely agree with those contained in document A/C.1/L.320/Rev.1, we wish to state that we are entirely in agreement with section A of this draft resolution.

We do not believe that the time is ripe for new declarations of a fundamental nature on this point. We believe that it would be preferable for all of these draft resolutions and the debates in this First Committee, as well as what comes forth in the form of documents and debates in the General Assembly, to be referred to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, as has already been suggested in this draft resolution that we have studied.

The CHAIRMAN: I have no further speakers on my list to speak on this draft resolution. Before we proceed to take a vote, I should like to ask if any member wishes to speak now.

Mr. ATHAR (Pakistan): I have already spoken my piece generally on this subject. Therefore, I do not wish to speak at any length again except to say that though my country is not a co-sponsor of this draft resolution, I should like to affirm full support for it.

I shall not go into a detailed examination of its inherent merits, which has already been done so well by several other representatives. I shall content myself with the remark that we find its provisions wholly satisfactory. What we find to be a matter of equal satisfaction is the gratifying fact that the two great space Powers are joint participants in this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed to the vote, I should like to invite the representative of the Secretary-General to inform the Committee on the financial implications of the adoption of this draft resolution.

The SECRETARY: In accordance with rule 154 of the rules of procedure regarding the financial implications of draft resolutions before the Committees of the General Assembly, I should like to make the following comments on behalf of the Secretary-General.

Under the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.320/Rev.1, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space is requested to undertake urgently further work.

Since the members of the Committee are representatives of Governments, no payment would be made by the United Nations in regard to travel and subsistence costs, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1075 (XI). Should the meetings of the Committee and its Sub-Committees be held at Headquarters, then the Secretary-General believes that no additional credits would be required for this purpose in 1963.

However, as a matter of information for the members of the First Committee, the Secretary-General wishes to point out that during 1962 the Committee met twice at Headquarters and the two Sub-Committees held their meetings in Geneva. Should the same pattern be followed in 1963, the additional costs that might arise would be, on the basis of the 1962 experience, of the order of \$40,000 to cover the cost of temporary conference servicing staff at Geneva and travel and subsistence costs for Headquarters substantive staff.

The CHAIRMAN: I would now invite the Committee to proceed to the vote on this draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.320/Rev.1 and Add.1. I have no requests for vote by division. I would therefore put the whole draft resolution to the vote.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I declare consideration of this item concluded, I am sure that the Committee would wish me in its name to tender its thanks to the representatives of the specialized agencies, the World Meteorological Organization, the International Telecommunication Union, UNESCO, the World Health Organization and the International Atomic Energy Agency, for their constructive participation in the work of the Committee on this item. I am sure that their reports have been of immense assistance to the members of the Committee in their examination of this item. Consideration of this item by the Committee is now concluded.

AGENDA ITEM 28

THE KOREAN QUESTION: (a) REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE UNIFICATION AND REHABILITATION OF KOREA (A/5213 and Add.1; A/C.1/877, 882, 883; A/C.1/L.321); (b) THE WITHDRAWAL OF FOREIGN TROOPS FROM SOUTH KOREA (A/C.1/869, 877, 882, 883, 884; A/C.1/L.318, L.321).

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to point out that one of the documents mentioned in the Journal, document A/C.1/884, which is a letter dated 10 December 1962 from the permanent representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, enclosing a letter from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and certain documents issued by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, will be distributed to the members of the Committee during the course of the day.

Among the documents, there are also two draft resolutions, contained in documents A/C.1/L.318 and A/C.1/L.321. The first is submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union under item 28 (b), namely, the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea; the other is submitted by the delegation of the United States under item 28 (a) and (b). These draft resolutions relate to the question of invitations to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea to participate in the discussion of the Korean question without the right to vote. It will be recalled that, at its 1284th meeting, the Committee decided that the question of extending invitations should be considered not later than at the beginning of the discussion of the Korean question. In the circumstances, I propose, with the Committee's approval, to ask those members of the Committee who wish to speak on this particular aspect of the question to do so at this stage, after which the Committee will vote on the draft resolutions. I would appeal to members of the Committee to restrict their remarks to the two draft resolutions and to avoid as much as possible a discussion of the substance of the question.

Mr. ALLOTT (United States of America): Today we begin our annual discussion of the Korean question. This issue has been on the agenda of the General Assembly every year since 1947. The United Nations is deeply embedded in the recent history of Korea, and the reverse is also true: the Korean question has deeply affected the history and the development of the United Nations. It was in Korea that Members of the United Nations first acted collectively with military force to fulfil the purposes of the Charter. For nations which look to the United Nations for support and security, the United Nations action in Korea is a promise and a sign. It is difficult to find any similar example in history in which nations from far away undertook, with courage and generosity, an enormous investment in lives and money to defend a small State, a victim of aggression. This deep emotional and historical significance of the Korean question forms the background of our annual debate.

The immediate issue before this Committee is the invitation of Korean representatives to participate in our debate. We hope that this question may be settled promptly and that we can move on to the discussion of the Korean question itself. But we all know that this question of Korean participation goes deep into the heart of the Korean question. It reflects the fundamental positions of all of us on the nature and the facts of the issue.

The Soviet representative has tried to force a quick debate, which he has called merely procedural. Maybe he believed that through such actions and such tactics he could lead the Committee to take an ill-considered decision which it would not take following a thorough consideration of the issues. Korean participation is not a simple matter of procedure, to be decided in a political vacuum.

The first question, of course, is whether Koreans should participate in this debate at all. Here there appears to be no disagreement. The Republic of Korea has been heard in our debates for many years, and the United States and Soviet resolutions assume that at least some participation is desirable. The second question is which Koreans should be heard. All of us who participated in the debates on the Korean question at the fifteenth and sixteenth sessions of the General Assembly will remember the answer given by overwhelming majorities representing nearly all parts of the General Assembly: only Korean spokesmen who accept the competence and the authority of the United Nations to act on the Korean question should be heard. Any other position defies reason. It would be absurd

(Mr. Allott, United States)

to invite as participants in our debate those who reject in advance our right to make whatever decisions may result.

For the past two years, the United Nations has issued invitations to the Republic of Korea and to the North Korean regime, provided that the competence and the authority of the United Nations to act on the Korean question be accepted unequivocally by the North Koreans. On both those occasions, the results have been the same. The Republic of Korea has done everything possible to co-operate with the United Nations, has accepted its decisions faithfully, has supported its work attentively. In contrast, up to the present time the North Korean regime has used every occasion to reject United Nations competence, authority and past decisions. Under these circumstances, to paraphrase our decision of last year, there is no basis for participation by representatives of the North Korean regime. What useful purpose, may I ask, could possibly be served by asking once again the position of a regime which continues to defy our right even to discuss the question? Perhaps the North Korean regime may some day change its attitude and demonstrate its willingness to accept the competence and authority of the United Nations. If representatives of the North Korean regime should change their policy and be willing to co-operate constructively with this Committee and the United Nations, then we could consider the question of participation in a completely different light.

(Mr. Allott, United States)

There is a clear continuity of policy on the part of the North Koreans in their attitude towards the United Nations. The attitude of the North Korean authorities is not significantly different from what it was when the North Koreans were participating in aggression against South Korea and against the United Nations. If we pretended we did not know this, we would be putting our heads in the sand, we would be suggesting that the United Nations and that we, as representatives, are ignorant of what is going on in Korea and are not aware of the official North Korean policy.

Communist frustration of United Nations efforts to assist in a solution of the Korean question dates from 1947, and nothing has happened in the last year which changes that in the slightest.

Let me review the record of the North Korean regime and the United Nations a record which extends right up to the present time. The United States presented the question of Korean independence to the United Nations in September 1947, having been thwarted in direct negotiations with the Soviet Union to bring about the unification of Korea on the basis of the Yalta discussions and the Potsdam Declaration.

After a full debate, the General Assembly adopted a resolution on 14 November 1947 which set forth a fair and reasonable programme for solution of the Korean problem, a solution based upon free elections under United Nations observation, proportional representation and the formation of a national government by the freely elected representatives of a national assembly. It was a programme for real self-determination, following a long period of colonial rule. That programme for reunification has been regularly reaffirmed by the United Nations in its resolutions on the Korean question.

The Soviet occupation forces refused, however, to permit the United Nations Commission even to enter North Korea, and they exercised a complete boycott of the United Nations programme. Nevertheless, a lawful Government of Korea at Seoul was established in accordance with the United Nations programme. Then the Pyongyang regime was established in North Korea. That regime, too, has consistently opposed United Nations efforts to deal with the Korean question. It has opposed not only particular United Nations proposals to deal with the substance of the Korean question, it has challenged the right of the United Nations to deal with the Korean question on any terms except the terms of the North Korean authorities.

(Mr. Allott, United States)

It has challenged not only the solutions proposed by the United Nations, but also the competence and the authority of the United Nations to propose such solutions. It has for fifteen years rejected the competence and authority of the United Nations to act on the Korean question. From 1947 to the present day, it has refused to permit the United Nations Commission even to enter its territory. We wonder what it has to hide.

On 25 June 1950, this regime launched a flagrant military aggression against the Republic of Korea, defied the call of the United Nations to cease this aggression, and fought against United Nations forces which sought to repel them and to restore the peace.

On 3 May 1954, at the Korean political conference in Geneva following the armistice, North Korean representatives rejected even a reference to United Nations discussions on the Korean question which had taken place up to that time. I would add that it remains the position of the North Korean authorities to reject any reference to United Nations decisions or even discussions of the Korean problem which have taken place during the past fifteen years.

On at least nine different occasions since 1959, through its controlled Press and radio or in public statements by spokesmen for the regime, they have denied the right of the United Nations to deal with the Korean question. On 23 October 1962, Premier Kim Il Sung made his regime's position unmistakably clear in a speech before the Third Supreme Peoples' Assembly, saying:

"We consider that the United Nations has no right to discuss the Korean question and it has no right to interfere in the domestic affairs of our country."

As recently as 24 November of this year, North Korea issued a memorandum stating, flatly and categorically:

"The United Nations must no longer interfere in the Korean question. It must take its hands off Korea."

On 8 December, the North Koreans issued a new declaration. Its terms are almost identical with those contained in the North Korean letter of 19 December 1961, in which the North Koreans replied to the qualified invitation of this Committee. That reply was declared by this Committee to provide no basis for North Korean participation. This year, before this Committee could even discuss whether to

(Mr. Allott, United States)

renew this qualified invitation, the North Koreans have sent their reply in almost the same words. Again, it provides no basis for North Korean participation. It asserts once again "that the United Nations has no right to discuss the Korean question".

This position of the North Korean regime is no recent or equivocal position; it is not something that is tactical or sudden. We have not taken texts out of context in a way which changes the position of the North Korean regime. The North Korean regime has shouted its rejection of United Nations action in Korea from the housetops. Right up to the present time, to the present moment, it has missed no opportunity to define, clarify and emphasize its rejection and abuse of the United Nations and the United Nations efforts for fifteen years, fifteen long years, to deal with the problem of Korean division.

The position of the Republic of Korea stands in stark contrast to the defiance and the rejection by the communist regime in the north. Pursuant to the General Assembly resolution of 14 November 1947, the Republic of Korea successfully held elections on 10 May 1948, despite communist efforts to oppose them by violence. The procedure and conduct of these elections were freely observed by the United Nations Commission.

(Mr. Allott, United States)

That Commission made a finding on 25 June 1948, that the results of the ballot of 10 May 1948 are a valid expression of the free will of the electorate in those parts of Korea which were accessible to the Commission and in which the inhabitants constituted approximately two-thirds of the people of Korea. The General Assembly concurred in this finding in its declaration of 12 December 1948, which said that there has been established a lawful Government (The Government of the Republic of Korea) ... and that this is the only such Government in Korea. In passing, it is worth noting that the General Assembly recommended in its resolution of 12 December 1948 that Member States should take this into consideration in establishing their relations with the Government of the Republic of Korea.

The Republic of Korea's co-operation with the United Nations has continued to the present time. As consistently revealed by reports of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK) the Commission has been permitted to travel and observe freely throughout South Korea in carrying out its mandate from the General Assembly. It has agreed to the United Nations programme as a basis for unification of the country and it has consistently accepted the competence and the authority of the United Nations to take action on the question. This particularly is the position of the present Government. On 24 June 1961, Foreign Minister Kim Hong Il said that the Government rejected unification by force and supported past United Nations resolutions on the Korean question, by adhering to the United Nations Charter, and by respecting the competence and authority of the United Nations to take action on the Korean question.

As set forth in the addendum of the UNCURK report of December 1961, Chairman Pak, following talks with President Kennedy on 14 November 1961, said that he reaffirmed his faith in the United Nations and his determination to seek the unification of Korea in freedom through peaceful means under the proposals laid out and reaffirmed by the United Nations General Assembly.

(Mr. Allott, United States)

The latest report of UNCURK, dated 1 September 1962, notes in paragraph 21 that leading figures of the Government have reiterated the Republic of Korea's adherence to the Charter of the United Nations and its respect of the competence and authority of this Organization.

In a fundamental way the Republic of Korea is a child of the United Nations which the United Nations for fifteen years has been trying to assist. Our efforts to solve the greatest handicap which the Korean people face, their separation into two parts, has not yet succeeded; but those efforts go on and the great hope of the Korean people is that the United Nations will succeed. In spite of its enormous handicaps of military attack, subversion from outside, and constant political and propaganda harassment, South Korean Governments since independence have gradually broadened relations with other countries and developed constructive participation in international affairs. Although deprived of membership in the United Nations itself by Soviet veto, the Republic of Korea has been admitted to and is active in many of the United Nations specialized agencies. It was admitted to the Colombo Plan on 16 November 1962. Fifty-one Members of the United Nations have established or agreed to establish diplomatic relations with this Government.

The contrasting records and attitudes of the Republic of Korea and of the communist regime of North Korea speak eloquently for themselves. Yet despite the great differences between the two, the USSR draft resolution seeks to place on the same plane the two Governments and allow each to come before this body to discuss the Korean question -- a question which, I emphasize, the communists deny the right of this Committee and the General Assembly to consider. The Soviet draft resolution asks us to act as if we thought the North Korean Regime and the Republic of Korea would participate in the same manner and to the same ends. It assumes there are no differences in the policies and the history of the two. The draft reads as if this Committee had not already twice stated the conditions for participation in our debate. It ignores the rejection given in advance in the 8 December declaration this year of the North Korean Regime.

The United States has also submitted a draft resolution. It reaffirms in its preambular paragraphs the principles for participation which this Committee has twice before set specifically that the North Korean Regime may participate if it is prepared to accept unequivocally the competence and the authority of the

(Mr. Allott, United States)

United Nations to take action on the Korean question. The Republic of South Korea has already done so many times. The United States draft resolution in its first operative paragraph notes in moderate language -- which if adopted would emphasize the dignified position of the United Nations in the face of North Korean slander -- that the North Korean Regime has twice rejected the competence and authority of the United Nations and maintains such a position at the very present time. In such circumstances we believe it would be undignified and certainly unnecessary to go through the formality of a further invitation to the North Koreans to be followed by a new formal rejection, particularly when the last rejection has occurred in the last three days.

Finally, the United States draft resolution extends an invitation to the Government of Korea to participate in our debate. I believe there will be virtually no objection to such a paragraph. It would be inconceivable for the United Nations not to invite participation by the Republic of Korea.

(Mr. Allott, United States)

In fact, from the full record of North Korean statements, there cannot be the slightest doubt that the regime there does reject the authority and competence of the United Nations. This is so clear that it is not really a question or an issue. But we should ask why the North Korean regime takes that position. The answer, regrettably, lies in its determination, with outside guidance and assistance, to force its own solution to the problem of Korean unity, even against the will of the Korean people themselves. To that end it even instigates one of modern history's most flagrant acts of aggression to unify the country by force. This design, however, has been thwarted by the United Nations. That is why the North Koreans abuse and reject the United Nations efforts to assist in solving the Korean problem. Thus the question of participation by the North Korean regime is not a procedural issue in this debate. It goes to the very heart of the purposes of the United Nations and its effectiveness as an instrument for security and peace throughout the world.

Mr. MOROZOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): First of all, I should like to clarify one point in the discussion up to now. If I understood you correctly, Mr. Chairman, the Committee now has to examine two draft resolutions, one presented by the Soviet Union and the other by the United States, on the question of an invitation to representatives of the Korean people to participate in a discussion on the substance of this matter. As soon as we finish discussion of this and take a decision on these two draft resolutions, we shall begin to discuss the merits and substance of the question. If this was your suggestion, Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with it and I shall abide by that procedure.

What is there to say about the statement that we have just heard from the representative of the United States? It is difficult to say what was dominant in that statement -- a completely blatant misrepresentation of events in the Korean Peninsula, or the desire at any cost to impose the will of the United States on the United Nations during our examination of the question of withdrawal of foreign, particularly American, troops from South Korea. It is difficult to say what part was more outstanding in that statement, but both these objectives were clearly present.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

Later I shall return to the obvious misrepresentation of the factual situation which was evident in the statement of the United States representative. I should like now to draw the attention of the Committee to the main problem which we have to solve in a businesslike way as we begin discussion of this matter.

In the first place, I would draw the Committee's attention to the draft resolution tabled by the delegation of the Soviet Union (A/C.1/L.318). The Committee has this draft resolution before it. We propose to recognize that the discussion of the question concerning the peaceful settlement in Korea without representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea cannot be fruitful, and we ask the Committee to decide to invite representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea to participate without vote in the discussion of this question. If one compares this text which I have just mentioned with the unlimited torrent of lies and slander against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which we have just heard from the representative of the United States, and with the draft resolution tabled by the United States (A/C.1/L.321), it will be seen, if one remains calm and objective, that the proposal of the Soviet Union is dictated by the actual situation in the Korean Peninsula, that its proposal is not motivated by any political sympathies or enmities.

This is quite different from the approach adopted, unfortunately, for many years by the United States, and which it tries to impose on the United Nations. The United States would like to have the whole discussion take place here, in the first place, the question of an invitation to representatives of both parts of Korea, North and South. It would like to solve that problem on the basis of its political sympathies or positions. The United States has little regard for the Charter of the United Nations, for political objectivity and for the creation of the necessary conditions for examining the question of the end of foreign occupation in South Korea. All that we heard this morning was dictated by political considerations and nothing else.

But the delegation of the Soviet Union, which of course had a different attitude towards the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the regime of the so-called Korean Republic -- and this attitude is no secret -- proposes that this question be solved in a realistic manner, taking existing facts into account, facts which neither the delegation of the United States nor

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

any other can eradicate, change or modify, whatever they may think of the situation or of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The representative of the United States tried several times to contrast the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the regime of the so-called Republic of Korea. Of course, he saw a deficit in the balance sheet for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and a big advantage for the regime of the so-called Republic of Korea. That is his business. When we start to discuss the matter in substance we shall show that contrast. We shall show how the truly popular authority and government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea flourishes and prospers, and how, under the yoke of foreign occupation, the population of South Korea pines away. We shall show that the only reason why no peaceful unification of Korea has been possible up to now is the presence of foreign troops, the presence of United States bayonets, in the southern part of the Korean Peninsula. Let us not prejudge matters now and develop this theme because it would be unjustified since we are now dealing with the prejudicial question which we have to solve, the question of the invitation to be addressed to representatives of the Korean people to participate in the discussion of this problem.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

But let us come back to the first argument I presented. I do not think anyone here will believe that because I sit here now as representative of the Soviet Union I praise the Soviet draft resolution as against the position taken by the United States. We have no sympathy for puppets who, behind the protection of United States bayonets, call themselves the Government of the Republic of Korea and we are sure that these puppets will in due time meet the fate of all those who, with the help of foreign bayonets, try to betray and sell out their own people.

But, accepting the fact of the existence of this regime, and even though it is a puppet regime, we propose to invite also the representatives of the regime of the so-called Republic of Korea because we want to have an objective discussion of the matter, a discussion where both sides are heard, even though in our view one of the sides has no right to be represented here. As for who should not be represented here, it is the military fascist clique which wrecked even the pseudo-regime with its so-called democratic laws, a regime which of course never existed in South Korea in the days of Syngman Rhee but which at least was formally recognized before the fascist coup d'état and the establishment of the fascist military dictatorship which wiped out even the formal semblance of any rule of law that might have existed in South Korea. These are the people who should not be heard because they do not represent the Korean people.

I make this comment because I wish to bring out with all clarity the fact that despite our own political sympathies and antipathies, despite the fact that we are the friends of the regime truly representing the Korean people, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, we nevertheless find in ourselves the strength which the delegation of the United States unfortunately will not find, the strength to invite the representatives of both parts of Korea to participate without vote in the discussion of this question. That is the first difference between our position and the position once again taken by the delegation of the United States. We support our proposal and we appeal to all delegations capable of judging and coming to their own conclusions without being influenced by membership in any military or political blocs headed by the United States. We appeal to all those who have not lost the ability to make



(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

their own decisions and base them on their own conclusions, to understand us when we say that participation by the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in discussion on the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea is most important. This situation has been serious for a long time and has become truly urgent. A positive solution thereof will greatly contribute to the reduction of international tensions and the strengthening of peace not only in the Far East but throughout the world. A successful solution of this problem would facilitate real re-unification of the Korean people on a democratic basis.

We have already had occasion to tell this Committee how South Korea has been transformed by its occupiers into a military and strategic base with many military installations, including nuclear and rocket bases for intermediate-range rockets. All this has been done in violation of the 1953 Armistice Agreement providing for negotiations for the withdrawal from Korea of all foreign military forces, hence the withdrawal of these foreign forces. The military installations are in direct proximity to the frontiers of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the Chinese People's Republic and the Soviet Union. We see there a dangerous concentration of international tensions constantly being exacerbated by the policies of the United States, principally the transformation of South Korea into an American military base.

Once again we wish to recall that the occupation by foreign troops of South Korea constitutes the main obstacle to the solution of the problem of the peaceful unification of Korea. If there had been no foreign troops there, the people of Korea would long since have been able to solve their internal problems. For this reason we must at long last hear the legitimate demand of the Korean people for the withdrawal of the foreign troops and an end to foreign intervention in the internal affairs of their country. In this connexion I would point out that all foreign troops were long ago withdrawn from North Korea, from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Units of the Chinese People's Volunteers were withdrawn from that country in November 1958. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea -- and this is, of course, something which the representative of the United States did not mention -- solemnly proclaimed, and

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

still proclaims, that it has and can have no aggressive designs against anyone who does not aim to solve by force of arms the question of the unification of the country, and that under no circumstances will it resort to force if force is not used against it. Who, under these circumstances, would want to become suspect of blindly and mechanically following the lead of the United States in this matter in its policy so completely inconsistent with the United Nations Charter? Who, under these circumstances, could claim that an invitation addressed to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to participate without vote in the discussion of the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea, would debase the authority and damage the prestige of this Organization? On the contrary, it is only those who are prepared to follow blindly the dangerous and reckless policy of the United States, who can share the views expressed in the draft resolution submitted by the United States, a proposal to invite only the representatives of the regime of the so-called Republic of Korea. Only those who want to see the flag of the United Nations continue to be used by the United States of America to cover up its aggressive designs against the Korean people and in the Far East generally, will vote in favour of a document of that kind.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

It goes without saying that we shall vote against the draft resolution tabled by the United States. It is a completely unacceptable draft resolution. It is dictated by a desire to perpetuate the occupation of South Korea by American troops. This draft resolution supports a policy that would fan the flames of this most dangerous, hotbed, this area of tension, in the Far East, and would threaten international peace and security.

The third remark which I wanted -- indeed, am compelled -- to make is caused by an incredible misrepresentation of important historical events, and the position of the Soviet Union and the government of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea with regard to aspects of the problem inscribed on our Agenda: the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea.

This is not the first time, it must be the twelfth or the fifteenth time, I do not know exactly, I have not the patience to count, and the number does not really matter. The delegation of the United States endeavours to impose on the world its own interpretation of events which occurred in the Korean peninsula, when units of the army of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea were attacked from the South and when events started which gave rise to a military conflict which in turn led to an armistice. Again and again we hear this thesis which was advanced by John Foster Dulles and his aides concerning these events. Again and again, we are told that the foreign occupation of South Korea is the business of the United Nations whose flag -- to the shame and dishonour of our Organization -- is still used by the occupiers who have complete freedom of action on the soil of South Korea to the prejudice of the interests of its people.

Allow me to quote some American sources, and I think that they will be recognized as trustworthy and authoritative even by the present representatives of the United States participating in the discussion of this problem. It is well known that the resolutions on the Korean question, imposed on the United Nations by the United States, had as their only goal the justifying of the aggressive policies of the military cliques of the United States and South Korea. It is no secret to anyone that it is the United States who, in 1950, started a military occupation in South Korea before the adoption of any resolution by the United Nations.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

I said that I would have sufficiently authoritative American witnesses for this argument and that is what I shall present. This fact was recognized in an open meeting in the Senate of the United States in 1951 by the former Supreme Commander of the United States Forces in Korea, General Douglas MacArthur.

He said:

"The American army started to operate twelve hours before the adoption of a resolution by the United Nations."

He also said:

"My relations with the United Nations were purely nominal. All that I did was fully controlled by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Even my routine reports had to go through the censorship of the State Department and the Pentagon."

Briefly speaking:

"I had no relations with the United Nations of any kind. All my correspondence was prepared by the Command of the American Army in Washington."

What is the representative of the United States going to say now? Is he still going to say that the occupation by American troops is done in the name and under the flag of the United Nations? Although since that statement was made over ten years have elapsed, has anything changed in the way things are organized and directed in the so-called operations of the United Nations in Korea as compared to what General MacArthur described quite clearly? If one were to compare that operation with the operation of United Nations forces in other parts of the world, does the structure, the machinery, have anything to do with what the Charter provides for when it speaks of the use of armed forces on the instructions of the United Nations?

The war in Korea was launched by the United States before the United Nations had time, even in a completely illegal manner without the participation of one of the permanent Members of the Security Council, to give its views. Even in this illegal manner, even before the resolution was adopted, the war had already been started. It continued and it was waged with the responsibility and the means of the United States. It was directed by the United States. It was transformed into a military occupation in South Korea which is still financed,

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

politically inspired and administered exclusively by the Government of the United States.

This is why we understand the reservations contained in the speech of the representative of the United States when speaking of the competence of the United Nations in Korea and three times, instead of speaking of the competence of the United Nations, he spoke of the competence of the United States of America. Of course we do not wish to quibble. We do not say, to be sure, that this is exactly what appears in the verbatim record. This is, of course, a slip of the tongue, but it is correct. This reservation, which occurred three times in the speech of the United States representative, is quite easy to understand. It was simple to make. This will shed all necessary light on the last point I want to stress.

That is the competence of the United Nations in the so-called Korean question. In this respect I would like to recall what was said by the head of the Government of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea, Kim Il-sung, in his speech on 23 October 1962 at the first session of the Supreme Peoples Assembly of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea:

"We consider the United Nations Organization has no right to examine the Korean question and has no right to interfere in the internal affairs of our country. The Korean question must be discussed by the Koreans themselves in Pyong-yang or in Soeul and not by foreigners in New York or Washington.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

"The question of the unification of Korea is an internal problem of the Korean people and can be solved only by the Koreans themselves. What grounds can there be," Kim Il Sung said, "for other countries to interfere in the internal affairs of Korea? Can they solve our internal, national matters? To hope that a country can be unified on the basis of foreign forces is a forlorn dream and this is the task of imperialistic forces. The Korean people is fully able to unify the country with its own forces and it must unify it."

When we are told now that the legitimate reservations and objections of the Government of the DPRK, which represent the aspirations and desires of the whole Korean people in the North and in the South, must be considered as an argument on the basis of which you should supposedly reject the resolution tabled by the Soviet Union, we affirm that this argument is completely groundless. We propose, in our draft resolution, to invite representatives of the DPRK and the so-called Republic of Korea in a discussion of the question of the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea, a question which, if it were solved, would liquidate a hotbed of dangerous tensions in the Far East. We are convinced that the delegations who are for the strengthening of peace and freedom will support the need to withdraw foreign troops from South Korea. Such a solution would lead to an improvement in the internal climate and the creation of conditions under which the Korean people would be able to solve by peaceful means and without any foreign interference, the question of the unification of Korea. This is why all argumentation used by the delegate of the United States misses its goal everywhere, especially when he speaks of the statements made by the Government of the Korean Democratic People's Republic denying the competence of the United Nations.

Yes, the Government of the DPRK, the Government of the Soviet Union, and the Governments of the many peace-loving and neutralist States reject the right of the United States to interfere in the internal affairs of any country, including the internal affairs of the Korean people. The Government of the DPRK, as can be seen from documents which were just distributed in this Committee, and the Government of the Soviet Union considers that no one State, whatever its power, is entitled to interfere in the internal affairs of any other State merely because it has the power to do so, or on any other ground.

(Mr. Morozov, USSR)

This interference in the internal affairs of other countries, when it takes on the guise of foreign occupation, is especially intolerable and violates the Charter of our Organization and, of course, in this light the United Nations has no competence and it cannot tolerate interference in the internal affairs of any country. It would suffice to peruse the first Articles of the Charter to see that this is not a Soviet invention. It is one of the fundamental principles of the Charter without which the United Nations and its activities would be deprived of any sense. It would be easy for you to find it in the Charter. It prohibits intervention by the United Nations in the internal affairs of any country and if a puppet regime, which you created, which you fed and watered, agrees to any actions which you wish to take, this is the affair of the traitors to the Korean people who represent that regime.

Not one single self-respecting State, large or small, can condone interference in its internal affairs, can tolerate that you decide the question of the reunification of a country rent asunder through some historic events that were decided behind its back by foreigners, not in the capital of the given State, not on the soil of Korea but in the offices of the State Department, the Pentagon or the Government circles of the United States. Nobody has given you that right and you will never succeed in falsifying history and stating that it isn't you who abuse the flag of the United Nations, in your own selfish interest. But has the United Nations, in actual fact, made any decisions that have any force in law? There has never been any such decision by the United Nations.

Thus, all the arguments presented by you in the matter of competence are groundless. They would only serve, like many other efforts made by you in recent years of foreign occupation, to try to create a semblance of the United Nations having blessed and supported your actions. This is why there is no contradiction between the invitation which we propose in our draft resolution and the statements on the so-called competence of the United Nations to solve the Korean question mentioned by the representative of the United States in his speech. We continue to expect that the delegations of the independent countries represented here, always interested in the maintenance of international peace and security, will support the draft resolution of the Soviet Union, document A/C.1/L.318, and reject as completely unacceptable the draft resolution of the United States, document A/C.1/L.521.

The CHAIRMAN: I recognize the representative of the United States in exercise of his right of reply.

Mr. ALLCOTT (United States of America): I would like to reply briefly to the statement of the Soviet representative in this Committee, in answer to some statements he made.

First of all, if I understood the words of the interpreter correctly -- and I am sure I did -- in connexion with his reference to the "blatant" attempt of the United States to misrepresent the events of Korea, I must reply to, and reject wholeheartedly and completely, as representative of the United States, the outrageous statement made about -- and I am quoting the words of the interpreter -- the "limitless supply of lies and slander by the United States".

Not only as a representative in this United Nations Assembly, but as a United States Senator, I must reject this in whole and completely, and say that all of the references in my statement are documented, word-for-word, by documents that are available to anyone here.

The Soviet Union has raised many, many issues. They began by saying that they were going to confine themselves, "unlike the United States", to the issues upon the two resolutions which are before this Committee. But it did not take but a few moments before we were out on an excursion into all sorts of alleged facts, which, of course, has been the Soviet position from the first.

The Soviet representative has even stated that the South Korean Government, the Republic of South Korea, attacked North Korea. As far as I know, that view of history has been completely rejected by every one outside of the Soviet group, and who has had anything to do with, or any knowledge of, the Korean question.

But let us talk for just one moment about the real issue here, and that is whether the North Koreans have established a basis for participation in the debate. I notice that the Soviet representative was very careful to avoid the basic thesis and the central theme of the United States statement, which is that the North Koreans have completely rejected, again and again, the right of the United Nations, not only to come into the Korean question, but have even rejected the right of the United Nations General Assembly or its Committees to discuss it. It seems to me, as a plain, sensible, common, ordinary man, that what the Soviet representative is

(Mr. Allott, United States)

proposing here, and what the Soviet resolution does, is to permit a party to come into a discussion by which it is not going to be bound, and which it does not admit we have the right to discuss. It is analogous and similar to the situation of permitting a party to come in to a law-suit and participate in it, when he has said beforehand that the Court has no way of binding him upon the judgement or decree of the Court.

The Soviet representative agrees that the North Koreans reject the right of the United Nations to discuss the question of unification, and he has talked about slips-of-tongue. But I notice that he also slipped, because, twice in his statement, he quoted words directly out of the Pyong-yang statement made on 24 November 1962, a full text of which is available here, in which he talked about the abuse of the United Nations Flag, and in which, of course, he also talked about the "imperialist United States aggressors". The Soviet representative agrees that the Koreans rejected the right of the United Nations; so what purpose is served by bringing the North Koreans in here? Twice we have set up the basis of participation by the North Koreans, and they have not only rejected it through the years: they rejected it in their long statement, their memorandum of 24 November of this year; they have rejected it within the last three days. Therefore, there can be no useful purpose in bringing them in, since they, and they alone, are the ones who flaunt the efforts of those sitting in this Committee, as well as of the nations who participate in the United Nations to try to bring about resolution of this long and troublesome problem.

I shall defer, and reserve the right to reply to the specific matters mentioned by the Soviet representative, at a later date in this discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: In view of the lateness of the hour, I understand that the representative of China would not mind speaking this afternoon.

May I request Members who wish to participate in the debate on these draft resolutions so to indicate at the beginning of our meeting this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

United N  
GENI  
ASSE

SEVENTEEN

Official Rec

Agenda item  
International  
of outer  
the Peace  
Meteor  
national  
ued)  
General  
Consider

Chairman

International  
space: rep  
Outer Space  
the Intern  
5203, chap  
A/C.1/880  
Add.1) (ca

G

1. Mr. TH  
General As  
the peacefu  
not the ex  
which led  
were equal  
as they we  
such as hi  
different sc  
countries.  
courage  
statement ;  
with limite  
of space. I  
was stress  
mittee, and  
bate. But ir  
for technic  
an alternat  
first steps  
taken by ne  
natural for  
ments. But  
by cold wa  
military ac  
closely rel  
complete d  
nature of t  
between the  
fine itself