

August 22, 1973 Letter, Ahmet H. Ozbudun to C.V. Narasimhan, "'Suspension' of Activities of UNCURK?"

Citation:

"Letter, Ahmet H. Ozbudun to C.V. Narasimhan, "'Suspension' of Activities of UNCURK?"", August 22, 1973, Wilson Center Digital Archive, "International incidents and disputes -Korea - correspondence general (603.1)," Executive Office of the Secretary-General, S-0196-0008-08, United Nations Archives and Records Management Section (UN ARMS), New York, NY. Obtained for NKIDP by Charles Kraus. https://wilson-center-digital-archive.dvincitest.com/document/117604

Summary:

Ozbudun sends Narasimhan a letter on "suspension" of activities of UNCURK.

Credits:

This document was made possible with support from Kyungnam University

Original Language:

English

Contents:

Original Scan

103.1

NATION CVN/jem

cc: Mr. Shevchenko

22 August 1973

CONFIDENTIAL - General and you may have reliable interestion on

My dear Ahmet, and analysis of thought a antistication of the second

sources have are unable either to many up to som-I have received your confidential letter of 10 August on the subject of "Suspension" of Activities of UNCURK,

I have taken note of its contents.

Arous of series indications that Yours sincerely, standuition (rather than the "suspension") or truite.

C.V. Narasimhan Chef de Cabinet

Mr. Ahmet H. Ozbudun Principal Secretary Seoul, Korea

Wilson Center Digital Archive

Original Scan

UNITED NATIONS



NATIONS UNIES

UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE UNIFICATION AND REHABILITATION OF KOREA (UNCURK)

CONFIDENTIAL

10 August 1973

"SUSPENSION" OF ACTIVITIES OF UNCURK --- ?---

Dear Mr. Narasimhan,

The Secretary-General and you may have reliable information on recent New-York date-lined reports that the ROK Foreign Minister and UN representatives of four "friendly" countries have agreed <u>inter alia</u> to propose the "<u>temporary suspension</u>" of UNCURK's activities at the forthcoming UNGA. Ministry sources here are unable either to deny or to confirm this, and state that Mr. Kim Yong Shik may prefer to report on the matter verbally upon his return around 17 August rather than by cable now.

If the reports are unfounded, the chances, at this stage, seem in favour of earlier indications that what might be actually sought is the dissolution (rather than the "suspension") of UNCURK.

If, however, the reports on "temporary suspension" are correct, the ramifications would include the following:

(a) Re-thinking on the part of the ROK and consultations among friendly countries have established "temporary suspension" to be infinitely preferable to abrupt dissolution. This is all the more so since the option of dissolution will remain operational in the future.

(b) A suspended UNGURK would still remain as the repository or custodian of the UN principles on Korean unification. Moreover, the political vacuum created as a result of suspension would be relative and not absolute as that resulting from outright dissolution. (However, suspension may, in the final analysis, be a transitory bridge toward dissolution).

(c) The draft resolution proposing "temporary suspension" should indeed define this concept carefully. In the absence of this, Member States may have no alternative but to bind themselves to their individual, and probably most conflicting, interpretations in their explanations before or after the vote. Serious questions and undue controversy as would arise may include (i) the matter of duration of the suspension; and/or (ii) the issue as to how UNCURK would be re-activated, if any, and by whose decision.

Mr. C. V. Narasimhan Chef de Cabinet United Nations - 2 -

It would be one thing to set a definitive date for the resumption of the Commission's activities and entirely another thing to leave the decision for resumption either (i) to UNCUEK members; or (ii) to a call by the ROK; or (iii) the advent of an emergency (who would decide); or (iv) to a vote by the GA. (In the latter case, an affirmative Assembly vote on the matter may be as hard to obtain as the formation of a successor political presence to UNCUEK).

(d) Another difficult matter connected to the foregoing is the very definition of "suspension", and what would happen to UNCURK <u>physically</u> during the period of suspension.

Seemingly subsidiary but vital questions include the following: (i) Would the Commission be <u>totally</u> or <u>partially</u> inactive? (ii) Would its membership <u>remain</u> in the ROK or would it be "temporarily" transferred elsewhere (New York)? (iii) What would happen in the event of serious developments concerning Korea or the Korean question, whether internal or external? (iv) What would happen to the Commission's budget, its assets and its present Headquarters building (rent free and obtained with untold difficulty)? (v) What would happen to its members and its Secretariat (international and local staff) — would the Secretariat be kept, reduced or out off? In reference to (ii), (iv) and (v) above, it is suggested that the <u>status quo</u> be maintained since what is a <u>political</u> question <u>now</u> might adversely and perhaps hopelessly be treated as a <u>financial</u> and <u>administrative</u> matter or be hence "settled" on these and not on pertinent political grounds.

The foregoing naturally remains <u>academic</u> until the confirmation, if any, of the said contingency of "temporary suspension" (on the reported initiative of the ROK and the four "friendly" powers) remains. However, some of the arguments herewith are applicable to the so-called "Algerian item" in the agenda of the twenty-eighth UNGA.

I continue resolutely to believe in the indispensability of a political and military presence of the UN in the form of the UNC, UNUUK, or a substitute political presence for the latter, so long as this Korean Peninsula is practically the only fertile ground on earth now for the inadvertent or premeaitated concoction of a third world war. Moreover, I would venture to retain my conviction that a <u>live</u> rather than a <u>suspended</u> UN presence in Korea is imperative. However, if the issue is bound to be between "suspended animation" and "no political presence at all", I would infinitely prefer the former, for it may literally "buy time" for an operational and realistic <u>quid pro quo</u> for the <u>status quo</u>. This thinking is resolutely shared by an increasing number of observers at this end.

Secretary

With kind regards,