



Skýrsla: First Committee 29. January, 1951.

Bjarni Benediktsson – Stjórnámál – Utanríkisráðherra – Utanríkismál – Sameinuðu Þjóðirnar – First Committee – Alþjóðasamstarf - 1951

Tekið af vef Borgarskjalasafnsins

bjarnibenediktsson.is

Einkaskjalasafn nr. 360
Stjórnámálamaðurinn
Askja 2-12, Örk 2

©Borgarskjalasafn Reykjavíkur

Mr. Chairman: *activities in this endeavour are not the fault*

The United Nations can always, in every problem that confronts it and in every difficulty it has to face, seek firm, secure and unfailing guidance in one source. That is the Charter of the United Nations, which was created in the idealistic atmosphere that prevailed at San Francisco. In the Charter there are embodied the ideals that gave birth to the United Nations Organization and the principles that should guide it. *Let us first bear in mind that the problem of the*

importance of In Article 1 we find the purposes of the United Nations and in paragraph 1 it states that they are, I quote:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

an armed attack From the very day that the world was stirred by the brutal and reckless invasion by the armed forces from North Korea into the territory of the Republic of Korea and to the present moment, the United Nations has been earnestly taking effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of this threat to the peace and for the suppression of this act of aggression and has been patiently endeavouring to bring about by peaceful means adjustment of this internationally dangerous situation.

The adversities in this endeavour are not the fault of the responsible majority of the United Nations, which has but one desire -- to achieve peace by honorable means.

For almost eight weeks the Political and Security Committee has been most gravely seized with this problem and although the discussions have been very extensive, allow me, Mr. Chairman, to outline briefly what have been the endeavours of the United Nations and what actions have been taken.

Let us first bear in mind that the problem of the independence of Korea was before the General Assembly in 1947, 1948 and again in 1949, and in all these years, the General Assembly adopted resolutions, the essential objective of each being the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic Government of Korea.

In accordance with these resolutions and under the auspices and protection of the United Nations, there was established a lawful Government of the Republic of Korea which had effective control and jurisdiction over the southern part of Korea up to the 38th parallel.

On June 25, 1950, the Security Council resolved that an armed attack upon the Republic of Korea had been made by forces from North Korea. The Security Council simultaneously called for the immediate cessation of hostilities and for the withdrawal forthwith of the armed forces of North Korea from the territory of the Republic of Korea.

When this was ignored, the Security Council two days later, without hesitation and by an overwhelming majority, condemned the aggression of the North Koreans and called upon all

members of the United Nations to assist the Republic of Korea to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area.

This decision of the Security Council was subsequently approved by 53 nations, most of which in one form or other gave assistance to the Republic of Korea.

It is interesting to note that India, whose wise counsel is so much appreciated in the United Nations, strongly and wholeheartedly supported these resolutions and the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, shortly afterwards stated to the Press as follows, I quote: "If aggression was allowed to proceed then the structure of the United Nations inevitably collapsed and a large scale war resulted. The Security Council had no alternative but to declare North Korea the aggressor and subsequently call upon the members of the United Nations to meet this armed attack and restore international peace."

At that time all the free world felt relief and confidence in the strength of the United Nations. For the first time a world organization had taken legal and collective action to repel aggression and to maintain peace.

So strongly and thoroughly had the attack of the North Koreans been prepared that at one time there was imminent danger that they would overrun the whole territory of the Republic of Korea. But the United Nations forces gradually came to the rescue of the South Korean army and when men and material had been assembled, the aggressors were driven into their own territory.

The fortunes of war had turned in favour of the United Nations when the General Assembly in the beginning of last October,

again by an overwhelming majority with only the Russian bloc opposing, re-affirmed the resolutions of the Security Council and resolved that all appropriate steps be taken to ensure conditions of stability throughout Korea and that all constituent acts be taken including the holding of elections under the auspices of the United Nations for the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government in the sovereign state of Korea. The General Assembly further decided that the United Nations forces should only remain in Korea for the purpose of achieving the above objectives and that furthermore all necessary measures should be taken to accomplish economic rehabilitation in the whole of Korea.

It was after the General Assembly re-affirmed the unity of the free world in regard to Korea that a new situation arose in that country, when in November last hundreds of thousands of armed forces from China invaded Korea and intervened in the war. So well had this aggression been prepared and so numerous were the armies from Communist China that the United Nations forces were driven back into the territory of the Republic of Korea to the points from where they had advanced months before.

It has been said that from the moment of the Chinese aggression, there was a new war in Korea and a new foe with which the United Nations were engaged. Despite this fact and in the face of this blatant attack on the people of the Republic of Korea and the United Nations itself, the United Nations has taken an attitude of patience and conciliation towards this strong and frightful aggressor. It may be said that in doing so the United

Nations has been faithful to its pledge to bring about peaceful solution of an international conflict. It is more doubtful if the United Nations has done everything in its power for the suppression of this act of aggression as stated in Article 1, first chapter, of our Charter.

Therefore, one hears voices loudly asking if there is one rule for a small aggressor and another for a big one.

Since the 14th of December, when the General Assembly adopted a resolution appointing a Cease Fire Committee of three of its most outstanding and respected members, the President of the Assembly, Ambassador Entezam of Iran, Mr. L. B. Pearson, the Minister of External Affairs of Canada, and Sir Benegal Rau of India, the United Nations has three times approached the Chinese communist regime and always been rebuffed. The replies from Peking have been arrogant and defiant. The representative of the Communist regime, whom the Cease Fire Committee contacted immediately on their appointment, was not allowed to communicate with them and was hurriedly recalled to Peking.

The Chinese communist regime branded the Cease Fire Committee as illegal and likened its conciliatory proposals and endeavours to a trap and an old trick.

The third approach for conciliation, which this Committee approved by 50 votes against 5 Soviet votes, was rejected. This communication enumerated five principles for the achievement by stages of a program for a cease-fire in Korea, for the establishment of a free and unified Korea and for a peaceful settlement of Far Eastern problems.

The Peking regime was invited to stop shooting and start negotiating. This they refused and offered to negotiate provided they could decide which countries should sit in at the negotiations, which should take place in China and meanwhile the shooting should continue. Some Delegations, however, have maintained that the Chinese reply needs further elucidation and amplification and therefore negotiations should take place.

We feel that it is of the utmost importance that further talks take place but only in such a manner as is consistent with the prestige and authority of the United Nations.

The discussions of this problem have now lasted more than six weeks in this Committee and we have reached the point where each Delegation will have to take its stand. It is clear to all of us that our decision in this matter is of vital importance for the future of the United Nations and can be of paramount consequence in the present world situation.

There are at present two draft resolutions before the Committee. One from the United States of America, Document A/C.1/654. This resolution has already been sponsored by a great number of countries.

In paragraph 2 it is noted that the Peking Government has rejected United Nations' proposals to bring about cessation of hostilities in Korea with a view to peaceful settlement and that its armed forces continue their invasion of Korea and their large scale attacks upon the United Nations' forces there.

Accordingly, it is found in paragraph 3, I quote: "The Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China by giving direct aid and assistance to those who were already committing

aggression in Korea and by engaging in hostilities against United Nations forces there has itself engaged in aggression in Korea."

When hundreds of thousands of Chinese soldiers, fully equipped with planes, tanks and all modern military equipment are fighting in Korea--and furthermore, when considering the attitude of the Peking Government towards the United Nations--how can we possibly avoid the conclusion that the Chinese Government is engaged in aggression in Korea. It is mere mockery of the United Nations and the world in general, in these times of utmost gravity, to tell us that the Chinese fighting in Korea are merely volunteers who happened to take a stroll across the border. One could even ask why then they are not simply called tourists.

The United Nations did not hesitate to accuse the North Koreans of aggression. They were, however, fighting within their own country while the Chinese invaded foreign territory and are fighting on foreign soil and are killing the sons of member nations of the United Nations.

It is the plain duty of the United Nations to state facts and it is the regrettable fact that the Chinese are engaged in aggression in Korea. It has been said by some Delegations that this statement of truth may offend the delicate feelings of the Government in Peking and thus incite them to increase their aggression and refuse to negotiate with the evil minded United Nations. May I ask, is it the privilege of the Peking regime to brand the United Nations as aggressors and in particular the United States of America, who are defending the very life of the United Nations

with the blood of their sons and the fortunes of their people day by day and thus giving comfort to the people of Korea and people of all other small nations by proving for the first time in history that the ideal of collective security is not a mere phrase but a reality today.

This resolution further calls upon the Peking Government to cause its forces and nationals in Korea to cease hostilities against the United Nations' forces and to withdraw from Korea. Furthermore, it confirms the determination of the United Nations to continue its action in Korea to meet the aggression and calls upon all states and authorities to continue to lend every assistance to the United Nations' action in Korea. It also calls upon all states and authorities to refrain from giving any assistance to the aggressors in Korea.

Paragraph 8 requests a Committee composed of the members of the Collective Measures Committee as a matter of urgency to consider additional measures to be employed to meet this aggression and to report thereon to the General Assembly.

It is clear that an Ad Hoc Committee is to be appointed to consider measures to meet this aggression. I wish to stress that the Committee is only authorized to consider measures of this nature and must report thereon to the General Assembly. It is therefore obvious that the General Assembly will decide if and when any punitive measures should be taken and no country is committed to any measures proposed by the Committee. The General Assembly will decide on same and each country has then and there the right to decide its stand in connection with any such measures. It should

therefore be clearly borne in mind that we are not deciding now on any sanctions. We are only initiating consideration of the advisability of imposing punitive measures at a later stage. This paragraph therefore is for the sake of security and no results of the considerations there suggested will be presented to the General Assembly so long as there is any hope of a peaceful settlement in Korea. The distinguished Delegate from Lebanon has proposed an amendment which clarifies this paragraph and we will vote for that.

The last paragraph confirms that it continues to be the policy of the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea and the achievement of United Nations' objectives in Korea by peaceful means and requests the President of the General Assembly to designate forthwith two persons who would meet with him at any suitable opportunity to use their good offices to this Committee and the principles of the Charter, this end.

This last paragraph once again signifies the outstretched hand of the United Nations for a peaceful honourable settlement. The Committee of Good Offices which is proposed here and which I have no doubt will be composed of some of our wisest and ablest members can immediately assume its duties and it should be known to the Peking regime that these representatives are willing to meet and negotiate with them on the basis of the principles of the United Nations' charter.

We are here establishing a new organ for conciliation and peace, which proves that despite repeated disappointment the United Nations still hopes for peace and considers the door open. The United Nations came to Korea for peace and stays there only for peace.

The other resolution now before us is Resolution A/C.1/642 Revision 1, sponsored by 12 Asiatic and Arab countries. This draft resolution recommends that representatives of the seven Governments suggested by the Peking Government should meet as soon as possible for the purpose of securing all necessary elucidations and amplifications of the reply of the Peking Government to the principles for peaceful settlement as approved by this Committee and of making any incidental or consequential arrangements towards a peaceful settlement of the Korean and other Far Eastern problems.

This resolution originally abandoned this Committee's attitude that a cease-fire in Korea must come first and any negotiations afterwards. It has now been changed to include a clause about cease-fire. It however ignores the other principles approved by this Committee and the principles of the Charter, and is, therefore, in our opinion, unacceptable.

In accordance with these considerations and facts, the Icelandic Delegation will vote for the draft resolution proposed by the United States of America. In doing so, we bear in mind and give due consideration to the following:

There are only at this fateful hour two alternatives: The United Nations must stand firm or fail. There seems little doubt that the North Korean invasion into South Korea originated, was instigated and has been supported by international communism in its thirst for world domination. The Chinese aggression also seems another aspect of the perilous scheme of international communistic expansion, with which humanity is confronted and which throws gloom and fear into the national life of every nation, particularly of the small ones which cannot defend themselves.

We all know now that if the United Nations had not interfered in Korea, there would today be a communistic puppet regime in Korea in control of the whole country. If Korea should fall into the hands of the Communists, what would be the fate of Indo-China, Thailand, Burma, Malaya, even Indonesia and the Philippines, and we could go further. Isn't it possible that there might be a heavy knock at the door of India? India can be reached from other directions than from Tibet, which the Communists now have subjugated.

My people have the greatest sympathy for the peoples of Asia although we live far apart and are little known to each other. We feel that Korea should be for the Koreans, Tibet for the Tibetans and China for the Chinese. Asia for the Asiatics but not for the Russians.

Somewhere the fanatical scheme of communistic expansion must be halted. Only strength and unity of the free world can stop it. The whole world is in danger. Today it is Korea. Tomorrow it might be Iran, or Yugoslavia, or Western Germany, or Norway, Sweden, or even Iceland. Collective security is our only hope. That the United Nations must give us. At the time of the commencement of the Korean war, the United Nations was a weak and sick body. The United States, more than any other nation, have invigorated the United Nations and given it new strength. They have in fact become the blood donors to that weak body. The prestige and authority of the United Nations was revived and enhanced and today it means more to all the world than it ever did before. Let us hope the nations of the world will not be disappointed. Let us hope that lives are not being lost in Korea in vain.

We know now that World War II could have been stopped if there had been a united free world in 1938-1939. We believe and pray that with firmness and strength and unwavering adherence to and enforcement of its principles the United Nations will succeed in averting World War III and in creating a peaceful community of free nations.

In Article 1 we find the purposes of the United Nations to be: to maintain international peace and security, to prevent the outbreak of war, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, a settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

From the time that the world was stirred by the Soviet invasion of Poland and the German invasion of Czechoslovakia into the territory of the Republic of Poland and to the present moment, the United Nations has been endeavoring to bring about effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of this threat to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression and has been actively engaged in the peaceful means adjustment of these international disputes.