

**United Nations**  
**GENERAL**  
**ASSEMBLY**

**TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION**

**Official Records**



**1919th**  
**PLENARY MEETING**

*Monday, 7 December 1970,*  
*at 3 p.m.*

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

Agenda items 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 93 and 94:

Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament  
Report of the First Committee .....

Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament  
Report of the First Committee .....

Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament  
Report of the First Committee .....

Implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: report of the Secretary-General  
Report of the First Committee .....

Establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency  
Report of the First Committee .....

Status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2456 B (XXIII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)  
Report of the First Committee .....

Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security  
Report of the First Committee .....

Agenda item 98:

Question of Korea:

(a) Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations;

(b) Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea;

(c) Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea

Report of the First Committee ..... 6

Working group on the financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East 12

**President: Mr. Edvard HAMBRO (Norway).**

**AGENDA ITEMS 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 93 AND 94**

**Question of general and complete disarmament: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament**

**REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8198)**

**Question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament**

**REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8179)**

Page

**Urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests: report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament**

**REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8180)**

**Implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States: report of the Secretary-General**

**REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8192)**

**Establishment, within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency, of an international service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes under appropriate international control: report of the International Atomic Energy Agency**

**REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8193)**

**Status of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 2456 B (XXIII) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco)**

**REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8181)**

**Economic and social consequences of the armaments race and its extremely harmful effects on world peace and security**

**REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8184)**

1. The PRESIDENT: I request Mr. Černík, the Rapporteur of the First Committee, to present in one intervention the Committee's reports on agenda items 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 93 and 94.

2. Mr. ČERNÍK (Czechoslovakia), Rapporteur of the First Committee: I have the honour to present to this plenary meeting of the General Assembly the reports of the First Committee on the seven items relating to disarmament problems, namely, agenda items 27 [A/8198], 28 [A/8179], 29 [A/8180], 30 [A/8192], 31 [A/8193], 93 [A/8181] and 94 [A/8184].

3. At its 1726th meeting, on 3 October 1970, the First Committee decided to hold a combined general debate on all of the seven above-mentioned agenda items. The general debate took place at the 1748th to 1762nd meetings of the Committee, from 2 to 16 November 1970.

4. In connexion with the individual items, the Committee adopted a number of draft resolutions which are contained in the reports submitted.

5. First, in connexion with item 27, the First Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the four draft resolutions contained in paragraph 27 of its report [A/8198]: draft resolution I, concerning the treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof; and parts A, B and C of draft resolution II. In this connexion it should also be noted that the Secretariat, in consultation with the depositary Governments, will take the necessary steps to ensure that the texts of the treaty, in the five languages referred to in article XI, are equally authentic.

6. Secondly, in connexion with item 28, the First Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 11 of its report [A/8179].

7. Thirdly, in connexion with item 29, the First Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of draft resolutions A and B contained in paragraph 12 of its report [A/8180].

8. Fourthly, in connexion with item 30, the First Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 8 of its report [A/8192].

9. Fifthly, in connexion with 31, the First Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 8 of its report [A/8193].

10. Sixthly, in connexion with item 93, the First Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 8 of its report [A/8181].

11. Seventhly, in connexion with item 94, the First Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 7 of its report [A/8184].

*Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the First Committee.*

12. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes on the draft resolutions recommended in the First Committee under item 27.

13. Mr. SHARIF (Indonesia): My delegation has asked to speak in order to explain the vote it is going to cast on draft resolution I in document A/8198, commending the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof—a draft resolution on which it voted differently in the First Committee.

14. My delegation had ample time in the First Committee to explain the Indonesian position on the draft treaty itself. We welcomed last year the initiative of the two major nuclear Powers in proposing such a draft treaty in the context of total demilitarization of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and we are equally indebted to the members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament for having prepared in the space of a year the text of the draft treaty.

15. We have stated our doubts, particularly on the articles referring to the Geneva Convention of 1958 on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone,<sup>1</sup> to which Indonesia is not a party. Consisting of not less than 13,000 islands, large and small, and with most irregular depths of the waters around, between and connecting those islands, and with a coastline which is much longer than the Equator, Indonesia, like any other archipelago, regards the seas surrounding its component islands as of utmost importance to the people of its islands, not only as part and parcel of its national life and a God-given source of livelihood, but for the security of the entire nation as well.

16. On these unique considerations of an archipelago-State, the Indonesian Government has regulated the Indonesian continental shelf and the Indonesian waters—including safe passage for peaceful traffic of foreign vessels in our waters—by legislation, and no treaty should encroach upon our national jurisdiction, whether directly or indirectly.

17. Since no observers were allowed at the proceedings of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, my Government had no knowledge of the text of the draft treaty until the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament [A/8059] was circulated in New York at the beginning of our present session. For such an important matter as agreement to the limitation of a twelve-mile sea-bed zone for our own defence arrangements, time was indeed too short. The more so since no security guarantees have been obtained from the nuclear-weapon States, particularly from the one in our area.

18. We are indeed appreciative of the sincere efforts of the delegations of Peru, El Salvador and others further to improve the text of the treaty in the First Committee. Like them, we would have preferred to have a prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the entire sea-bed and ocean floor, and a complete demilitarization of those areas.

19. After the deliberations in the First Committee, we continued to study the matter further and through consultations we have received additional explanations. It seems clear by now, much to our regret, that no total prohibition is possible as yet in present world developments, and the present draft treaty seems to be the maximum that we can achieve at this time. Placing emphasis now on article V, which states that: "The Parties to this Treaty undertake to continue negotia-

<sup>1</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 516 (1964), No. 7477.

tions in good faith concerning further measures in the field of disarmament for the prevention of an arms race on the sea-bed, the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof', my delegation has found it possible to recognize that—however imperfect and limited it may be—the treaty is a starting point for further progress which may lead to a total prohibition against installing nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction in the entire marine environment.

20. It is in this spirit of good faith and hope for its beneficial influence on arms control negotiations between the major nuclear Powers and on international relations as a whole that my delegation has decided to vote now in favour of the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee.

21. Our affirmative vote on the draft resolution should, however, in no way be interpreted as denoting approval of the draft treaty attached to the draft resolution, nor should it prejudice the final position that my Government will adopt towards the signing of it. We will continue to study and analyse the new treaty.

22. Mr. KHANACHET (Kuwait): My delegation abstained in the vote in the First Committee on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.523, which now appears in document A/8198, because it wished to record its objection to the approach adopted in the latter stages of the drafting of the treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof.

23. It is the understanding of my delegation that all States should have an equal opportunity to participate in all phases of the conclusion of a treaty, including the drafting of it. This includes the right of all States to suggest amendments and changes before the final text is approved.

24. Moreover, in this specific instance the draft treaty should have been submitted to the sea-bed Committee,<sup>2</sup> which should have debated it at length and discussed every one of its preambular and operative paragraphs separately. We regret that the competence of the sea-bed Committee has been ignored and that the normal procedures applicable to the drafting and conclusion of treaties have been overlooked, both in the sea-bed Committee and in the First Committee.

25. We believe that the present trend to treat certain treaties as the exclusive reserve of big Powers or of a limited number of countries can only lead to a polarization of the United Nations and constitute a serious infringement of the sovereign equality of all States, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

26. While my delegation will cast an affirmative vote on the draft resolution commending the treaty, it wishes to place on record its reservations regarding the manner in which the treaty was concluded and the approach

of the big Powers to treaties relating to disarmament in general. At the same time, I should like to affirm that the Government of Kuwait reserves its position regarding signature and the ratification of the treaty.

27. Mr. DE SOTO (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation has already at great length made known its views regarding the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof.

28. I would merely wish, on behalf of my Government, to reiterate here that Peru regrets the way in which this draft treaty was submitted to the General Assembly, a way which did not give delegations adequate time to make known their views and to have their comments on the substantive aspects noted.

29. I would merely wish to repeat that, despite the good intentions that may have dictated the submission of the draft resolution and the draft treaty, my delegation and Government still feel that this draft and this treaty do not constitute disarmament measures, and that as measures of arms limitation, they are poor since they allow the emplacement of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction where they do not at present exist.

30. However, I repeat that this in no way affects the negative vote of Peru regarding the draft resolution commending the draft treaty, and in no way prejudices the commitments to which Peru is linked by the Treaty of Tlatelolco.<sup>3</sup>

31. Mr. GALINDO POHL (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In the First Committee [1757th meeting] my delegation referred at length to the draft resolution which the General Assembly is now discussing and which commends the draft treaty on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof, and which requests that that draft treaty be opened for signature. I shall not repeat here in detail the arguments adduced in the First Committee regarding the internal inconsistencies in the draft treaty, inconsistencies that reduce its usefulness as a secure source of contractual obligations, nor the reasons that prompt us to consider that this draft treaty goes beyond its objectives and brings into play political and legal arguments to support the maritime claims of certain Powers.

32. As far as its basic objectives are concerned, the draft treaty unnecessarily involves the Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone that was signed in Geneva on 29 April 1958. This gratuitous reference to the Geneva Convention, which has no bearing on the goals of the draft treaty, might lead one to believe that this draft treaty has two objectives: the first and most important, the denuclearization of the sea-bed; and the other, and collateral objective,

<sup>2</sup> Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction.

<sup>3</sup> Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, opened for signature on 14 February 1967.

to strengthen certain claims of marine law. The draft declares that the denuclearized zone overlaps the contiguous zone defined in the Geneva Convention. Apart from being unnecessary, that is inaccurate; and furthermore it mentions the territorial sea, which is also unnecessary, since the General Assembly is considering the holding of a third conference on the law of the sea which we trust will be studying, among other subjects, the territorial sea.

33. With regard to the main objective, that is, the denuclearization of the sea-bed, my delegation entirely supports it for we feel it to be urgent that nuclear weapons be not emplaced on the sea-bed; apart from this my delegation has pointed out that we would prefer the total denuclearization of the seas from coast to coast, because of the obvious and enormous dangers of contamination and pollution if nuclear weapons should be emplaced along the twelve-mile coastal zone.

34. But apart from these disadvantages which touch on national maritime policies, the draft treaty does raise other problems which have a bearing on its internal coherence and structure and which have nothing to do with the position of El Salvador regarding maritime law. I will sum up these problems.

35. First, paragraphs 1 and 2 of article I establish respectively over the same zone an absolute prohibition on the emplacement of nuclear weapons, and a relative prohibition which excepts the coastal State. If the treaty is conceived of in these terms, in its very essence it carries the seeds of a problem that will arise when one tries to interpret or implement the treaty. As far as the draft treaty itself is concerned, the absolute prohibition would have to refer to that zone beyond the twelve-mile zone from the coasts and the relative prohibition, which excepts the coastal State, would refer to the twelve-mile belt.

36. Secondly, the right of verification set forth in article III does not refer to the denuclearized zone where obviously it should be applied; rather it refers to what lies beyond that zone, that is, the twelve-mile coastal zone. And yet it may be presumed that there is no intention of establishing the right of verification in that coastal belt, but rather in the denuclearized zone itself.

37. Thirdly, very often the expression "beyond" is used, and particularly beginning in article I, paragraph 1, which says that the denuclearized zone is that which lies "beyond the outer limit" and so on "as defined in Article II"; and that zone mentioned in article II is the belt that lies beyond the twelve-mile limit, which means that what should be denuclearized is not being denuclearized. The repeated use of the word "beyond" in the draft treaty and never of "within" or even "in a specific zone," which should be used, will raise many misunderstandings which will be very difficult to clarify.

38. I shall not, however, refer in detail to all the other errors that I mentioned in the First Committee. I am not playing with semantics. These are not shadings that can be deleted or completed. These are not just

words to be added or deleted, which very often occur in documents of the General Assembly. We are dealing with problems of concepts which represent things, objects and obligations of a contractual nature which cannot be shuffled around as is done very often with cocophony, syntax or with mere grammar.

39. My fourth point refers to the fact that the draft treaty establishes the coincidence of the outside limit of the denuclearized zone with the outside limit of the twelve-mile zone mentioned in the Geneva Convention of 1958; it establishes that the sea-bed zone referred to is coterminous with the contiguous zone. But, in that Convention the contiguous zone is mentioned only in its broadest width, but there is no precise breadth given for it. Furthermore, the coincidence is impossible, for the contiguous sea must be measured on the surface of the water, whereas the sea-bed is measured on inclined planes. Twelve miles over an inclined plane of the sea-bed of the coastal areas are shorter than the line that would be projected from the surface of the contiguous zone to the marine floor. Between the contiguous zone and the twelve-mile limit of the sea-bed there is no coincidence, but overlap, which may be more or less accentuated, but nevertheless exists, and it is all the greater when the slope along the coastlines of the sea-bed is greater.

40. The difficulties inherent in the negotiations of a treaty of this nature do warrant the widest understanding on the part of the international community, and yet that argument is not adequate to gloss over the problems and the errors which I have mentioned. We cannot be expected to set down our arms, our regulations and our history and with them sacrifice the legal logic and the contractual techniques of international relations.

41. It is for those reasons that my delegation had, with regret, to vote against the treaty in the First Committee, and we will have again to vote against it this afternoon. Obviously that negative vote is not directed against the very laudable, important, significant and promising objectives that are being sought in the question of disarmament and non-armament by the nuclear Powers.

42. Along that road we must show our understanding of and our gratification at the agreement arrived at among the great Powers, but we can nevertheless continue to regret that some of us, the smaller countries, cannot support with our votes the texts submitted.

43. In this case my Government has preferred to stand with as considerable a minority as possible, but even were we to stand alone, we would have to vote against this document.

44. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to vote on draft resolution I, entitled "Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof", which is contained in paragraph 27 of the report of the First Committee [A/8198]. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, People's Republic of Congo, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* El Salvador, Peru.

*Abstaining:* Ecuador, France.

*Draft resolution I was adopted by 104 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions (resolution 2660 (XXV)).*

45. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Chile in explanation of vote.

46. Mr. ZEGERS (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Chilean delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution on the specific understanding and with the express reservations that we made known in the First Committee [1764th meeting].

47. The PRESIDENT: The next three draft resolutions in paragraph 27 of the report of the First Committee [A/8198] relate to general and complete disarmament.

48. I now put to the vote draft "resolution II A. A roll-call" vote has been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

*Saudi Arabia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

*In favour:* Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central Afri-

can Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, People's Republic of Congo, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Australia, Austria, Belgium, China, Finland, France, Greece, Haiti, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands.

*Draft resolution II A was adopted by 102 votes to none, with 14 abstentions (resolution 2661 A (XXV)).*

49. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote draft resolution II B.

*Draft resolution II B was adopted by 107 votes to none, with 7 abstentions (resolution 2661 B (XXV)).*

50. The General Assembly will now vote on draft resolution II C. A roll-call vote has been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Bul-



garia, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Hungary, Mongolia.

*Draft resolution II C was adopted by 106 votes to none, with 10 abstentions (resolution 2661 C (XXV)).*

51. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 11 of its report on agenda item 28 [A/8179].

*The draft resolution was adopted by 113 votes to none, with 2 abstentions (resolution 2662 (XXV)).*

52. We now turn to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 29 [A/8180]. As no delegation wishes to explain its vote the Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 12 of its report.

*Draft resolution A was adopted by 102 votes to none, with 13 abstentions (resolution 2663 A (XXV)).*

*Draft resolution B was adopted by 112 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 2663 B (XXV)).*

53. I now invite Members to turn their attention to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 30 [A/8192]. As no delegation wishes to explain its vote, the Assembly can proceed to the vote on the draft resolution recommended in paragraph 8 of the report.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 106 votes to none, with 9 abstentions (resolution 2664 (XXV)).*

54. The Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 31 [A/8193]. As no delegation has asked to explain its vote, the Assembly will vote on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 109 votes to none, with 5 abstentions (resolution 2665 (XXV)).*

55. The next report of the First Committee refers to agenda item 93 [A/8181]. Since no delegation wishes to explain its vote, the Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho,

Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Southern Yemen, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* None.

*Abstaining:* Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Sudan, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 104 votes to none, with 12 abstentions (resolution 2666 (XXV)).<sup>4</sup>*

56. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 94 [A/8184]. As no delegation wishes to explain its vote, the Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended in paragraph 7 of the report. The administrative and financial implications arising out of operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution are set forth in document A/8199.

57. Since the First Committee adopted the draft resolution unanimously, may I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

*The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 2667 (XXV)).*

## AGENDA ITEM 98

### Question of Korea:

- (a) **Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations;**
- (b) **Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea;**
- (c) **Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea**

### REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8185)

58. Mr. ČERNÍK (Czechoslovakia), Rapporteur of the First Committee: I have the honour to present to this plenary meeting of the General Assembly the report of the First Committee on item 98 [A/8185].

59. The First Committee considered this question in two parts. At its 1741st to 1747th meetings from 26 to 30 October 1970, it discussed the invitation aspects of the question. At its 1766th to 1771st meet-

<sup>4</sup> The delegation of Guyana subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to be recorded as having abstained.

ings, from 19 to 24 November 1970, it considered the substantive aspects of item 98 and, after a series of votes, adopted the draft resolution contained in paragraph 19 of the present report. Accordingly, the First Committee submits that draft resolution to the plenary General Assembly for its decision.

*Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the First Committee.*

60. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting.

61. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): Owing to my illness and the small size of my Mission, my delegation was absent when the vote was taken on the invitation aspects of the question of Korea in the First Committee. Had we been present we would have voted in favour of inviting simultaneously and without condition a representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and a representative of the Republic of Korea as interested parties to take part, without the right to vote, in the discussion of the questions relating to Korea.

62. We urge that North and South Korea should meet to iron out their difficulties as West and East Germany are doing.

63. My Government recently decided that consular relations should be established between Mauritius and South Korea. I wish this Assembly to know that this new development in the foreign affairs of Mauritius does not in any way commit my country to the cause of South Korea. The present policy of the Government of Mauritius with regard to divided countries is to avoid formal recognition of either of the two parties until the countries concerned have been reunited or recognized as separate entities of the international community.

64. In order not to jeopardize the foregoing policy, my delegation would like to ensure that at least the *status quo* is preserved in Korea. This attitude explains our vote in the First Committee on the draft resolution entitled "Withdrawal of the United States and all foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations". We shall therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 20 of its report [A/8185].

65. Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The Soviet delegation, speaking in explanation of its vote, wishes to make the following comments in connexion with the report of the First Committee, in which there was a sharp and tense political debate on the question of Korea. Two diametrically opposed approaches to questions relating to Korea emerged clearly and definitely from that debate. Bearing in mind the interests of the Korean people, the representatives of a large group of socialist and Afro-Asian countries strongly advocated an approach designed to remove the obsta-

cles to the unification of Korea, to end the foreign occupation of South Korea, to prohibit foreign intervention in any form in the internal affairs of the Korean people, to prevent a further aggravation of the situation in the Korean peninsula and, lastly, to establish peace throughout the Korean land.

66. The discussion of these questions showed most convincingly that the main obstacle preventing the Korean people from achieving its nation-wide objective—the peaceful unification of Korea by democratic means, without foreign interference—is the continuing occupation of South Korea by forces of the United States and its military allies under the United Nations flag. During the debate in the Committee, convincing facts were adduced to show that the foreign occupation forces numbering 60,000 men and the Seoul puppet régime are continuing military preparations in South Korea, transforming it into a strategic spring-board of the United States. For its part, South Korea is engaging in constant and innumerable military provocations and hostile acts against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea along the 38th parallel and in that country's air space and territorial waters. These actions by the foreign occupiers and puppet authorities are seriously aggravating the situation in the Korean peninsula.

67. The discussion in the First Committee clearly showed that South Korea has been transformed into a strategic spring-board aimed not only against the other socialist States in this area but also against the peoples of Asia fighting for their national and social liberation and against imperialist domination and foreign interference. On the orders of its protectors across the Pacific Ocean, the South Korean puppet clique has dispatched 50,000 South Korean mercenaries to take part in the aggressive war against the heroic Viet-Nameese people. The propagandist hullabaloo raised recently about plans for a cut-back in United States forces in South Korea is clearly designed to distract the attention of the international public and of States Members of the United Nations from the danger inherent in the presence and activities of United States armed forces in South Korea.

68. In actual fact, large-scale measures are being continued to expand still further the military preparations being made in South Korea under the false and hypocritical pretext of providing defence against the so-called danger from the North. In fact, there has not been and cannot be any threat to South Korea from the North. There has not been a single foreign soldier in the territory of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for a long time now. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea, a peace-loving socialist country, has never been and is not a danger for the people of South Korea. The people of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is engaged in peaceful and constructive labour, and it needs peace for the creation of a new socialist society.

69. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has again officially confirmed and stated in its memorandum of 16 September 1970 [A/C.1/1008], as it has often done in the past, that

“it has no intention to march South and has no intention to solve by force of arms the question of Korean unification”.

70. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has constantly and on many occasions put forward specific proposals for a democratic and peaceful settlement of the Korean problem. These proposals, which were expounded by many delegations in the First Committee, are motivated by a sincere concern for the fate of the Korean nation and for the interests of peace in Korea and in the Far East.

71. As was convincingly demonstrated in the statements of many delegations in the First Committee, the so-called United Nations Commission on Korea is still being used for justifying and excusing the occupation of South Korea and for grossly interfering in the affairs of the Korean people. In fact, the only countries which participate in its work are countries which are military allies of the United States. The Commission rubber-stamps reports concocted by the United States Command, falsifies the facts about the situation in North Korea and misconstrues or ignores important proposals of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea aimed at achieving unity and independence for Korea.

72. Year in and year out, this Commission has been serving as an instrument for slander and insinuation against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea—the first socialist State on Korean soil, which in a short period has achieved truly remarkable successes in economic construction and is consistently pursuing a policy of peace and peaceful unification of Korea.

73. A growing number of States Members of the United Nations are convinced that this Commission is not only failing to contribute to the solution of the Korean question in the interests of the Korean people but is one of the serious obstacles to the attainment of this goal by the Korean people. A large group of socialist and Afro-Asian States, defending the interests of the Korean people and wishing to strengthen peace in the Far East, put forward and championed a proposal to the effect that all United States and other foreign forces occupying Korea under the United Nations flag should be immediately withdrawn from that country.

74. These States also proposed the dissolution of the United Nations Commission on Korea, which is an instrument of foreign interference in the internal affairs of the Korean people. It can be said with full justification that the adoption of positive decisions on these matters would undoubtedly lead to the creation of favourable conditions for a peaceful solution of the problem and for the unification of both parts of Korea without any foreign interference and on a democratic basis by the Korean people itself, in accordance with its fervent desire to see its homeland united, free and prosperous.

75. However, the United States, and the countries which under the momentum of the period of the cold

war are following the same course on the Korean question, again frustrated the adoption in the First Committee of just decisions which would promote the interests of the Korean people and the strengthening of peace in Korea. In spite of and in violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter, they once again placed obstacles in the way of the holding of a normal, business-like discussion in the First Committee. They prevented the adoption of a resolution inviting representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as a directly interested party, to take part in the discussion of the question of Korea.

76. This act of flagrant discrimination and arbitrariness towards a socialist State has once again made clear to everyone that in the discussion of the Korean question the United States and its allies are, as before, pursuing only their selfish aims, which have nothing to do with the achievement of unity and peace in Korea. Using the votes of a number of other countries, the United States imposed on the Committee a resolution which is in flagrant contradiction with the innermost hopes and interests of the Korean people and with the goal of strengthening peace in the Korean peninsula.

77. The proposals contained in the resolution which was imposed on the First Committee and is submitted for consideration by the General Assembly have nothing to do with the real tasks of the United Nations, the true interests of the people of Korea or the cause of peace in that area. As was the case in previous years, it is proposed in this draft resolution that the continuation of the occupation of South Korea by foreign forces under the United Nations flag should be endorsed, that the existence of the notorious United Nations Commission on Korea should again be prolonged and that foreign interference in the internal affairs of the Korean people should be continued.

78. Like the delegations of many other countries which are concerned about the strengthening of peace and the interests of the Korean people, the Soviet delegation is firmly convinced that the General Assembly can play a positive role in this matter only if it directs its efforts towards ensuring that the Korean people has every possibility of accomplishing its national objectives itself, without the presence of foreign forces in its country and without any foreign interference, no matter what name or flag is used to camouflage it. There is only one true way of doing this: by withdrawing from South Korea the so-called United Nations armed forces—that is to say, the United States and other foreign forces—and dissolving the illegal United Nations Commission on Korea.

79. The Security Council is at present considering a criminal act of armed aggression by Portugal against an independent, sovereign State—the Republic of Guinea. Many representatives of Afro-Asian countries have strongly condemned this aggression in their statements in the Security Council and have demanded that the aggressor be severely punished. The act of armed aggression against Guinea is a typical manifestation of the policy of neo-colonialism and imperialism.



Another manifestation of the policy of imperialism is the attempt to transform South Korea into a strategic spring-board directed against the socialist State of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and against the national liberation movement in Asia. This is a link in the one and same chain. It is a manifestation of the one and same policy of imperialism. In view of all these actual facts of contemporary international life, the Soviet delegation appeals to all those who oppose the aggressive actions of neo-colonialism in Africa and it urges them resolutely to oppose the policy of colonialism, neo-colonialism and imperialism in all its forms and manifestations in all parts of the world and to vote against the resolution imposed on the First Committee, as being harmful to the cause of peace and contrary to the interests of the Korean people. We appeal to the delegations of all countries which hold dear the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and the interests of the Korean people, and which favour genuine national independence and freedom for all peoples on earth, to vote against this resolution.

80. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan): The substance of the Korean question was discussed at full length in the First Committee. Therefore, my present statement will be very brief, touching only on those points which are strictly relevant to the vote of my delegation.

81. We have before us the report of the First Committee, which clearly indicates to the Assembly what the Committee believes to be the right course of action. It reports that the First Committee has rejected in a most decisive manner, after thorough discussion, draft resolutions A/C.1/L.524 and A/C.1/L.525, which demanded respectively the withdrawal of the United Nations forces in Korea and the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

82. On the other hand, the First Committee has adopted by an overwhelming majority and recommended for adoption by the plenary General Assembly draft resolution A/C.1/L.531, of which my delegation was one of the sponsors.

83. My delegation is firmly convinced that this judgement of the First Committee is right and prudent because the draft resolution which it recommends for adoption is constructive and positive in its approach to the problem, both recognizing the role the United Nations should play in peacefully bringing about an independent and unified Korea and making clear the sole objective of the United Nations forces at present in Korea. By contrast, the two other draft resolutions which were rightly rejected by the First Committee were unconstructive and negative in their approach and would lead us to nothing but instability and chaos, instead of to stability and peace in the Korean peninsula.

84. The efforts made by UNCURK are indeed praiseworthy and its dissolution would not serve to lessen tensions in the area but would lead to confusion and danger. It is also clear to impartial minds that

a withdrawal of the United Nations forces over-night, without any prospect in sight of the creation of conditions for a lasting settlement in Korea, would bring about unhappy consequences.

85. For these reasons, my delegation is going to vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee which is clear, simple and definitive. I am confident that this draft resolution as recommended by the First Committee will be adopted by an overwhelming majority of the General Assembly.

86. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation spoke [1770th meeting] to the substance of the Korean question when the First Committee was considering the item. For this reason, at the moment I shall limit my statement to an explanation of vote on the draft resolution and to draw the attention of delegations to certain implications which this text raises for the General Assembly.

87. The first thing that must be said is that the draft resolution contained in paragraph 20 of document A/8185 is nothing but a repetition of identical texts which this Assembly has been constrained to adopt over a period of twenty years, with the sole object of perpetuating the division of the Korean nation, to maintain American occupation of South Korea and to encourage the interference of this Organization in the domestic affairs of the Korean people, in violation of the Charter of San Francisco itself.

88. The unimaginativeness of the sponsors of this document is obviously the result of the progressive bankruptcy gradually overtaking the anti-Korean policies which were forced upon this Organization by the United States of America. The so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea has in the last few years suffered certain vicissitudes which point to its speedy demise and dissolution, not only because that is the view of an increasing number of Member States, but because within the Commission itself that anti-Korean policy has met with greater and greater obstacles. As we know, first of all, one Member State withdrew its support for the report and this year another decided to abandon the so-called Commission.

89. While this steady process of dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission is taking place—as decreed by history and as the obvious consequence of the nature of the Commission, which is hostile to the principles of law as well as its inability to solve any problems—now the General Assembly is asked in operative paragraph 4 to note with approval the efforts made by the Commission—and to request the Commission, in paragraph 5, “to pursue these and other efforts”. The “efforts” are those to which paragraph 4 refers, and they are efforts in pursuit of the mandate imposed upon this Assembly from the very outset. Then we have a sentence of a most mysterious nature; perhaps its meaning may be deciphered by the sponsors, but by them alone, because it says: “to pursue these and other efforts”.

90. Those efforts, according to the draft resolution, must be those that are part of the mandate of the Commission. Obviously, those "other efforts" must be marginal and outside the mandate. And this again would be a *carte blanche* given by the General Assembly to the Commission, or, more specifically, to the United States to do its will with this organ as an instrument against the Korean people. In the same paragraph the Commission is asked not, as in the past, to submit its annual report to the Assembly—this time it is more general. It calls for "regular reports" that could be "submitted to the Secretary-General, and to the General Assembly as appropriate".

91. This wording introduced by the United States in the last few years was originally explained as a desire not to force the General Assembly each year to have to consider every year the reports whose mechanical repetition contributed nothing new, and which it had discussed for twenty years. I should like to point out that the implications of this new wording last year were that the Assembly received not just one report from the so-called Commission, but two, and that this useless and unhelpful organization is costing the United Nations an increasing amount every year which is being used for purposes which flout the principles of the Charter.

92. Operative paragraph 6 can only be termed—to put it mildly—a legal monstrosity. First it notes that the United Nations forces have in greater part already been withdrawn. Then immediate mention is made of the objective of the United Nations forces, and, then no further mention is made of the United Nations forces. Instead, mention is now made of the "Governments concerned". In other words, military units whose presence in South Korea is still being described as United Nations flagbearing forces, will be in Korea, not until the United Nations decides otherwise but until the "Governments concerned" think otherwise.

93. Anyone who has taken the trouble to study the national breakdown of those troops—more than 95 per cent of which are United States forces, with the symbolic presence of units of some other countries—will realize that this Assembly is being asked to do two things at once: first of all, to agree once again to offer its flag and its name to specific military units of the United States Eighth Army operating in the Pacific area and at the same time to lend its flag to the United States Government, to grant, quite magnanimously, to that Government the right to decide how long those troops will remain in South Korea.

94. With regard to the other condition or variant for the withdrawal of troops—the request by the Republic of Korea—we pointed out in the First Committee that even the limited reduction in American forces in South Korea had, according to the United States Press, been carried out against the will of the Seoul régime, so it is, to say the least, ironic to refer in this paragraph of the draft resolution to any exercise of will by the Seoul régime, since we are all perfectly aware of the source of its feigned and false sovereignty.

95. My delegation wants to stress the fact to the Assembly of the responsibility that will be assumed by it in continuing for one more year to give a single Member Government the choice of using the flag of our Organization as and where it desires, to wield it against the rights of an independent people and to utilize it as a means of prolonging the colonial occupation of a country and standing in the way of its independent unification. This situation, which is causing growing alarm in the international community, was recognized at the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Nations held in Lusaka from 8 to 10 September 1970. The Heads of State and Government of more than fifty countries stated that the presence of foreign troops in South Korea constituted a source of international tension and a threat to peace and security in the area.

96. My delegation wishes to repeat that the problems that exist in the Korean peninsula cannot be solved until this Assembly categorically decides upon the total withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea and the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, and upon an end to the interference by this Organization in the domestic affairs of the Korean people. The problem of the unification of Korea is a matter which falls exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the Korean people, and no one has any right to interfere.

97. Furthermore, whatever the illegal decisions flouting the Charter which the United States may be able to impose on the General Assembly, as it has done for twenty years, they will still not prevent the Korean people from achieving the exercise of their inalienable rights to independence and national unity, by their own means, regardless of imperialist impositions and this Organization's interference.

98. Mr. MAZEWSKI (United States of America): The statement of the Soviet representative makes it painfully clear that the Soviet Union's real purpose in insisting on this debate is not to make progress towards the United Nations objectives in Korea but simply to use this General Assembly once again as a platform for the abusive and vitriolic propaganda and inversions of the truth that are so dear to the hearts of the rulers of North Korea and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It seems to my delegation that speeches of that kind are a severe imposition on the patience and the good nature of this Assembly.

99. To correct all the mis-statements they contain would take up far too much time and would, in any case, be unnecessary, since the historical facts about the Korean question are known to the world. Let me only say that I was amazed to hear again, just a few minutes ago, the allegation that South Korea, and the United States, not North Korea, were the aggressors in 1950. That is probably the most celebrated and most discredited untruth in the history of the United Nations. I should think that anyone would have difficulty in repeating it without blushing.

100. The Soviet representative also made a false allegation about the question of the participation in

the First Committee in the debate on this item. The decision concerning participation in the debate was taken by a vote of the entire First Committee, not, as alleged, by any narrow clique. The vote in favour of requiring equal and fair conditions of the representatives of North and of South Korea was indeed decisive. There were 63 in favour, 31 against and 25 abstentions.

101. However, substance is more important than rhetoric. The substance of the question before us is how to obtain the long-standing objectives of the United Nations in Korea. These objectives, reaffirmed only last year by the General Assembly by an overwhelming vote, are to bring about by peaceful means the establishment of a united, independent and democratic Korea under a representative form of Government and the full restoration of international peace and security in the area. It is in the light of those objectives that the proposal now before us on the Korean question must be evaluated.

102. The United States will vote in favour of the draft resolution on the Korean question which was approved by a large majority vote in the First Committee.

103. I must say that my country, and I am sure many others here, would have gladly seen a debate on the Korean question omitted at this session, since it was perfectly clear that the rigid policy of North Korea would make any such debate sterile and unprofitable. However, those who speak for North Korea in our proceedings insisted once again that the debate be held, and in precisely the same unproductive mould with which we are all too familiar. It thus became necessary to ensure that the outcome of the debate would be consistent with the interests of the Korean nation and with the obligations of the United Nations.

104. That limited objective is embodied in the draft resolution before us. Once again the standard proposals to get the United Nations out of Korea, and to strip South Korea of all outside support in its defence against its unfriendly neighbours, were defeated by large majorities. And the Committee approved, once again by a large majority, the draft resolution before us, which reaffirms the historic objectives of the United Nations in Korea and reaffirms also the mandate of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea.

105. Let us hope that by adopting this draft resolution the General Assembly will make manifest to all parties the determination of the United Nations not to abdicate its responsibilities to the Korean people, or to the maintenance of peace in that part of the world. With this both understood and underscored, perhaps the authorities in North Korea will be encouraged to view reality as it is, instead of through the distorting mirror they customarily use. What is needed in Korea is not bluff and bluster, but a willingness to work for peace; not tension and military provocation, but a readiness to seek out and enlarge areas of co-operation and accommodation; not subversion and dreams of military conquest, but commitment to a better and more secure life for all the people of the Korean peninsula.

106. In his speech of 15 August 1970, President Park of the Republic of Korea reaffirmed just that sort of commitment on the part of his Government. And he went on to challenge the North Korean authorities to: "a *bona fide* competition in development, in construction and a creativity to prove which institution, democracy or communist totalitarianism, can provide better living for the people." Let us hope that by adopting this resolution the General Assembly will help persuade the North Koreans to undertake just this sort of peaceful competition. We all know that the Republic of Korea continues to grow steadily in economic strength, in the development of its free institutions, and in its cordial and constructive relations with the world community. I cannot help wondering how the rulers in North Korea react to that development. It may be a disappointment to them since it is not consistent with their theories, but one day they and their spokesmen here may find it in their interest to substitute reality for their unreal abstractions.

107. A practical politician in the United States once expounded a rule which may be relevant to our discussion: "If you can't lick 'em, jine 'em." To state the matter in more correct grammar, if you lack the strength to overwhelm your opponent, try to reach some reasonable accommodation with him that will serve his interest as well as yours. I heartily commend that thought to the rulers of North Korea. It may be too difficult for them now, but some day they or their successors will come to it because they must.

108. In the meanwhile, let us in the United Nations remain faithful to our objective of self-determination for all the people of Korea.

109. In the twenty-five years that this Organization has existed, the Members of the United Nations have certainly learned that peace does not come through the waving of a magic wand. It comes instead through unflagging effort, often only by a series of small steps. The step we take here in reaffirming the United Nations role in Korea can contribute to the attainment of our objective of self-determination for all the people of Korea under conditions of peace and security. The United Nations presence in the Korean peninsula threatens no one. It can assist all of the people of that peninsula. All that is required is goodwill and, on the part of the North Korean authorities, the good grace to co-operate with the United Nations in paths of progress. Let us hope that this will be done, that polemics will cease and the hard but rewarding work of peace, co-operation and development will begin. And by voting for the resolution contained in document A/8185, let us keep the door open for that day.

110. The PRESIDENT: We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 20 of its report [A/8185]. A roll-call vote has been requested.

*A vote was taken by roll-call.*

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

*In favour:* Iceland, Iran, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras.

*Against:* Iraq, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nigeria, People's Republic of Congo, Poland, Romania, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

*Abstaining:* India, Indonesia, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Nepal, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Tunisia, Upper Volta, Afghanistan, Bolivia, Burma, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Chile, Finland, Ghana.

*The draft resolution was adopted by 67 votes to 28, with 22 abstentions (resolution 2668 (XXV)).<sup>5</sup>*

***Working Group on the financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East***

111. The PRESIDENT: I had hoped to be able to announce at this meeting the composition of the working group on the financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East established under General Assembly resolution 2656 (XXV), but one place has still not been filled. I hope that negotiations in the course of the evening will enable me to announce the composition of the Working Group early tomorrow.

*The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.*

<sup>5</sup> The delegation of Costa Rica subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to be recorded as having voted in favour of the draft resolution.