

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



1938th
PLENARY MEETING

Friday, 24 September 1971,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Address by Mr. Moktar Ould Daddah, President of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania	1
Agenda item 8:	
Adoption of the agenda (<i>continued</i>)	
First report of the General Committee	6

President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).

Address by Mr. Moktar Ould Daddah, President of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania

1. The PRESIDENT: I invite His Excellency Mr. Moktar Ould Daddah to be good enough to address the General Assembly.

2. Mr. OULD DADDAH (President of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, my first words will be to address to you, in the name of Africa, very sincere and cordial congratulations on your impressive election to the presidency of the twenty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

3. For the third time and at the third consecutive session of this Assembly, the current President of the Organization of African Unity is presenting what has come to be known as "the African dossier".

4. Some might think that this is only a ritual intended, at the most, to perpetuate a tradition—one more tradition of the Organization of African Unity [OAU].

5. And there may be some grounds for wanting to regard the continuing participation of the OAU in United Nations proceedings as a matter of routine. What I have called "the African dossier" is actually no longer a news item whose aspects there is some point in describing or whose urgent requirements should be stressed.

6. The permanent representatives of the African Governments, the vast majority of the heads of delegations of our continent at recent sessions of the United Nations General Assembly, have described at length the problems which today confront the African peoples and Governments. They have also highlighted—with a measure of success to which a well-deserved tribute should be paid here—the various solutions which the Africans propose to apply to the most acute problems. In fact, no responsible African has spoken from this rostrum or at any other meeting of the United Nations system without emphasizing the nature of the internal efforts being made by the Governments of our

continent to carry out to the end our legitimate struggle for the freedom, dignity and greater well-being of all.

7. I take it for granted, moreover, that all these spokesmen for the African cause have always specified the nature and terms of the aid which Africans expect from their international partners for the speedy emergence of a better Africa in a better world.

8. My eminent predecessors, the former Presidents of the OAU, in particular H.E. El Hadj Ahmadou Ahidjo, President of the Federal Republic of Cameroon, and H.E. Mr. Kenneth Kaunda, President of the Republic of Zambia, have already appeared before this Assembly, on behalf of the great family of the OAU, in 1969 [1780th meeting] and 1970 [1872nd meeting] respectively, to inform you of all the facts, the African philosophy and programme designed to serve not only the people of our continent but also all mankind. They have thus ably summed up and supplemented the particular aspects of "the African dossier" which so many African Heads of State and Government have been calling to your attention in the United Nations community for ten years, and more particularly during the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, with a regularity and consistency unequalled by any group of leaders from the other regions of the world.

9. However, I do not consider my presence here, at the start of this twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, as mere routine. My purpose is not to bring an original dossier to your attention. First and foremost, the problems facing Africa and the world at large are so complex and unrelenting that applied concentration is required to identify the facts which are, after all, constantly changing.

10. And since I have come here to speak mainly of African problems, it being my duty, on behalf of the Organization of African Unity, to present the views and positions of Africa on the great problems of our continent, I consider it useful, at the outset and before all else to describe the reasons for the attitude and the bases for the action being carried out, and above all to be carried out, by the OAU within the United Nations.

11. I have emphasized the regularity and the exceptional constancy which characterize the participation of Africa in the research, in the activities—in one word—in the life of the United Nations. That regularity and that constancy is above all an expression of the faith of the leaders and peoples of our continent in the United Nations. It is not a blind or unconditional faith, but an enlightened faith based on reason, which alone can generate discernment and action. Indeed, we do not consider the United Nations to be a perfect instrument. The United Nations, no more than

any other human organization cannot represent the radical panacea, the miraculous remedy for all the ills which afflict mankind. The truth is that we consider the United Nations offers an opportunity to mankind in its struggle to survive all the evil which man may do to man—all the ills the possibilities for which today modern science and technology have extended to infinity. This means that the United Nations also represents an opportunity for man to promote for mankind the positive resources of knowledge and wealth as well as the benefits of the progress of science and technology.

12. I have said that the United Nations represents an opportunity, that is to say, a potentiality at the service of man, which means that the Organization can be perfected.

13. Indeed, we in Africa believe that the United Nations can be stronger, more effective than it is today. To that end, our Organization will need the faith of all men. It can improve its usefulness only through the determination, courage and perseverance of the nations and peoples which constitute it.

14. I have spoken about the faith of men in the destiny of the United Nations. We Africans have inscribed this faith in golden letters in all the constitutions of our young States. We endeavour every day to give this faith more reality by reflecting it in the life of our Governments and our peoples, by giving our complete and entire support to all the principles of the United Nations Charter, to all its solemn declarations of the United Nations and to all its essential resolutions. This faith is the cornerstone of the charter of the Organization of African Unity.

15. I have also spoken of the determination, courage and perseverance of nations and peoples if we wish to have our Organization live despite all the difficulties that are scattered along the path of international relations. The determination of the Africans to maintain the United Nations as a lively and dynamic Organization nourishes our will to be constantly present here as well as everywhere that men meet under the aegis of the United Nations.

16. Courage, we believe, is necessary to enunciate and to denounce what is wrong in the international system so as to improve its performance. We Africans are determined to exercise that courage in spite of and against the prejudices and collective hypocrisy which, under the guise of "appropriateness and diplomacy", some would wish to impose on the working methods of our Organization.

17. I have spoken finally about perseverance—a necessary virtue—in spite of failures, in spite of daily repudiations inflicted on the value of so many basic principles of the Charter, in spite of the flagrant violation of so many solemn resolutions and in spite of the undermining of those moral pillars which at the beginning won the support of the young nations which, for some ten years, have been in the great family of the United Nations. More than goodwill, a kind of obstinacy, is needed, after these years of disillusionment, to continue to hope that, in spite of everything, better days are coming when the generous and just principles, which constitute the basis of the international contract that the Charter of the United Nations represents, will prevail. And above all that the barriers of covetousness, selfishness and

indifference which still divide our world between free peoples and dominated peoples, between the rich and the poor, between the large and the small would then disappear.

18. Africa thus recognizes that its main concerns and its political, economic and cultural problems are now widely known among the Governments of States Members of the United Nations. We nevertheless deem it necessary today—as in the future—to state our views wherever men meet in a common attempt to analyse the fate of mankind and to seek the bases of its well-being.

19. The Organization of African Unity is fully aware that its fundamental objectives—such as the total liberation of the continent, the struggle against colonialism and racial discrimination as well as economic, social and cultural development—have all been suitably incorporated in the resolutions and the programmes formulated by the series of organizations of the United Nations family. The representatives of the OAU nevertheless have the permanent mandate to do everything in their power at this session of the General Assembly, as well as in the future, to make sure that the commitments of the international community remain valid in the fields of the struggle for emancipation, liberation, dignity, economic and social well-being for that vast part of mankind to which we belong—that third world which in some places still suffers from foreign domination, in others from racial discrimination, and almost everywhere from the evils of hunger, disease and ignorance.

20. At the basis of our obstinacy, which I would describe as constructive, is one of the characteristics of our African philosophy: we persist in believing that in spite of the forces of selfishness and certain prejudices, men will not for ever remain insensitive to the attraction of the most elementary justice towards their fellow men.

21. An excess of economic and political power, beliefs inherited from history, a short-sighted solidarity will not, at least so we want to hope, indefinitely supplant the demands of equity and rectitude dictated by a broader solidarity among men and nations—a solidarity spread to the dimensions of a world of interdependence where the humiliation of a single human being is an attack on the dignity of all and where the poverty of some makes more than risky the opulence of all the others.

22. Are we speaking of a dream world? Is it a question of a Utopia, a vision of the mind which will never become reality because it is shared exclusively by the less endowed among nations and men?

23. There are times when one is tempted to believe that that is all it is; there are certain acts, certain positions which overwhelm us with doubt. Nevertheless, generous hope quickly prevails, and this remains our most decisive asset for the coming of a better world which in any case we Africans are determined to promote by the strength of our co-operation, our work and our sacrifices, and also by means of the assistance that others may give us. It is within that general framework that I should here like to recall some of the essential concerns of the OAU for which this session of the General Assembly should make it possible—if everybody wishes it—to find at least some elements for solutions.

24. I do not know whether in that approach I would not create an element of surprise by beginning with the problems of African unity. It seems to me quite appropriate to clarify the state of the union of hearts and minds, of active solidarity and of the unity of action pursued by the peoples and the leaders of the continent within our regional organization. The hopes and the potentialities for our aspirations to freedom, justice and material and cultural well-being provided by the Organization of African Unity largely justify us in drawing up a balance sheet—for ourselves and for others—of the evolution of our common undertaking. Furthermore, is it not a common practice, that, each year, on the eve of the summit conference of the Organization of African Unity, observers, who are more or less well intentioned with respect to the African reality, announce that on the horizon they see ominous signs of the weakening and even the disintegration of our organization.

25. This year that ominous sign, which was proclaimed louder than ever by so many voices, was called "the dialogue with South Africa". But the most recent meetings of the Council of Ministers of the Organization of African Unity and the last session of the summit conference of our organization¹ studied in detail and in depth the problems underlying that "dialogue". But far from dividing Africa, as some had wished and others had announced, a serious and sincere debate was held on the problem which contributed rather to bringing to light the permanent determination of all the Governments and all the peoples of Africa to do everything in their power as soon as possible to eliminate racial discrimination from our soil. That debate, marked by the seal of African frankness, once more demonstrated that our organization has really become the crucible of a union which does not exclude divergences but which implies guarantees of a permanent effort to conciliate different views and to draw ever-greater strength from our wealth of diversity.

26. Perhaps this has not been understood well enough: the Organization of African Unity has never wished to have a rigid system; it has never assigned itself the task of melting in a uniform and monolithic whole the conceptions, the methods of work and the different modes of Governments of African nations. The Organization of African Unity is above all a common edifice where the solidarity of all reflects the variety of the materials that each group wishes to contribute to it. What we have wished to achieve is to draw from this diversity of human and natural resources, temperaments and ideas, something with which to constitute a centre of rapprochement, co-operation and agreement; because the history of the evolution of human societies has convinced us that together we are assured of greater strength, the better to attack the difficulties which we have shared in the past and which even today still assail and threaten us: foreign domination, racial discrimination, economic exploitation, poverty and cultural alienation.

27. But we know that our common commitment against those obstacles, however determined we may be, cannot by itself suffice to ensure our victory, certainly not soon enough to satisfy the legitimate impatience of our peoples.

Hence our permanent desire that all the resolutions and programmes which reflect this commitment should form the basis for permanent co-operation with our other international partners. It is not at all, far from it, a matter of wishing to place the entire burden on others for all the efforts and resources to destroy colonialism, racial discrimination, economic and cultural under-development once and for all; rather it is a question of recognizing—precisely in the light of our internal research which we are carrying out within the OAU to make the most of our own resources, solidarity and unity of action—the role which the outside world can play in bringing about the triumph of our struggle for a better Africa.

28. Africa, needless to say, is aware that in the world today there exist a certain number of States which history, economic and social development, and above all technological progress have endowed with means powerful enough to influence the course of events beyond their own borders. Those few privileged Powers can, by their moral, political, military or economic action, halt or accelerate the progress of mankind in the field of peace and the liberation of all men, as well as in the field of economic growth and greater social well-being.

29. That means that Africans cannot remain insensitive to the way in which those great Powers exercise their influence over the major problems affecting the destiny of peoples in general and of Africa in particular. Indeed, the more we spell out, within the Organization for African Unity, our common methods for combating colonialism, racial discrimination and under-development, the more decisive appear to us the present and potential responsibilities of the great Powers for the harmonious development of the programmes being carried out by the African peoples and Governments.

30. Decolonization heads the list of those programmes. The Organization for African Unity has assigned to itself as a sacred duty to use every means to liberate the last peoples who still suffer foreign domination. To that end the OAU has created a Co-ordination Committee for the Liberation of Africa, whose task it is to co-ordinate all diplomatic, military and material assistance which free Africa must provide to the men and women who are waging a courageous and difficult struggle, within lands that are still occupied, in order to regain their independence.

31. At the inception of the Organization for African Unity we believed that our Liberation Committee and the OAU as a whole had a substantial ally, in that sacred struggle, in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the United Nations in December 1960 [resolution 1514 (XV)]. We hoped that, in accordance with that historic document, the great Powers had really committed themselves to supporting the efforts and the sacrifices which Africa was willing to make in order to free as soon as possible the last of its sons and daughters who still suffered under the colonial yoke.

32. Today experience has proved that the efforts of those valiant freedom fighters, as well as the assistance made available to them by the Organization for African Unity, would largely have sufficed to remove foreign domination from our soil if the last of the colonialists had not been

¹ Eighth ordinary session of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, held at Addis Ababa from 21 to 23 June 1971.

assured of even greater assistance on the part of a large number of what I referred to earlier as "the great Powers."

33. Nobody, indeed, can deny that without the massive aid received by its powerful NATO allies, Portugal, one of the poorest countries in Europe, could not have continued for as long as it has the deadly war it is waging in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau) against the legitimate struggle of African peoples for their freedom, independence and dignity. Portugal's NATO allies can no longer claim that the so-called "defensive" weapons which they generously offer Portugal, or the "objective" diplomatic support given by some, do not contribute to a daily increase in the means for repression of the peoples of Africa by the Portuguese settlers.

34. Thus it is obvious that the continuation of Portuguese colonialism, the obstinacy and the arrogance with which the Lisbon authorities continue to defend the aberrant concept of the occupation of Portugal's so-called African provinces could not be conceived of today were it not for the active support of the NATO Powers. Directly or indirectly, these allies of Portugal are responsible for all the bloodshed caused by that country in those last bastions of colonialism in the name of the claimed "defence of Western civilization".

35. "Defence of Western civilization"! I have deliberately chosen to refer to that slogan so often invoked by the Portuguese authorities to justify their atrocities in the African Territories which they still occupy. I could just as well have cited other pretexts, such as "the defence of Christian civilization" or "the fight against communism". A few years ago those slogans seemed to be nothing more than ridiculous pretexts put forward only by the last advocates of colonialism and racial discrimination. Today there are so many indications which lead us to believe that those slogans vaunted by Portugal and the racist minorities in South Africa and Rhodesia increasingly guide the attitude and action of a large number of the Governments which constitute that vaguely defined West. What is most disturbing today is not that the Powers of that "West" are silent and thus give the impression of accepting that *de facto* solidarity with Portugal, South Africa and Rhodesia; what troubles us more and more is that, despite the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, despite the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and so many solemn resolutions against colonialism and racism, the Western Powers continue to increase their aid to régimes which still practice these odious systems.

36. While the assistance of the NATO Powers to Portugal is obvious, and while that assistance represents today the most decisive element in the pursuit of the colonial war in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea (Bissau), it is equally certain that the aid provided by the great Powers to the minority régimes in South Africa and Rhodesia contributes, more than any other factor, to strengthening the oppression and the repressive methods used against the peoples of southern Africa. Despite the relevant resolutions of the United Nations and the OAU against the sale of arms to South Africa, or the economic sanctions against Rhodesia, the régimes of those two countries see the military means and economic support they receive from the great Powers growing day by day.

37. Neither commercial profit nor bilateral pledges seem to us to be valid reasons to justify this visible increase in economic trade and technical and technological assistance which Europe and America continue to supply to the minority régimes of South Africa and Rhodesia, and it is this concrete and decisive encouragement which they jointly offer which perpetuates in that region of our continent foreign domination and racial discrimination. In the attitude of these Powers other motivations, other justifications, must be found, deeper than this flagrant violation of the moral principles on which the United Nations is built. The time has come for these great Powers allied to the torturers of Africans to say clearly and unequivocally what is their position in the legitimate struggle of the peoples of our continent.

38. One cannot in the past have paid the price, which one knows, to bar the route to Hitlerite nazism and to defend a part of Europe against the invasion of the Nazis and today continue so openly to assist the heirs of the latter in South Africa, Portugal and Rhodesia. One cannot at every turn proclaim one's sympathy for the African cause, one's desire to help the Africans and at the same time so visibly be the supplier of weapons or the economic partner of their avowed enemies, Portugal, South Africa and Rhodesia.

39. Perhaps, given the silence and the contradictions, we should ourselves try to understand the moral reasons and the justifications for this flagrant difference which is increasingly affirmed between the energy deployed in the past to safeguard the legitimate rights of the peoples of Europe against the Fascist folly and the apathy abundantly displayed today, even the complicity displayed with complacency, in regard to the situation which prevails in southern Africa, in the Portuguese colonies, or the illegal occupation of Namibia or the Arab territories. Are we to understand that, for the allied Powers, in regard to the backwardness of colonialism and racial discrimination, the rights to dignity, freedom and sovereignty of the peoples of Europe and America are more sacred than those of the peoples of Africa or the Middle East?

40. A clear debate to bring to light not only the elements of the replies to these questions which the Africans put themselves, but also a new direction for action by the great Powers given the colonial tragedy and racial discrimination could, on the morrow of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, be one of the immediate objectives of the General Assembly if there is a genuine wish that the international community, turning over the page of declarations of principle resolutely take up the specific phase of achievements.

41. The peoples and Governments of Africa, for their part, feel the urgency of putting an end to these contradictions between principles and action more than ever. They will no longer be satisfied with pledges or promises; they aspire to see the achievements and to live the mutations of their destiny. While these mutations seem to them to be indispensable at the political level of the struggle for independence and dignity, they are equally necessary in the economic, social and cultural fields. This is why the Organization of African Unity has also assigned to itself the task of jointly setting to work all the human and natural resources of Africa so as to bring about as early as possible

better living conditions for all. This is also why we are as interested in the economic and cultural work of the United Nations system as in the political programmes I have mentioned. This is why, finally, the International Development Strategy, which was adopted [resolution 2626 (XXV)] on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations and at the beginning of the Second United Nations Development Decade has been given particular attention by the States Members of the Organization of African Unity.

42. This Strategy, which summarizes the conclusions of the various specialized agencies and programmes of the United Nations family, defines a certain number of targets and prescribes an over-all working method which in the years to come should make it possible for the countries of the third world to achieve their economic take-off. Every one of us would be tempted to find in that historic document a source of satisfaction, the basis for serious hope that, because of the concerted effect of the domestic efforts of the poor countries and the assistance from developed countries, there will be a substantial improvement in the living conditions of our peoples. Yet this strategy is far from the first attempt at organizing on an international level the struggle for the economic growth and social as well as cultural progress, of peoples. Past experience shows that there is a considerable distance between the target set and the reality achieved; in fact there are sufficient reasons for discouragement, so that today the principles, commitments and working methods contained in the development strategy are no longer accepted as a reliable guarantee for a better start towards the solution of the problems of the economic life of the peoples of the third world.

43. Yet we welcomed with enthusiasm, I repeat, the adoption of this Strategy, because we know that it offers a framework which is perhaps new for a permanent debate regarding what we jointly could and should do to lessen in some small measure the gap which today divides the rich from the poor nations.

44. If, we all really and sincerely, have recognized that the international inequalities which exist today in the economic and social fields are in themselves a serious source of tensions among peoples and thereby a latent threat to the peace of the world, then we must resolutely commit ourselves to the only course which will make it possible to attenuate under-development. Success in this course will, of course, depend on those that are mainly concerned themselves, that is to say, the peoples of the third world. It is by their sacrifices, their spirit of discipline and their co-operation that they can establish and strengthen the fundamental elements which will ensure the take-off of their economies and introduce the first improvements in their standards of living. But in this world, where interdependence between various parts of the globe grows from day to day, the role which the have-nots can play in the acceleration of the economic and social progress of others is, here also, very important.

45. The fact that the countries of the third world in general, and the States Members of the OAU in particular, are determined fully to assume their responsibilities in the rapid application of the Development Strategy is a truth

that cannot be questioned. This truth, which casts on all our States and all our peoples the grave dangers inherent in under-development is imprinted everywhere in the attitude as well as in the action of African Governments taken individually and in the Organization of African Unity as an expression of their aspirations for co-operation in the service of their peoples.

46. It is by virtue of this truth that, when independence was barely won, each of our countries endeavoured to define and set up a coherent system which would enable it as early as possible to identify all the natural, human and financial resources available, to plan in the most realistic fashion possible the evolution of the various sectors of economic and social life, so as to ensure by every means the application and rapid control of its development plans.

47. Likewise, it is because we were more than conscious of the need for us to count above all on our own efforts that we very early embarked on economic, social and cultural co-operation as one of the surest means to build economies which meet the requirements of modern life. Among neighbouring countries, surrounding the basins of the main rivers or lakes, we have undertaken a multitude of experiments at joining our forces and these experiments facilitate progressive integration of our methods of research, planning, economic achievement and today represent the largest and richest gamut of experiments in integrated development which any region of the world has known in history.

48. Finally, we created the OAU, and we assigned to it, among other things, the harmonization and co-ordination of our national or multinational policies intended to improve the economic and social conditions of our peoples. Our Economic and Social Council, our Council of Ministers and the Conference of Heads of State or Government periodically devote themselves to a study of the evolution of the economic and social conditions on the continent, so that each time they may arrive at the major decisions whereby they avoid duplication and vain waste of our efforts towards development. Above all, the OAU considers itself to be the motor element of a common African front in the hard dialogue between the "have" countries and the poor countries which is established wherever a specialized agency or a programme of the United Nations family brings men together on international economic problems.

49. The common front which we intend to constitute and maintain in no way implies a hostile or aggressive attitude towards the rest of the world and, in particular, towards our partners of the wealthy countries. Experience has simply taught us that in this world where economic power is concentrated and prospers increasingly in groups of States, Africa has no chance of seeing its interests taken into consideration unless it unites. Hence, our permanent efforts to arrive at joint positions within the specialized agencies where the programmes of the United Nations system are drawn up to assist the economic and social progress of the third world and where negotiations to achieve international co-operation in the field of trade, conceived of as an aid to the economic growth of the developing countries, are carried out.

50. I should like to dwell a little on the particular importance, within African programmes, of the entire

system intended to organize trade better at the international level. Our countries, whose economies so far are based almost exclusively on the exploitation of agricultural and mineral resources, are certainly those where the fluctuations and uncertainties of international trade represent a constant subject of concern. Because the deterioration in the terms of trade, the machinery and consequences of which have been commented on at length and brought to light by economists as well as by the leaders of the peoples of the third world, is in itself one of the most serious threats which weighs on the future of human societies in the nations of Asia, Latin America and Africa. By having to suffer the greatest uncertainties from year to year in regard to the level of resources which each may expect to draw as the result of its efforts to rationalize and increase production, the deterioration in the terms of trade creates complete uncertainty for the poor countries as to whether they will have sufficient investments and the technical means necessary to carry out programmes of industrialization, diversification, technical training, which are alone capable of placing them within a viable and modern economy.

51. No one will then be surprised that at the time when, under the aegis of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, a general system of preferences is established for the less developed countries, those responsible, the vast majority of whom represent the least endowed sector among the poor countries, want to set everything in motion so that this new attempt at the reorganization of international trade will not end up by further aggravating the evils which it is intended to attenuate or cure. An opening up of the markets of the developed countries to the manufacturers of the developing countries will not have marked or positive effects on the economies of the countries of Africa unless it is conceived of as a means to increase substantially the volume of African exports towards the rich markets and to ensure a stable revenue for each product exported.

52. Now, the system of preferences as it exists today, excludes, through commodities, the major volume of exports from African countries. Perhaps it is true that other countries of the third world would derive a substantial benefit from the new system. But should we not fear that to the existing international inequalities we shall soon see the rapid superimposition, of greater inequalities among the countries which are today called "developing countries"? We in Africa really fear in the absence of special guarantees for the least endowed among the less developed countries, that tensions which have already been created will grow and be exacerbated as they are every day by the division into rich and poor zones.

53. This is why, conscious of our duties to bring about the greater well-being and to enhance the interests of our peoples, as well as universal peace, we committed ourselves in UNCTAD, as we have wherever problems of international economic life are studied, to seek with our partners special clauses which take into account the exceptionally unfavourable situation in which colonization has left the economies of the great majority of our countries.

54. It is our wish that this legitimate struggle which we intend to pursue, will not, as is still the case, stumble

against the intransigence and the selfishness of those which the hazards of history have already endowed with modern economic means.

55. These are the grave problems which particularly concern the OAU. If my statement has not been specific, it is because the problems are many and complex and their nature and scope had to be emphasized. They are so acute and persistent that one cannot imagine how the world will find a positive and lasting balance, unless the international community endeavours to find the viable and urgent solutions which are imperative. Let patience attend our insistence.

56. In the meantime, the representatives of the States Members of the OAU, who will address this session of the General Assembly, will, each, when presenting the specific views of African Governments, complete this list of crucial requirements which seem to us to determine the present and the future.

57. In this connexion I must indicate that the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania will have occasion to restate the views and the positions of the Government of Mauritania not only on African problems, as seen by the Organization of African Unity, but also on all the major problems of our times, and in particular on the Middle East, on the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, on the deadly war which devastates Indo-China and on the problem of the reunification of Korea—and these are problems which I have referred to at this rostrum during the last session of the General Assembly [1877th meeting].

58. The PRESIDENT: On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank His Excellency the President of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, representing the States Members of the Organization of African Unity, for the important address he has just made.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda (*continued*)

FIRST REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/8500)

59. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now resume consideration of the recommendation of the General Committee in paragraph 17 of its report [A/8500] regarding item 104 of the draft agenda, entitled "The colonial case of Puerto Rico".

60. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): I have asked for the floor in order to speak against the proposal by the representative of Cuba which would overturn the recommendation of the General Committee that item 104 of the draft agenda [A/BUR/177, para. 15], styled "The colonial case of Puerto Rico", should not be included in the agenda.

61. I am amazed to find the gentleman from Cuba talking about free elections, and I can think of only one explanation for our colleague's performance here today: that is, that the concept of free elections, the concept of self-

determination by free elections, is, regrettably, an alien concept to him.

62. During the discussion of this item at the General Committee's 192nd meeting yesterday we tried to be very brief and I will be so again; I shall not engage in a general debate. The reasons why the General Committee properly decided yesterday not to recommend inscription of this tendentious item remain very valid today. The item is prejudicially entitled "The colonial case of Puerto Rico". Who—other than our colleague—has decided that Puerto Rico is a colony? Certainly not the people of Puerto Rico.

63. The intent of this item and of its author is to interfere in the internal affairs of the United States and of Puerto Rico. The relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico is founded on the clear recognition by the United States of the Puerto Rican people's inalienable right to self-determination. Over 80 per cent of the voters in Puerto Rico approved the establishment of the free associated State in 1952, and by the approval of the overwhelming majority, therefore, a relationship was established that has endured and developed over nearly 20 years. No change in this relationship has ever been imposed on the people of Puerto Rico; on the contrary, this relationship has steadily evolved with their repeatedly expressed approval, approval repeatedly expressed through free elections.

64. The people of Puerto Rico have had other occasions to express themselves on their political status. General elections have been held every four years: in 1956, 1960, 1964 and 1968. In addition to the two major parties, which between them obtained over 95 per cent of the votes, the Independence Party—the very movement about which the gentleman from Cuba spoke—also took part; it received some support, ranging from a high of 3.5 per cent of the total down to a low, a discouraging low, of 2.7 per cent. And it should be emphasized that none of the political parties in Puerto Rico has ever challenged the integrity of the electoral process. In addition to those elections, the people of Puerto Rico participated in a special plebiscite on their political status held on 23 July 1967: 60.4 per cent supported the existing Commonwealth status; 39 per cent voted for Statehood in the United States Federal Union; and .06 per cent voted for independence. It is generally recognized that the actual sentiment in favour of independence was greater than that vote indicates—it might have been as high as 4 or 5 per cent, we will concede that—but the Independence Party, reportedly recognizing its weakness, urged its adherents to boycott the plebiscite so as not to reveal what has appeared election after election as a total lack of support.

65. The people of Puerto Rico will again have an opportunity to register their political choice at the polls in November 1972 in a free and contested election—a concept, I might add, alien to our friend from Cuba—and no political party will be prevented from participating because it advocates a political programme different from that of the majority.

66. The fact that a tiny, infinitesimal minority in Puerto Rico holds contrary views is not unique. There are such minorities in my own country, and I suspect that there are

in each of your own countries. If you had a plebiscite, if you had a vote, there would be a tiny minority that would want to do things in some way totally different from the way they are done by your duly constituted Governments. This is true, I would say, around the world.

67. For those reasons, the United States strongly supports the recommendation of the General Committee. I trust that we may dispose of this question promptly so that we can proceed with the important matters that have caused us all to assemble here.

68. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): I have asked for the floor as a member of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples—membership in which we have held since its establishment—in order to support the inscription on the agenda of item 104: "The colonial case of Puerto Rico". Let me pick up the threads where the representative of the United States left them.

69. Speaking about the so-called plebiscite in Puerto Rico, he ended by saying that a tiny little portion of the people voted for independence. The pages of human history are full of lost causes, or what appeared at one time to be lost causes but later enlightened the whole history of mankind. Certainly Socrates was in a minority when he was condemned to die, but it is the death of Socrates that now condemns those who condemned him. Certainly Christ was in a minority when he was crucified, but it is that crucifixion that now condemns the crucifiers. Therefore, let us not talk about majorities and minorities. Majorities are for those who can rig them. Majorities are for those who can buy them. Majorities in a so-called free system are for those who can dominate the press and buy the greatest and largest number of shares in the corporations of the mass media.

70. My reasons for supporting the inclusion in the agenda of the item "The colonial case of Puerto Rico" fall into two categories: realistic ones and legal ones. Let me deal with the first category. A question such as the question of Puerto Rico, whether we agree to discuss it in the General Assembly or not, is not simply and solely a question of the inclusion or non-inclusion of an item in the agenda. It is a question of whether our deliberations are taking place in an air of reality. For if there is an accusation that has been levelled against our Organization for the last quarter of a century, it is that very often we deal in the abstract with forms and with legalisms altogether divorced from the reality in which mankind lives.

71. The words of the President of Mauritania, who has just addressed the Assembly, are still echoing in our minds and in our souls. In the spirit of realism, let us look around us at all the continents of the world. Whenever we find a tragic human problem we find at its root sometimes the denial—through brutal force in some instances—of the right of a people to its views, and sometimes the denial to a people of its right to self-determination.

72. I said, let us look around. In Africa—the President of Mauritania has just given us enough examples. In Europe—let us see what is happening in Ireland. Is it not in essence

complete obduracy to refuse to recognize the right of a people that wants to have its own sense of belonging as it understands it? In Asia, what constitutes the essence of the problems of Viet-Nam, where a barbaric war is taking place, of Korea, of the Middle East and of Palestine, except the denial of the right of peoples to self-determination and to be themselves? Ultimately, this is a very deep human problem, which is much deeper than, and goes far beyond, whether a vote is taken to include an item in the agenda or not. The problem is, indeed, the unspeakable sadness of a national identity erased, reduced into nothingness. It is the engulfing suffering of the human being, who knows his roots and is sure of his roots, yet sees himself uprooted by brutal force. It is ultimately the sufferings of the masses of the world, sufferings which are constant reminders that we should lift ourselves above the level of mere shadow argumentation and artificiality to the level and the bed-rock of the heart of humanity.

73. I come now to the second category of my arguments, which are the legal arguments. Up to 1960, the United Nations recognized two types of colonial Territories: Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories. If Cuba or any other nation had requested the inclusion of "The colonial case of Puerto Rico," let us say, between 1953 and 1960 a reversal of General Assembly resolution 748 (VIII), adopted in 1953, would have been necessary. But for the reversal of that resolution, upon which, legally, the United States bases its relations with Puerto Rico, a two-thirds majority would have been required.

74. Luckily, however, in 1960 the General Assembly adopted its resolution 1514 (XV) upon the initiative, and thanks to the efforts, of the delegation of the USSR. A third category has come under that resolution: territories that have not yet attained independence. The first two categories are Trust Territories and Non-Self-Governing Territories. Witness operative paragraph 5 of that declaration on decolonization:

"Immediate steps shall be taken, in Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories or all other territories which have not yet attained independence, to transfer all powers to the peoples of those territories, without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed or colour, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom."

75. Since Puerto Rico did not become either a part of another nation or sovereign, and since it was not a Trust Territory or a Non-Self-Governing Territory, what resolution 748 (VIII) did was to send Puerto Rico into a political and juridical limbo. But suddenly, in 1960, after resolution 1514 (XV) was adopted, Puerto Rico found its place and acquired a status recognized by the United Nations as one of the "territories which have not yet attained independence".

76. The United Nations has a duty to defend all parts of its resolution. Not doing so could become very dangerous. As is known, the United States has tried hard in the Committee of Twenty-Four to ignore, and even to have that Committee abolish, the category of colonial territory. If the United States wishes to have that part of resolution

1514 (XV) removed, it should be compelled to introduce a new item into the agenda of the General Assembly entitled "The modification or amendment of resolution 1514 (XV)", or words to that effect. If I know the rules of procedure, if Article 18 is invoked—as it so often is by the United States delegation—that would require a two-thirds majority. Meanwhile, that section belongs in the resolution and must be defended and complied with. We cannot allow the United States and its expansionism to feel above the law and beyond the will of the General Assembly.

77. In the Committee of Twenty-Four I said that the United States delegation—before withdrawing, along with the United Kingdom, after that Committee earlier this year—had attempted to prevent discussion of the question of Puerto Rico in the Committee on decolonization. I then spoke in favour of the inclusion of that item in the agenda, and I think the arguments I made are relevant today.

78. First, each session of the General Assembly is master of its own business. Were that not so, many errors would be perpetuated. Even the history of the United Nations has not been without instances of tragedy resulting from the rigging and falsifying of the will of the majority. Truth was never decided solely by the number of votes. Secondly, as a non-aligned country, the Syrian Arab Republic is bound by the decisions of the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries,² which called upon the Special Committee to consider the situation in Puerto Rico and other territories in the light of resolution 1514 (XV). Thirdly, there has been a significant change in the composition and political alignment of the United Nations since 1953, when resolution 748 (VIII) was adopted. Of the 46 countries that attended the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, 27 were not Members of the United Nations in 1953—more than the number of States that voted in favour of resolution 748 (VIII) in 1953, which was adopted by 26 votes to 16, with 18 abstentions. The fact that the vote in the Fourth Committee, before the question had been referred to the General Assembly, had been 22 in favour to 18 against with 19 abstentions appeared definitely to indicate that the United States delegation had exerted pressure on some Members in order to gain four additional votes.

79. Even today the General Assembly might decide upon the recommendation of the General Committee in the sense the representative of the United States has indicated. But history and tomorrow will be the ultimate judges.

80. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): We are discussing a very important question involving the fate of a nation which has been fighting for its freedom for many years now. Some speakers are trying to use before this august body such arguments at the expression of the will of the people and the expression of their right to self-determination. That the expression of the will of the people of Puerto Rico or their self-determination is not involved has been brought out in a very detailed and reasoned manner in the Cuban Government's memorandum [A/8441] and in statements by the representatives of Cuba

² Held in Cairo from 5 to 10 October 1964.

and Syria. It is clear from what we know about relations between the United States and Puerto Rico that those relations are of a purely colonial type. It is the intention of the United States representative, however, to divert the Assembly from a discussion of the essential nature of the present situation in Puerto Rico and to use resolution 748 (VIII) as a cover for his country's actions.

81. But what kind of resolution is that? The Syrian representative commented aptly on it and one has only to read it to see very clearly that this document is in no way a model for the United Nations in 1971. And yet that is precisely what the United States would like us to believe. The United States delegation, in opposing the discussion of this item, also refers to the fact that a plebiscite was held in Puerto Rico in 1951 in which the people themselves supposedly chose their form of government. But let us hear what Puerto Rican Government figures have to say about that.

82. On 18 March 1961, in answer to a letter from the president of the Christian Action Party of Puerto Rico, the Secretary of State of Puerto Rico, Dr. Carlos Lastro, whose functions included recording the returns in all elections and referendums, said that, in the files of his Department, there was no document showing that a referendum was ever held in which the people of Puerto Rico were offered three options: statehood, independence or Commonwealth status. I think that statement refutes the United States delegation's argument quite convincingly.

83. I would also like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to the fact that the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in 1964 in Cairo, in which 47 States took part and 10 others were represented by observers, noted in its declaration that Puerto Rico had not yet become a self-governing territory. The Conference of non-aligned countries called on the United Nations Special Committee on decolonization to discuss the situation in the Territory in the light of resolution 1514 (XV), i.e. the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

84. The Byelorussian delegation considers, therefore, that the time has come once again to discuss the situation in Puerto Rico in the United Nations. The reasons why this question should be discussed in the General Assembly have been set out in detail in a memorandum from the Cuban Government, annexed to the letter of 17 August 1971 from the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the Secretary-General of the United Nations [A/8441], and also in statements made by the representatives of a number of countries at this meeting.

85. The Byelorussian delegations supports the Cuban proposal to include this item in the agenda of the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

86. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This morning we announced that the United States delegation would doubtless have recourse, as its only argument, to the manipulation of some electoral data with regard to the case of Puerto Rico. I also expressed some doubts with respect to the way arithmetic is taught in the south-east of

the United States and, after having heard the new statement made by the representative of the United States this afternoon, we have observed once again that when it comes to counting votes or the attitude of the voters in colonial elections on the island, for the representative of the United States the only valid votes are those of the political forces financed by the colonial administration.

87. The representative of North American colonialism referred to the results of the 1958 election and quoted the total figures of the votes obtained by some parties. I shall refer once again to the document of the Electoral Board of the colonial authority of Puerto Rico to confirm the data in so far as Mr. Bush's arithmetic will go and then to complete them with other data which he traditionally forgets.

88. In fact, one of the colonial parties obtained 18.5 per cent of the support of the Puerto Rican electorate. That percentage is the one which corresponds to the figure read by Mr. Bush. The other obtained 29.2 per cent and a third political force, the party for independence obtained the small figure he mentioned.

89. This morning I had already indicated that actually in Puerto Rico at that time there was a small political organization which was in favour of electoral participation, but that the main and major political trends in favour of independence had for decades repudiated the colonial electoral farces and on that occasion called on the people of Puerto Rico to refrain from participating in those elections. If Mr. Bush could count the figures he quoted in this Assembly, he would see that the figures with which he tried to impress representatives give only 48 per cent of the Puerto Rican electorate so that 52 per cent—thus the majority of the Puerto Rican electorate—acted in complete accord with what was recommended and suggested by the main political forces for independence on the island, which are not exactly the ones who have played the game of the North American electoral farces, but rather those which, because they openly fought against foreign domination, have many of their leaders in North American prisons for two decades.

90. Continuing with this arithmetical game—it would have been interesting if the United States representative had manipulated these figures here—I would say that possibly the number of years which they have applied as sentences to the Puerto Rican patriots far exceed the number of votes manufactured by the colonial authority. To mention only one statistic—I know that North Americans enjoy the numbers game—between 1950 and 1953 the sentences imposed on Puerto Rican patriots who fought for independence totalled 15,000 years in prison. This illustrates the atmosphere of what Mr. Bush calls free elections, the atmosphere that was prevalent in Puerto Rico during the time of the famous plebiscite.

91. Furthermore, I had also forecast that the representative of the United States would find it difficult to come here to refute the information which I drew, solely and exclusively, from the organization manual of the United States Government, which illustrates the curious case of self-government and self-determination which has been created—an administrative creature with no authority to project itself outward; it lacks authority to control its

security forces; it lacks authority to control its customs, but furthermore it has no authority whatsoever with regard to narcotics and a whole host of lesser activities, which possibly in many other colonial countries are the attributes of local authorities and which—as I stated this morning—goes so far that it is impossible to sow seeds or cut down a tree without authorization from Washington.

92. This afternoon the Assembly heard the voice of an African statesman who once again reiterated the urgency for this Organization to confront the solution of the colonial problems in the world. My delegation reaffirms once again that the problem before the Assembly touches directly and unavoidably on this fundamental issue. It is not merely a matter of the situation of the people in Puerto Rico. It is a matter of the prestige of this Organization. And, as was so rightly pointed out by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, of the judgement history will pass on our Organization.

93. The representative of the United States referred to the wishes of the population of the territory, and he manipulated the data which he had mentioned earlier. Those data were also used in 1953, when the General Assembly last considered this problem. At that time the vast majority of the non-aligned African and Asian States rejected the North American position. Now with regard to the versions which might be given by political persons or organizations in a territory, I wish to recall what an illustrious representative of an Asian country said at that other time when the United States played with its arithmetic in order to persuade the Assembly to accept its views. He said: "In every subjugated country the people speak with two tongues, one for themselves and one for the conqueror. There will always be political parties which will bear witness and which will have the blessings of the Administering Authority." North American arithmetic ends in those parties to which it has given its blessing. Nevertheless, we must note that after 73 years of colonial oppression of the people of Puerto Rico, the North American blessing cannot yet reach 50 per cent of the electorate of that country.

94. In the course of the debates in the General Committee yesterday, some delegations raised objections or stated reservations with regard to the title of the item proposed by Cuba. My delegation gave this item the title "The colonial case of Puerto Rico" for the very simple reason that that is what it is. Nevertheless, we wish to place on record before this debate comes to an end that we would have had no objection to having this title amended, with the understanding that the opinion of my delegation has been clearly stated in the course of these debates as well as in the memorandum we submitted [see A/8441].

95. At the same time—and since this is a problem of historical importance for this Organization, even though the representative of the colonial Power, like all its colleagues in the exercise of colonialism, does not consider this question important—my delegation wishes to request that the decision of the Assembly on this item be taken by a roll-call vote.

96. Finally, we wish to emphasize the commitment, or the duty, of independent States from the countries of the third world to take the only position which is consistent with the

positions taken with regard to colonialism on other items which the General Assembly considers. Commander Ernesto Che Guevara stated at the nineteenth session from this rostrum [1299th meeting] that the case of Puerto Rico is the problem which defines the true anti-imperialist attitude which is taken today in the international arena. My delegation believes that the attitude which will be taken with regard to the case of Puerto Rico will not so much affect the people of Puerto Rico as the prestige and seriousness of this international Organization. History will judge us on the basis of the judgement we pass today.

97. With respect to Puerto Rico, its people, we state once again, have not been conquered after more than 70 years of occupation. After all the attempts to destroy its national culture and to assimilate it to the metropolis, after having suffered the incalculable pressure of North American power, this is still a people among whom the liberation movement grows and fights more resolutely every day for its emancipation.

98. Cuba will continue to fulfil its duty of solidarity toward the people of Puerto Rico, Latin Americans like ourselves and our brothers in history, whatever decision the General Assembly may take. As the great Latin American scholar, Juan Montalvo once said:

"Bolívar still has work to do. His sword will not be suspended in the temple of glory, because as long as there is an enslaved people in the new world, his task will not have been completed."

99. Mr. VILLEDA MORALES (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This is the first time that I address the United Nations because I have only just arrived from my country as head of the permanent delegation of my country to this world Organization.

100. In making my first statement at this time, when an issue which is crucial and current for Latin America is being dealt with, I do so as a former President of the Republic of Honduras and, at the same time, as a standard bearer of the cause of democracy, not on an exclusively insular scale but on a continental scale.

101. I believe that independence is a conquest, not a gift. It is a conquest wrought by peoples so as not to be deprived of the right of self-determination. It is not the gift of any assembly.

102. I am a friend of the people of Puerto Rico, and I am a friend of the Cubans who are in Puerto Rico and those who reside in the United States. Interpreting that wish which arises and springs from the heart of the people, I believe that no country which has cancelled the right of self-determination through the exercise of the vote has the authority to claim the exercise of that right from another country. I am not opposed to the independence of any country. On the contrary. In this century when interdependence is the sign of the times, I believe that independence must be a conquest which is won in the streets through the efforts of a people which desires not only its political independence, but also its economic self-sufficiency or independence.

103. The latest data in connexion with the plebiscite held in Puerto Rico in 1967 show the following figures: 60 per cent of the electorate voted in favour of a free associated state; 39 per cent voted in favour of statehood; and 0.67 per cent voted in favour of independence.

104. Naturally, there was a percentage of absenteeism, as usually happens in most Latin American countries, which is a normal rule for that activity.

105. In making this brief statement, I repeat that I do not agree with the theory of opposing the independence of any people. On the contrary, I once again proclaim the principle which I have always advocated throughout my public life: the watchword of Latin America must be non-interference, no colonialism, no imperialism—but integration.

106. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to assure you, Mr. President, and the Assembly that it was not my intention to come back and steal more of your time, but I am compelled to do so because of the inspiring statement of Mr. Villeda Morales. I wish merely to give the following quotation as an example of how some of the machinery, so desired by and so dear to the United States representative, functions:

“The Government of Honduras was guided at all times by its love of freedom and its desire that all the peoples of the world should achieve full independence. He therefore considered that notwithstanding the high degree of development Puerto Rican institutions had achieved, the United States should continue to carry out its obligation under Article 73 e of the Charter to transmit information on Puerto Rico, since that territory had not yet achieved full self-government, the sole stage at which the General Assembly could free an administering Power from its obligation. Moreover, the transmission of information in no way prejudiced the efficient working of the administration of the territory or hampered the evolution of its people towards full self-government.”³

107. The representative of Syria earlier referred to the pressures exerted by the North American delegation, and here we have a case of that—one of the best examples.

108. In the Fourth Committee Honduras spoke in the way I have just quoted; it spoke against the Latin American draft resolution and voted against it. A little later, in plenary, it changed its position. As to the reason for that change, I imagine that this Assembly will suspect what it was; there is no need to refer to it. Perhaps at that time Mr. Villeda Morales was President of the Republic. I do not recall when he held that post.

109. But the only thing I wish to say—I do not think his words deserve much comment—is that what he has done this afternoon is the same as what happened 20 years ago. Everybody knows where the order came from—perhaps even the text—for that gentlemen to come to this rostrum and play the role of traitor to a brother country, to hand over or state that he was in favour of handing over the destiny of a people who are his brothers to the master who

exploits it. Already 20 years ago his delegation had given a good example of this. Today he has done no more than confirm that history repeats itself.

110. The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to vote on the General Committee's recommendation, contained in paragraph 17 of its first report [A/8500], that item 104 of the draft agenda should not be included in the agenda. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Japan, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar,⁴ South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Ceylon, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast.

Against: Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mongolia, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, People's Republic of the Congo, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Hungary, Iraq.

Abstaining: Kuwait, Laos, Mauritius, Mexico, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados, Bolivia, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Cyprus, Dahomey, Egypt, El Salvador, Gabon, Gambia, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Jamaica.

The recommendation was adopted by 57 votes to 26, with 38 abstentions.

111. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to the recommendation of the General Committee contained in paragraph 18 of its report.

112. Mr. DUGERSUREN (Mongolia) (*translated from Russian*): I have asked for the floor in order to express my delegation's vigorous protest against the General Committee's recommendation to postpone until the next session of the General Assembly any discussion of the question of the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations, and the dissolution of the United Nations Commis-

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Session, Fourth Committee, 352nd meeting, para. 43.*

⁴ The delegation of Qatar subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been against the recommendation.

sion for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. We consider the General Committee's decision to be quite illogical and contrary to the dictates of common sense. It has totally failed to take account of the essence of these important problems, which are closely bound up with the vital interests of the Korean people and the responsibility of the United Nations to take measures to strengthen peace and security in the Far East. This absurd recommendation by the Committee was adopted as a result of a preconceived manoeuvre by the representatives of certain Powers in the General Committee.

113. It is understandable that the United States and its allies are doing everything in their power to avoid discussion of these important problems, since every such discussion naturally turns out to the disadvantage of the United States and the other parties involved in this affair. Every such discussion in fact turns into a sharp condemnation of the criminal acts of the United States against the Korean people.

114. Those who staged this manoeuvre cynically made use of the negotiations that began recently between representatives of the Red Cross organizations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea as the basis for their argument. We do not deny that these contacts are of some importance for Korea despite the fact that they deal only with specific, narrow problems. It should be emphasized that this dialogue was set in motion as a result of many years of effort by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which has favoured and continues to favour the development of contacts between North and South Korea in order to further the peaceful unification of their country. However, this dialogue, regardless of its importance for Korea, cannot possibly serve as grounds for the United Nations to put aside the discussion of crucial problems which require solution by the Organization without delay. The withdrawal of United States forces from South Korea and the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea are problems which fall into just this category.

115. The need for these problems to be discussed by the General Assembly and for positive decisions to be taken on them arises from the fact that the continued occupation of South Korea by United States forces is the main reason for the division of Korea, and, as was so rightly pointed out in the sponsors' explanatory memorandum [A/8444 and Add.1 and 2], this occupation is also the source of a serious threat to peace and security not only on the Korean peninsula but throughout the entire Far East. As for the so-called United Nations Commission, its activities aggravate this situation still further and prevent the Korean people from dealing with their internal problem.

116. Our delegation considers that the Korean people should be given the opportunity to settle their internal affairs for themselves without outside interference and to bring about the unification of their country in a peaceful, democratic manner. It is the duty of the United Nations to lose no time in arriving at a positive settlement of the problems we are discussing here in order to create favourable conditions for effecting the unification of Korea—conditions which are in keeping with the highest national

interests of the Korean people. We wish to stress, moreover, that the withdrawal of the United States occupation forces from South Korea and the liquidation of the so-called United Nations Commission is in keeping not only with the national interests of the Korean people but also with the interests of our Organization itself and the task of strengthening peace and tranquillity in the Far East and throughout the world. It should be added that the military occupation of South Korea by the United States was originally carried out and is today continuing under the illegal protection of the flag of our Organization.

117. As I mentioned yesterday in the General Committee, while I was in Panmunjom this summer I saw there the faded and unsightly flag of the United Nations, which still stands on the table at which the truce agreement was signed. The United Nations aggressors used that flag as a cover for their aggression against the Korean people. Now our Organization should take immediate measures to wipe out this stain on its escutcheon.

118. From what I have said it is abundantly clear that the withdrawal of United States troops from South Korea and the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission remain, as before, questions of the utmost urgency both for the United Nations itself and for the world community. Our delegation considers that it is the inescapable duty of the United Nations to discuss these questions in a business-like manner, with the participation of representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea, and to take a positive decision on them. That is why I said at the beginning of my remarks that the General Committee's recommendation goes against the dictates of common sense and fails to take account of the essential nature of the two problems which the Mongolian delegation and 19 other delegations of socialist countries and Afro-Asian States proposed for consideration once again at this session.

119. In the light of these considerations, the delegation of the Mongolian People's Republic proposes that the General Assembly should reject the General Committee's recommendation to postpone until the next session consideration of the items on the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and on the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea and that Assembly should decide to include them in the agenda of the present twenty-sixth session.

120. Our delegation hopes that this proposal will be supported by the members of the General Assembly.

121. I request, Mr. President, that you should hold a separate, recorded vote on each of these items, to wit, items 106 and 107 of the draft agenda of the General Assembly.

122. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland): Mr. President, the Polish delegation reserves the right to express to you on another occasion our sincere congratulations on your election to the high post of our presiding officer. I am now taking the floor mainly to speak in favour of the inclusion in our agenda of the two items submitted by our Mongolian friends and those delegations which were convinced of the usefulness and indeed necessity of sponsoring the relevant draft

resolutions. Thus we are in favour of having a debate and a decision on these two problems at this session.

123. We beg to disagree thoroughly with the arguments advanced hitherto for the postponement of this debate until the next session. We could agree with one aspect of the case: that the United Nations should, as quickly as possible, drop the so-called Korean problem altogether from the agenda of the United Nations and leave the Korean people alone to settle their own problems without foreign interference. However, as the situation stands now, we deem it necessary that the United Nations take a resolute stand on deciding upon the elimination of two obstacles which impede such a desired development. Permit me to deal briefly with those existing hindrances.

124. Year after year it has been said here that the United Nations flag is being abused by military units of a super-Power which is continuing a military presence in South Korea that fully deserves to be called, in simple terms, a military occupation. One can only wonder how long such a situation might persist. I have to remind this Assembly that the pertinent article of the Armistice Agreement of 27 June 1953, article IV, clearly states:

“In order to ensure the peaceful settlement of the Korean question, the military Commanders of both sides hereby recommend to the governments of the countries concerned on both sides that, within three (3) months after the Armistice Agreement is signed and becomes effective, a political conference of a higher level of both sides be held by representatives appointed respectively to settle through negotiation the questions of the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Korea, the peaceful settlement of the Korean question, etc.”⁵

125. Now, in the 18 years that followed the Armistice Agreement nothing happened which might speed up the materialization of the above-quoted contractual undertaking. It would be improper, in the procedural debate which is now taking place, to elaborate further on this problem. Suffice it to add that for all these years the flag of the United Nations has covered up attempts to support in South Korea a régime which was not so much to the liking of the Korean people but which some outside forces imagined to be in their own interest. I submit that an end should be put to a situation where the symbol of the United Nations is being abused for purposes having—to put it mildly—nothing to do with the purposes of the Charter. It is therefore understandable that as the years passed many nations have simply withdrawn their active participation from the military establishment in Korea which is still using the United Nations flag. More or less the same applies to the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. The Commission in fact is year after year losing support among the membership of the United Nations. The resolutions which the Assembly passes year after year remain just empty phrases. Last year's resolution said, *inter alia*, in the fourth preambular paragraph that the United Nations is empowered “to extend its good offices in seeking a peaceful settlement in Korea”

[resolution 2668 (XXV)]. Nothing, however, has been done in this respect. The United Nations cannot register any achievements. Why should it persist in upholding a sterile institution, which as we know obstructs the desired settlement?

126. It has been rightly stressed here that we are now facing in Korea a new situation. North and South are trying to find a way to bring about a reconciliation leading to the peaceful unification of the country.

127. The constructive, peaceful unification programme proclaimed on 12 April 1971 by the Foreign Minister of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mr. Ho Dam, proposed *in r alia*, that “the representatives of political parties, public organizations and individual persons in North and South sit together at Panmunjom . . . to have a heart-to-heart consultation with each other”.

128. Meetings between the South and the North are now taking place in Panmunjom under the banner of the respective national Red Cross organizations. We can only wish the Koreans success in their endeavours and we should assist them by eliminating any appearance of outside interference. And that is precisely why we should take up the items proposed by Mongolia and by the co-sponsors of the Mongolian proposals with one aim in mind: to decide on the withdrawal of foreign troops from the South—just as they were withdrawn many years ago from the North—and to dissolve the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

129. Indeed, both the Commission and the foreign military forces are remnants of the cold-war period. We can get rid of them, not by postponing the decision till next year, but by acting here and now in the interest of the prestige of the United Nations and in the vital interests of the Korean nation. To close the chapter on the Korean problem, but to close it in a proper and just way, not by evasion, will, of course, constructively assist the consolidation of peace the world over.

130. As to the procedure suggested here by the Mongolian representative we, of course, support the proposal that items 106 and 107 should be voted upon separately.

131. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): It was my delegation that put forward the proposal concerning the Korean items which was adopted yesterday by the General Committee at its 192nd meeting. I shall not go into a lengthy discussion of the substance of these items. I shall merely repeat my reasons for putting forward this proposal—reasons which were found good by the General Committee yesterday. They are as follows.

132. It is a regrettable but inescapable fact that the debates we have held each year for many years on this question have followed an entirely predictable pattern. They must surely be the most stereotyped debates held anywhere in our Organization. So much so that there is no way of telling one year's debate from another except by reference to the date on the cover of the verbatim record. We cannot pretend that we have made any contribution to the solution of the Korean question by these debates.

⁵ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1953*, document S/3079, appendix A.

133. Is there any reason to expect a better result from a repetition of such a debate this year? I fear there is not. This was confirmed by yesterday's discussion in the General Committee, which reminded me all too forcibly of the annual debate in the First Committee.

134. In contrast to this unpromising situation, there has recently been a most important and hopeful development in the field in Korea. I am referring, of course, to the talks which have begun between the two Red Cross societies. This event is without precedent in the history of the Korean problem since the division of the country. For the first time in more than two decades, South Koreans and North Koreans are talking directly to each other. Here is a sign of movement and a sign of hope for the future. I am sure that all delegations in this Assembly hope that these talks will be fruitful and that they not only will achieve their own direct humanitarian purpose but will also prove to be the first steps along a road leading ultimately to the resolution of the Korean problem.

135. My delegation believes that in these new circumstances the General Assembly would wish to await further developments before resuming consideration of the Korean question. Let us hope that next year it will be possible for the General Assembly to take up the question in a new spirit, to look at the question with fresh eyes, and to make a constructive and helpful contribution to the problems as we have not been able to make in our stereotyped debates of recent years. Let us accordingly agree to abstain this year from a discussion which might hinder, rather than assist, the progress of the talks which have begun in Korea.

136. I accordingly hope that the General Assembly will approve the recommendation of the General Committee which covers all the three items and which should be taken as a whole.

137. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation considers it necessary, in with the discussion of the General Committee's report by the plenary General Assembly, to protest most vigorously against the ~~total~~ action taken by the United States delegation and certain other delegations supporting it, particularly the United Kingdom delegation, with a view to preventing consideration of items relating to Korea at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly under the pretext of postponing them to the twenty-seventh session of the Assembly.

138. These extremely important items, that is, the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and the dissolution of the infamous and illegally constituted United Nations Commission on Korea, were proposed for consideration at this Assembly by 20 socialist and Afro-Asian States Members of the United Nations.

139. Why, for the first time in many years of discussing items relating to Korea in the United Nations, has the United States delegation decided at just this point to resort to subterfuges dating from the days of the cold-war in order to block discussion of these questions in the Assembly? Why has the United States delegation chosen just this moment to go back on its previously much-vaunted claim

that the United States never hinders discussion in the General Assembly of questions submitted by other countries? The answer is quite simple. The fact is that the United States is seriously alarmed lest any genuine concrete measures should be taken to end the division of Korea and unite that country. That is the only possible explanation for the United States manoeuvre.

140. It is still more obvious to everyone now that the aim of the United States, in objecting so bitterly to General Assembly discussion of the withdrawal of United States and other foreign forces from South Korea, is to maintain the presence of its occupation forces in the territory of that country, which has been turned into a military base and staging area in the Far East. At the same time, the United States, the United Kingdom and the other parties to and advocates of the continued occupation of South Korea are also preventing consideration of the dissolution of the United Nations Commission on Korea in order to preserve this artificial, spurious entity within the United Nations system as a screen for continued foreign interference in the internal affairs of the Korean people.

141. This narrowly self-seeking imperialistic approach on the part of those who are trying to maintain the occupation of South Korea must be rejected.

142. The need for a speedy solution to the problem of the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations has long been an urgent one. It is the duty of the United Nations to take up this question without delay at the current, twenty-sixth, session of the General Assembly and not put it off to the next session. This is made imperative by the tense situation prevailing in the Korean area, where for many years a dangerous centre of international tension has continued to exist, maintained and nurtured by the forces of imperialism. This tension is caused first and foremost by the continued occupation of South Korea by the forces of the United States and its military-bloc allies contrary to the clearly expressed will of the Korean people. The maintenance of foreign troops on Korean soil, the numerous military provocations against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the area of the thirty-eighth parallel which divides South and North Korea and in the air-space and territorial waters of that country, and the escalation of military preparations in South Korea all create a very serious situation not only in the Korean area but throughout the Far East and are turning that area into a dangerous hot-bed of war.

143. As a result of this policy, the problem of the reunification of Korea remains unsolved. And the main obstacle to achieving peace on the Korean peninsula and to the peaceful unification of the country is still the illegal occupation of the southern part of Korea by foreign troops. Moreover, an illegal and clearly demagogic attempt is being made to use the flag of the United Nations as a cover for this foreign occupation to the serious detriment of the prestige and authority of the Organization, which is being used not to strengthen peace but as a cover for a policy of preparation for war.

144. It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet delegation insists most emphatically that the question of

the dissolution of the United Nations Commission on Korea should be included in the agenda for the twenty-sixth session. This Commission, which consists of supporters of the continued foreign occupation of South Korea, serves but one purpose: intervention in the internal affairs of the Korean people in the interests of external forces. To attain the peaceful unification of Korea without any external intervention, by the forces and the good sense of the Korean people themselves, this Commission, which should more rightly be called the Commission for the Disunification and the Continued Occupation of Korea, should be dissolved without delay, since all it promotes is the continued division of Korea and a dangerous exacerbation of the situation in that area.

145. The Korean question must be resolved by the Korean people themselves, according to their will and by their own efforts, in a peaceful, democratic manner. A practical method of resolving this question was indicated in April of this year at the Fifth Supreme People's Assembly of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The People's Assembly put forward an eight-point proposal, the purpose of which was to speed up the democratic, peaceful unification of Korea.

146. It is useful to recall this truly popular programme for the peaceful, democratic unification of Korea, especially for those few people who perhaps still permit themselves to be swayed by the infamous fabrications of imperialist propaganda about a supposed "threat from the North". The programme provides for the following measures which are both important and capable of practical implementation:

First, the withdrawal from South Korea of the aggressive forces of United States imperialism, since this is essential in order to bring about a relaxation of tension and remove the danger of war.

Second, a reduction in the strength of the armed forces of North and South to a maximum of 100,000 following the withdrawal of United States troops. This will create an atmosphere of trust and remove the burden of military expenditure imposed on the population.

Third, the United States-South Korean Defence Treaty, the Japanese-South Korean Treaty and all other treaties concluded between South Korea and other countries and running counter to the interests of the Korean people to be declared inoperative.

Fourth, general, democratically conducted elections to be held following the withdrawal of United States troops from South Korea.

Fifth, freedom of political activity for different political parties and public organizations to be guaranteed throughout South and North Korea. All patriots imprisoned in South Korea on charges of fighting for the unification of their country to be freed. Freedom of speech, press and assembly, including the holding of mass meetings, to be guaranteed.

Sixth, the creation, if necessary, of a confederation of North and South as an intermediate step towards the complete unification of the country. If this is unac-

ceptable to South Korea, it would be possible to set up a supreme national committee to discuss and co-ordinate measures aimed at achieving unification.

Seventh, measures to promote trade, economic co-operation and scientific, cultural sports and other types of exchanges between the North and the South.

Eighth, the convening of a political consultative conference of representatives of the various political parties and public organizations of South and North Korea to discuss problems relating to the unification of Korea.

147. Quite recently, on 6 August, the head of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Kim Il Sung, emphasized once again the readiness of the North Koreans to establish contacts with all South Korean political parties, public organizations and individuals, including the Democratic Republican Party, at any time. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has made and is today making constant efforts to bring about the rapid unification of Korea on a peaceful, democratic basis. At this moment, contacts are being established between the Red Cross organizations of South and North Korea to discuss such questions as freedom of travel, reciprocal visits to families, relatives and friends, freedom of postal communication between them, and a search for families scattered over the south and north of the country and arrangements for them to meet. The aim of the negotiations under way between representatives of the Red Cross organizations of South and North Korea is to promote a successful solution of the humanitarian questions that have been raised, which will, in turn, help to create the necessary conditions for a widening and deepening of mutual understanding in order to bring about the peaceful unification of that divided country.

148. In this situation, it is all the more significant that, literally on the day following these encouraging steps taken by the two Korean parties, the United States, disturbed by the way in which events were developing, decided to prevent consideration of the items relating to Korea at the current session of the General Assembly.

149. Thus, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is taking a step forward towards the peaceful unification of Korea while the United States is pulling in the opposite direction to perpetuate the occupation of South Korea.

150. The choice in this situation for the United Nations is absolutely clear. It must make a useful contribution towards creating the favourable conditions necessary for a just solution of the Korean problem by peaceful, democratic means. To this end the General Assembly should discuss and take decisions on the questions of the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission on Korea. It is this decision that is needed to remove these serious and deliberately created obstacles to the unification of Korea. It is the duty of the United Nations to remove these obstacles.

151. The Soviet delegation calls on other delegations to vote for the inclusion of these two items relating to Korea

in the agenda for the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly so that the Assembly may discuss them fully and take just decisions.

152. We therefore support the Mongolian representative's proposal to put the recommendation contained in paragraph 18 of the General Committee's report to a separate vote, which will mean that we shall vote against that recommendation and for the inclusion of these two items in the agenda of the General Assembly.

153. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): My delegation has asked for the floor to voice its support of previous speakers who have urged that items 106 and 107, relating to the Korean question, be included in the agenda of the twenty-sixth session and discussed in all their aspects. The two items touch upon two important aspects of the question: firstly, the political desirability of allowing the United Nations flag to be used as a cover for the continued presence of foreign forces in part of a divided country; and secondly, the danger to international peace presented by the presence of foreign troops and bases on the soil of another country.

154. At the time the Korean armistice was concluded 19 years ago, the two military Commanders of the opposing forces made a recommendation that their respective forces be withdrawn within an agreed period.⁶ While the foreign forces which had been stationed in the northern part of the country were withdrawn, those in the southern part of the country remained. Today we find more than 50,000 United States troops based there, ostensibly for the purpose of protecting the South Korean people from aggression.

155. Whatever might have been the reasons which prompted this Organization 20 years ago to lend its name and authority to a highly questionable operation in Korea, what is clear today is that there is no justification for the continuance of the operation. The United Nations contribution to the post-war solution of the Korean question must be to create or promote the political conditions in which the peoples of North and South Korea can meet and shape their future destiny. The presence in their midst of a foreign army is not conducive to that end. The least that this Assembly can do is to discuss the reasons for the presence of those forces, their withdrawal, and the question of the proper role of the United Nations in Korea, in view of changed circumstances.

156. It has been said that, because the local Red Cross organizations have used their good offices to secure some agreement between the authorities of North and South Korea on humanitarian matters, the United Nations should not disturb the situation by debate at this stage.

157. But we all know that the role of the International Red Cross, or the local Red Cross, is limited and that no action on its part can in any way affect the political situation. We must not expect it to serve as a substitute for the positive and constructive role which the United Nations can play in a matter which is so fundamentally political. The North Korean authorities have made a number of positive and far-reaching proposals for a peaceful solution

of the Korean question. We at the United Nations have a special responsibility in preparing the atmosphere, in creating the conditions, in which such proposals can hope to achieve a measurable degree of success.

158. We can do that by insisting upon the withdrawal of all foreign forces and the disbandment of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, which serves to symbolize the so-called presence of the United Nations in Korea. In my delegation's view, the money used to sustain such a Commission—I believe it is in the region of half a million dollars a year—could be used more profitably and more lawfully in the promotion of other United Nations activities.

159. It has been suggested that the debates on this question have continued along the same lines each year and that we should give the question a rest. It would not surprise my delegation if next year we were asked to put these two items into limbo.

160. No, that is not the way to solve problems, however distasteful they may be to some Members. We must face them, even though doing so involves facing a number of embarrassing facts. We should face them and discuss them rather than think we can run away from them by pressing for the postponement of their consideration.

161. I trust the Assembly will, by a large majority, vote in favour of the inclusion of these two items in the agenda.

162. Mr. BAHOLLI (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The General Committee of this Assembly yesterday decided to recommend that the discussion of item 106 of the draft agenda relating to the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign troops occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations, and of item 107, on the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, should be postponed until the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

163. The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania believes that such a recommendation is unjust and hopes that this Assembly will remedy this injustice. It is notorious that if a Korean problem still exists, it is because of the aggression perpetrated by the United States of America in Korea 21 years ago and the prolongation of that crime until today. Blemishing the United Nations flag by its aggression in Korea, the United States brought war to the homes of the Korean people, brought about the division of the nation into two parts and foreign occupation of the southern part of the territory.

164. Having failed in its effort to occupy all Korea, American imperialism, faced with the struggle of the Korean people and volunteers from the Chinese people, was forced to sign the Armistice Agreement of 1953. Nevertheless it did and is doing everything in its power, with the support of the puppet administration, to maintain its forces in South Korea with the purpose of using them as a beachhead of aggression against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the People's Republic of China and other peace-loving peoples of Asia.

⁶ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Annexes*, agenda item 16, document A/2228.

165. As a result of imperialist aggression, the evolution of events in Korea is following two completely different courses. In occupied South Korea, development is at a standstill, and the life of the people is characterized by unemployment poverty and ignorance. On the other hand, in the North, in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, life moves forward with enthusiasm. Economic and social development is on the rise. Last year, having successfully completed the seven-year plan, the people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea began working to accomplish a new six-year plan, 1971-1976.

166. The continuation of the American occupation of South Korea is a serious obstacle to the unification of the country and constitutes a persistent threat to the freedom of the Korean people. The national aspiration of the Korean people is the reunification of the country into a democratic and advanced State, but this is hampered in the first place by the presence of United States occupation troops in Korea.

167. The so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, for its part, is nothing more than an instrument of American imperialism and as such must be dissolved. The interests of the Korean people and of peace in that area demand that United States armed forces withdraw from South Korea and that the Korean people be left free to decide on the destiny of its homeland.

168. The Albanian delegation believes that on the two items the United Nations must take a decision that compels the United States of America to withdraw its troops from Korea.

169. For all these reasons, and so that the Korean question may emerge from the deadlock of 18 consecutive years, our delegation believes that there must be a discussion of agenda items 106 and 107 of the draft agenda.

170. Mr. SMIRNOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The Byelorussian delegation protests against the General Committee's recommendation to postpone discussion of items 106 and 107 to the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

171. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic is one of 20 delegations of socialist and Afro-Asian States that have proposed the inclusion of the items "Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations" and "Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" in the agenda of the twenty-sixth session.

172. Those sponsoring the inclusion of these items in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly are in favour of thorough discussion and a positive solution of all problems connected with the ending of the discriminatory relationship between the United Nations and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and with the ending of foreign aggression in South Korea. It is our deeply held conviction that representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of South Korea should take part in the discussion of these questions. There can be no doubt

that this would help to bring about a solution of the Korean problem in the interests, first and foremost, of the entire Korean people and of all the peoples of the Far East.

173. Why do those who oppose discussion of these questions at the current session wish to postpone consideration of them until the next, twenty-seventh, session of the General Assembly? Firstly, because discussion of the Korean questions will, they assert, interfere with the negotiations between the Red Cross organizations of South and North Korea. And, secondly, because these are not urgent questions, as the representative of Belgium said in the General Committee; it would seem there are, we are told, plenty of items on the agenda already.

174. We might have expected such unimpressive arguments from some of the Western States. Over the many years that the Korean questions have been under discussion we have witnessed two approaches to them.

175. The socialist countries and many Afro-Asian and other countries make sincere efforts to solve the Korean problem and to help the Korean people achieve their dream: the unification of their country. The advocates of this approach welcome the contacts which were proposed long ago by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and began in August of this year between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea. They propose that we should not put off discussion of the items on the withdrawal of United States forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations and on the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea but should deal with them at this session. We also feel that discussion of these items this year rather than next year will help to consolidate any results that may be achieved and will further the contacts now under way.

176. The advocates of the other approach have never wanted the Korean problem to be solved and have never wanted to help the Korean people unite their country. Even now, guided only by these considerations, they are proposing that discussion of items 106 and 107 should be postponed until next year. Moreover, they are trying to put a good face on matters by asserting that they do not wish to hinder the contacts that have begun.

177. It is clear to anyone with any common sense that the negotiations under way between the Red Cross organizations of South and North Korea can only have one outcome: to facilitate discussion of the Korean questions in the United Nations. At the same time, discussion of these questions in the United Nations can also, given a reasonable approach on the part of all delegations, have only one outcome: to help promote the contacts in Korea. And all this taken together facilitates the solution of the Korean problem as a whole. However, a solution of the Korean problem is not possible without the withdrawal of United States forces from Korea and the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission. It is to this that the Western Powers do not wish to give their assent. That is why they are against discussion of these questions at the current session.

178. They say that discussion of items 106 and 107 in the United Nations will hinder the contacts in Korea, but they

do not explain why. Indeed, no explanation is possible, for all the items on the agenda of the General Assembly are discussed somewhere else, in other places and in other States. Is this to serve as the basis for postponing the whole agenda until the twenty-seventh session and not holding the twenty-sixth session at all?

179. It is clear to everyone that this is not the reason for the position adopted by the Western Powers.

180. There is no sensible explanation that can be given for their proposal to postpone the discussion until the twenty-seventh session. Is it perhaps that the same questions whose discussions we are calling for at this session of the General Assembly are being discussed at the meetings in Panmunjom between the Red Cross delegations of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of South Korea? No. I was in Panmunjom a few days ago just at the time when the first meetings were being held between the Red Cross delegations. They are discussing quite different questions, namely questions related to the search for families, relatives and friends separated by United States aggression under the United Nations flag. Is anyone here prepared to state that the Red Cross can solve the question of the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations or the question of the dissolution of the United Nations Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea?

181. These questions can be resolved only by the United Nations, by the current session of the General Assembly. And that is what we are proposing. Discussion in the General Assembly and the negotiations at Panmunjom are not mutually exclusive. On the contrary, they complement each other. However, the Western Powers do not want to agree with this either.

182. There are other reasons why the Western Powers and their supporters are proposing that discussion of these questions should be postponed for a whole year. They wish to gain time. And why do they need time? They need time to carry out the so-called "Nixon doctrine", which essentially involves setting Asians against Asians by mobilizing puppet governments in Asia. In this context, for example, the United States imperialists, under the pretext of re-deploying the United States armed forces in the Far East in accordance with the so-called plan to cut back United States forces, are intensively reinforcing the combat contingent of their occupation force in South Korea, and recently they even invented a so-called South Korean-United States mixed corps. The United States imperialists are increasing their air and naval forces on a grand scale. They are systematically sending large groups of bombers and tactical aircraft to Korea from the territory of Japan and Okinawa. As one of the links in the strengthening of their naval forces they have formed a special operations fleet from vessels of the Seventh Fleet and have given it orders to stand by in the coastal waters of Korea.

183. At the same time, the United States imperialists have raised the strength of their puppet army in South Korea to 700,000 men. They have created a local defence army reserve numbering 2.5 million men and are hurriedly providing it with a full range of weapons and converting it

into a combat force. It is also common knowledge that the army of South Korea, numbering nearly 50,000, is taking part in the aggression against the peoples of Indo-China.

184. The United States imperialists have, in addition, taken a number of new measures, including the setting up of an air transport operations system for the rapid transfer of large military contingents from Japan and the United States to Korea. Time is needed for all this, too. That is why the Korean items are being postponed until next year. I could cite a number of other examples, but what has been said is enough to make it clear why they need to play for time and postpone for another year any discussion of the items we have proposed.

185. This is the true picture—not the one given by the Western Powers when they contend they do not wish to hinder contacts.

186. Nor does the suggestion by the representatives of certain States that discussion of the Korean questions should be postponed because the agenda is very full and the Korean questions are not urgent stand up to criticism. One cannot agree with that suggestion. Armed troops are facing one another in that area. The *Pueblo* incident, the violations of the airspace of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and violations of the armistice could escalate into major military operations at any time. In short, the situation there today is such that it represents a threat to peace.

187. In the period of less than 24 hours during which we were in Kaesong on 29 August of this year, the firing of 14,000 rounds of small-arms and artillery ammunition was recorded in that area from positions occupied by United States and South Korean puppet forces—14,000 rounds in less than 24 hours.

188. That is why the items we have proposed cannot be postponed and must be considered at the current session of the General Assembly.

189. One of the principal reasons for our insistence on the inclusion of these items in the agenda of the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly is the fact that the United Nations has an obligation to fulfil to the Korean people. As everyone is aware, the boots of American soldiers have been trampling the earth of South Korea for more than 20 years contrary to the clearly expressed will of the Korean people, which is to attain freedom and unity for their country. Having committed under the flag of the United Nations an act of aggression against the Korean people, the United States troops are continuing their illegal use of the designation "United Nations force" and of the Organization's flag as a cover for their monstrous crimes against the Korean people. It is a secret to no one that the presence of the United States occupation forces in the territory of South Korea is the principal, fundamental reason for the division of the country into two parts.

190. As a body whose principal aim under the Charter is to maintain international peace and security, the United Nations must eliminate this dangerous hot-bed of aggression in the Far East and help to bring about lasting peace in that area. This will be in keeping with the interests not only of

the Korean people but of all the peoples of that part of the world and will ultimately help to improve the international situation as a whole.

191. The items "Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations" and "Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" are of great and immediate importance for the future of the Korean people. The state of international affairs not only in the Far East but throughout Asia depends on whether a solution is found to these problems. A positive solution will help to enhance the authority and effectiveness of the United Nations.

192. At the same time, we oppose discussion in the United Nations of item 108 on the so-called "Question of Korea: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea", since it represents interference in the internal affairs of the Korean people and a violation of the United Nations Charter.

193. The Byelorussian delegation strongly urges the General Assembly to include items 106 and 107 in the agenda of the twenty-sixth session.

194. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand): Mr. President, on this first occasion that my delegation takes the floor at this session, I wish warmly to congratulate you on your election as our presiding officer, and I offer you the full co-operation of my delegation.

195. The New Zealand delegation supports the recommendation of the General Committee that items 106, 107 and 108 of the draft agenda [A/BUR/177], all relating to Korea, should be included in the provisional agenda of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

196. An important and very encouraging development has recently taken place in the Korean peninsula. For the first time since the outbreak of war there in June 1950 representatives of both North and South Korea have met on their own at Panmunjom in recent weeks to discuss a matter of common and vital concern. The Red Cross societies of the two parts of Korea held the first substantive session of their preliminary talks for the search and reunion of separated families in South and North Korea at the truce village of Panmunjom on 21 September last. The matter being discussed between the Red Cross representatives of North and South Korea is of great humanitarian importance to the people on both sides. If it can be settled, a major step will have been taken towards reducing tension between the two sides and improving the prospects for the resolution of their differences over a much wider field.

197. There are times when, in fulfilment of the Charter principle that the United Nations should be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations, the best course for the General Assembly to adopt is silence. We believe, that, in the interests of a settlement of the problems of the Korean peninsula, this is such a time.

198. My delegation considers it important that nothing should be done, nothing should be said at this time in this forum to jeopardize these prospects or to prejudice the

success of these current discussions. We fear that another debate this year on the question of Korea could have such an effect. We would note the fact that these talks have begun since the request for the inclusion of the items was submitted over one month ago. We believe that Members of the Assembly, if not the sponsors of items 106 and 107 of the draft agenda, would wish to take this fact into account when deciding not to provide an opportunity at this session for an arid and unproductive debate on the issues raised in the explanatory memoranda and in the polemical statements of some of the preceding speakers. The arguments are not new. We see little chance that a debate on them could produce constructive results. We therefore support the recommendation of the General Committee that consideration of the Korean items should be deferred to the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly, and we urge other Members of the Assembly to do likewise.

199. Mr. POLYANICHKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The Ukrainian SSR is a co-sponsor of the proposal to include the two items "Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations" and "Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" in the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly. Together with other socialist States and a number of Asian and African States, we have called for discussion of these two questions because of our deep conviction that this is in keeping with the national aspirations of the Korean people and also with the interests of the United Nations.

200. It is the innermost wish of the Korean people, who have been living in a country divided into two parts for more than a quarter of a century, to see their homeland united and free from foreign occupation. Because of the attitude taken by the South Korean authorities there is no communication between the populations of the North and the South.

201. The Korean problem definitely can and must be solved by the Korean people themselves without any external interference. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea has repeatedly put forward constructive proposals aimed at achieving the peaceful, democratic unification of their country.

202. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ho Dam, speaking at the fifth session of the Fifth Supreme People's Assembly in April of this year, set out a programme for the independent unification of the country. This programme calls for general elections, free and democratically conducted, to be held, for freedom of political activity to be guaranteed throughout the country, for the establishment, if necessary, of a confederation of North and South as an intermediate step towards complete unification of the country, and for measures to promote economic co-operation and scientific, cultural and other types of exchanges between the North and the South.

203. However, the prime and indispensable condition for the unification of Korea, as has been stated on more than one occasion by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, is the withdrawal of United

States and all other foreign forces from South Korea. Those forces have been there, under the flag of the United Nations, for more than 20 years. There have been many changes in the world during that time and many changes have taken place on the Korean peninsula and in our United Nations itself, but to this day the blue flag of the Organization is being used as a cover for the occupation of South Korea by foreign troops.

204. Together with other delegations from the socialist and Afro-Asian countries, the Ukrainian delegation proposes that this abnormal situation should be discussed. We consider that the name and the authority of the United Nations must not serve as a cover for foreign interference in the internal affairs of the Korean people.

205. We also feel that the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly should discuss and take a positive decision on the question of the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. The United States is using its name as a screen and as a tool for political interference in the internal affairs of Korea and the Korean people.

206. We are told that discussion at this session of the items relating to Korea may hinder the contacts that have begun between the Red Cross organizations of North and South Korea. That argument is totally unfounded. Moreover, it hides an attempt to put a spoke in the wheel of further contacts between North and South Korea.

207. The withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea, the termination of its occupation by those troops and the disbanding of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea will help to create favourable conditions for a fruitful dialogue between the representatives of North and South Korea. This has been repeatedly stressed—and I wish to draw your attention to the fact—in statements by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which, whenever the question of the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces from South Korea and the question of the dissolution of the "United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" have been included in the agenda of the General Assembly, have not only supported the

inclusion of these items but also requested permission for its representatives to take part in the discussion.

208. To avoid discussion of these questions at the current session of the General Assembly would be to commit yet another act of injustice against the Korean people, to turn our backs on their legitimate aspirations and to gravely prejudice United Nations efforts to help the Korean people solve the problem of unifying their country.

209. The delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic hopes that a majority of the delegations to the General Assembly will take an understanding attitude towards the request for the inclusion in the agenda, the two items relating to Korea, a request sponsored by Asian, African, European and Latin American States.

210. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Bulgaria on a point of order

211. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): The question we are now discussing the postponement until next year of the three items relating to Korea—is extremely important. I believe that this question deserves to be discussed in the General Assembly when all members are present, not at a time when attendance is thinning out.

212. Accordingly I propose that the Assembly postpone this item until another meeting since all of us, we and you, Sir, have other business to attend to this evening.

213. The PRESIDENT: According to rule 78 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly,

"During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the suspension or the adjournment of the meeting. Such motions shall not be debated, but shall be immediately put to the vote. . . ."

Accordingly, I shall put the representative of Bulgaria's motion for adjournment to the vote.

The motion was adopted by 73 votes to 18, with 18 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.