



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 8:	
Adoption of the agenda	
First report of the General Committee	1
Agenda item 9:	
General debate (<i>continued</i>)	
Statement by the representative of Iraq	14
Statement by the representative of Israel	15

President: Miss Angie E. BROOKS (Liberia).

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda

FIRST REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE
(A/7700)

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has before it the first report of the General Committee [A/7700]. We shall examine first section II, dealing with the organization of the session.

2. On the proposal of the Secretary-General [A/BUR/173], the General Committee recommends, in paragraph 3 of its report, that the General Assembly should make the following arrangements relating to the schedule of meetings: first, plenary meetings and Committee meetings should begin promptly at 10.30 a.m. and 3 p.m.; secondly, a five-day working week should be established, on the understanding that meetings on Saturdays, as well as night meetings, may be scheduled if necessary.

3. Moreover, in paragraph 4 of its report, the General Committee proposes to the General Assembly, in accordance with rule 2 of the rules of procedure, that the closing date of the twenty-fourth session should be Tuesday, 16 December 1969.

4. If there is no objection, I shall take it that these recommendations are approved by the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

5. The PRESIDENT: The General Committee also recommends to the General Assembly, in paragraph 5 of its report, that the First Committee should be provided with verbatim services and that the verbatim records should be the official records of that Committee. The General Committee further recommends that the debates of the Special Political Committee should be transcribed from sound recordings upon request, with priority in the

distribution being given to the records of the First Committee.

6. If I hear no objection, I shall consider that the Assembly approves these recommendations.

It was so decided.

7. The PRESIDENT: Finally, the General Committee proposes, in paragraph 6 of its report, that all the Main Committees make full use of the General Assembly hall when no plenary meeting is being held and, in particular, use the voting machine on a rotating basis.

8. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly approves that recommendation.

It was so decided.

9. The PRESIDENT: We shall now consider section III of the report of the General Committee. I invite Members to turn their attention to the recommendation of the General Committee in paragraph 8 of its report. This relates to item 23 of the draft agenda submitted by the Secretary-General in his memorandum [A/BUR/174 and Corr.1, para. 5]. The General Committee recommends that the question of Southern Rhodesia should be included in the agenda as a separate item. May I take it that the General Assembly approves that recommendation?

It was so decided.

10. The PRESIDENT: We turn next to paragraph 9, concerning item 32. The General Committee recommends the deletion of sub-item (b). The item would thus read:

“Question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction.”

11. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly approves that recommendation.

It was so decided.

12. The PRESIDENT: Paragraph 10 relates to the question of Korea. Before calling on the representatives who have asked to speak, I should like to remind members that rule 23 of the rules of procedure provides that debate on the inclusion of an item, when that item has been recommended for inclusion by the General Committee,

shall be limited to three speakers in favour of and three against the inclusion.

13. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): I have asked to speak on paragraph 10 of the General Committee's report [A/7700] in order to define the position of the Soviet delegation on the General Assembly agenda items relating to the Korean problem.

14. The Soviet delegation has already had an opportunity in the General Committee to set forth the Soviet Union's position, approach and proposals on matters relating to Korea. Unfortunately the General Committee has under the pressure of certain Western Powers adopted this year too, as in many previous years, a recommendation that three provisional agenda items relating to the Korean problem should be amalgamated into one item on the General Assembly's agenda under the general designation "Question of Korea".

15. The Soviet delegation deems it necessary to declare and to reiterate that this procedure for the discussion of questions relating to Korea is totally worthless. The past practice of discussing these questions together in one package under the general heading "Question of Korea" has not only failed to prove its value but has been completely discredited. This method of discussion has been used only for the purpose of diverting the Assembly's attention from a discussion of the substance of Korean problems, of the most important and topical problems which must be settled during the consideration of the Korean question: the withdrawal of foreign forces from South Korea and the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. These are two very important questions. They have been placed before the General Assembly as separate, independent items by a large group of socialist and Afro-Asian countries and should have been discussed separately before, since they were submitted before, and not together with the so-called report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, the more so since we all know well that this Commission is a still-born child of the worst days of the cold war, as we have already pointed out in the General Committee.

16. The urgent need for a discussion at this General Assembly session of the question of the withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations, an item submitted on the initiative of sixteen countries: Algeria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Iraq, Mongolia, Poland, Southern Yemen, Syria, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Republic of Tanzania, with the support of Mali and Romania [A/7642 and Add.1-5], arises because the military occupation of this part of Korea is the main reason for the continuing division of Korea, the main source of tension in that area and a tool for gross interference from outside in the internal affairs of the Korean people.

17. The territory of South Korea is being converted into a strategic bridgehead and a large military base used against

the Korean people themselves and against other Asian peoples fighting for their independence and national liberation, as the war in Viet-Nam has shown.

18. As a result of foreign occupation, the Seoul puppet clique has been turned into an obedient tool of aggressive designs and actions, has become a direct participant in the aggressive war against the heroic people of Viet-Nam. Recent events in that area, intensified military preparations, continued acts of provocation, the hostile edge of which is directed against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, clearly show the danger of the presence of United States and other foreign forces in South Korea and the urgency and importance of obtaining promptly a peaceful settlement in Korea. It should be particularly emphasized that the situation is made even more tragic because foreign interference in the affairs of the Korean people, the occupation of part of the Korean territory by foreign forces, continues under the flag of the United Nations and under cover of its name.

19. The use of the United Nations flag to cover a gross violation of the Korean people's rights is a shameful blot on the whole Organization.

20. In the prevailing situation the United Nations may play a useful role in the solution of the Korean problem by ending the foreign occupation of South Korea, inasmuch as the withdrawal of foreign forces is a basic and indispensable condition for the peaceful unification of Korea in accordance with justice. This is the only lawful and correct approach to the solution of the problem in the interests of the Korean people themselves, the approach which can and must be adopted by the United Nations. The Korean people must decide their fate themselves, without foreign intervention, without pressure from foreign occupation forces.

21. The Soviet Union is firmly convinced that the withdrawal of foreign forces from South Korea corresponds to the interests and aspirations not only of the Korean people but also of the other peoples demanding their right to freedom and independence. This view is held not only by the Soviet Union but by all sixteen countries which have sponsored the inclusion of this item in the General Assembly's agenda. It is the view also of those countries which have supported the proposal and added their signatures to it. This just demand of the Korean people is in full accord with the noble purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

22. To put an end to unlawful foreign interference in the affairs of the Korean people is also the purpose of the important proposal submitted by a large group of Afro-Asian and socialist countries for the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea [A/7643 and Add.1-3]. The USSR supports this proposal.

23. It will be remembered that in the General Committee the Soviet delegation resolutely opposed the idea that the Korean question should be placed on the General Assembly's agenda in connexion with the report of the so-called Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. We deem it essential to reiterate our objection now in plenary session and to state that the Soviet delegation

will vote against the inclusion of this question either in item 10 or as sub-item (c) of agenda item 99, as set forth in the General Committee's report.

24. It is your prerogative, Madam President, to determine when this matter should be put to the vote; but we would request you to put it to the vote, and we shall vote against the inclusion of this question.

25. The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has more than once resolutely opposed discussion in the United Nations of the so-called Korean question on the basis of the reports of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. In so doing it has emphasized that the unification of Korea is an internal matter for the Korean people and must be brought about by the efforts of the Korean people themselves. This is a fair and legitimate position. The General Assembly is in duty bound to take it into account and to act accordingly.

26. Among the States Members of the United Nations there is an ever-increasing awareness that the time has long been ripe for a new approach to the problems of Korea unencumbered by the fetters of worthless and outworn ideas. The criterion for the approach of the United Nations to the Korean problem can and must be the interests and wishes of the Korean people themselves, who are aspiring to unity and peace.

27. Lastly, the United Nations must approach the Korean problem from the realistic position of today and discard hopelessly outdated, backward and harmful conceptions incompatible with the Charter, the principles of justice and the interests of the Korean people. All foreign forces must be withdrawn from South Korea, and the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea—this putrid corpse—must be dissolved, liquidated and abolished. All outside interference in the Korean people's internal affairs must be stopped once and for all.

28. The Soviet delegation also deems it necessary to draw the attention of delegations at the General Assembly to another very important question, that of extending an invitation to representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take part in the discussion of problems relating to Korea at this General Assembly session. A positive decision at this Assembly session on the question of such an invitation would not prejudice the position of States Members of the United Nations regarding the substance of these matters, and would make a positive contribution to the discussion of questions relating to Korea. The presence of representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the Assembly and their participation in the discussion of these matters would enable the First Committee and the General Assembly to understand the position of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea more completely and to find means for a more correct solution of the Korean problems.

29. The States Members of the United Nations can no longer accept the present abnormal situation in which the official representatives of a sovereign State, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, whose Government has repeatedly declared its unflinching respect for the Charter and

the purposes of the United Nations, are deprived of the possibility of explaining their Government's views during the discussion of questions bearing directly on Korea. Needless to say, such an invitation to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea can be extended only without any prior conditions, without the imposition of any specific demands.

30. There can be no doubt that no one with common sense, let alone a legal expert—and among the delegations to the General Assembly persons with legal training, jurists, are particularly strongly represented, as experience shows—can conceive of a situation where fair, objective decisions are reached without both parties being heard. We all know that the ancient Romans already counselled and recommended that whenever a case was decided both sides should be heard, and that they applied that principle in practice. Yet certain leaders of our time whose countries lay claim to the role of ancient Rome have discarded this principle by attempting to impose their unilateral solutions in this very clear case.

31. States which desire peace, justice, the development of friendship and a hearing for small as well as large peoples in this exalted international forum must support a solution in which representatives of both parts of Korea would be invited and would be duly heard. An invitation to the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea might be a major constructive step in the discussion of matters relating to Korea in the United Nations.

32. It should be particularly emphasized that a decision to invite representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the discussion without any reservations or conditions should be adopted early, in good time, before the discussion of questions relating to Korea begins. Everyone acquainted with elementary geography knows and understands that both Korean States are a long way from New York, the advantage of South Korea being that its representatives are present here in New York and, it appears, even at this plenary meeting of the General Assembly. The efforts and the pressure exerted by a group of certain States on the United Nations also imposed during the worst years of the cold war decisions and a practice under which South Korea obtained the privilege of keeping its representatives permanently here in New York at the United Nations as "observers".

33. This is an unmistakably imperialist formula and practice imposed on the United Nations many years ago. It is directed against all socialist countries which are not Members of the United Nations: against the German Democratic Republic, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. Unfortunately it still exists in the United Nations. The time has come to abandon this vile practice in the discussion of questions relating to Korea, to put an end to it. In addition to the representatives of South Korea, those of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea must be accorded the right to participate whenever the United Nations discusses any matters relating to Korea. This will be fair and in full accord with the spirit and the letter of the Charter of the United Nations.

34. In view of the foregoing, the Soviet delegation considers that the General Assembly should accept as

expedient the early discussion, before agenda items relating to Korea come up for debate, the question of inviting simultaneously, without any prior conditions, the representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and those of South Korea to participate in the debate on those items.

35. The Soviet delegation may exercise its right to submit proposals to that effect at an appropriate stage in the discussion of this question.

36. For the time being, Madam President, I would reiterate that we request you to put to the vote separately the inclusion of the item entitled "Report of the United Nations Commission on the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea" (appearing in paragraph 10 (c) of the General Committee's report). The Soviet delegation will vote against the inclusion of this question in the agenda.

37. The time when we shall vote on paragraph 10—now or when we proceed to debate item 99 of the General Assembly's provisional agenda (report of the General Committee)—depends entirely on your decision. We request you to put this question to the vote separately.

38. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan): It is a fact acknowledged by all of us that the United Nations has been playing a very important rôle through the past years in the search for a satisfactory solution to the problems concerned in the unification and rehabilitation of Korea. Specifically, the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea has been rendering a valuable service in this regard. In the light of this fact, it is only legitimate for the Commission to address its report to the President of the General Assembly, so that all of us may have the opportunity of examining the report and give our full consideration to the problems involved.

39. My delegation now feels convinced that the inclusion of item 104 of the draft agenda submitted by the Secretary-General in his memorandum [A/BUR/174 and Corr.1, para. 5] "Question of Korea: report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea", on the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly is appropriate, thus doing justice to the assiduous work of the Commission.

40. As for the three items concerning Korea on the draft agenda, namely items 99, 100 and 104, my delegation continues to believe as we did last year, that those three items should be taken up together as sub-items (a), (b) and (c) under a single heading, "Question of Korea". First, those three sub-items are so closely interrelated that it is just not right to try and separate them artificially one from another. Secondly, looking at the situation from a totally practical point of view, the best way of dealing with those sub-items effectively and efficiently is to combine them. Only in this manner can we hope to avoid unnecessary repetitions in the debate and thus contribute to the expeditious work of the General Assembly, which is already burdened with an extremely heavy agenda.

41. My delegation sees no convincing reason why we should depart from the practice we have followed up to now in this regard, and for all the foregoing reasons it fully

supports the recommendation of the General Committee concerning the treatment of the Korean question [A/7700, para. 10].

42. Before I conclude, let me add a few words on yet another aspect of the question, to which reference was made by the representative of the Soviet Union a few moments ago, namely, the problem of who should be invited to participate in the debate on the Korean question. My delegation believes that this is neither the proper time nor the proper place to go into the substance of this matter. I should simply like to state that, in the view of my delegation, the present plenary meeting should confine itself to the formal questions before it, namely, the organization of our work, the adoption of the agenda and the allocation of items. My delegation will, naturally, be prepared to express its views on the matter of the invitation in the proper forum on an appropriate occasion.

43. Mr. JOUEJATI (Syria): Madam President, allow me to address to Your Excellency our congratulations on your election to preside over this session of the General Assembly. My delegation will express to you, when it intervenes in the general debate, its best wishes for your success.

44. We have heard the representative of the Soviet Union suggest, among other things, that a simultaneous and unconditional invitation be extended to the representatives of both the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea, to participate in the consideration of the agenda items relating to Korea, and that that invitation should be appropriately considered before we engage in the debate, as such.

45. This suggestion is truly procedural, but its procedural nature does not at all minimize its significance. It is of the utmost significance. If it is adopted, as we sincerely hope it will be, it will, we are sure, achieve tangible results. It will introduce into the Korean question from the outset a dynamic element that guarantees progress, whereas progress has previously been totally lacking.

46. It is distressing to note that year after year, one lengthy debate after another contributes only to immobilizing the question of Korea. The reunification and rehabilitation of Korea—goals that the United Nations is supposed to promote—are farther and farther from achievement. The sterility of the yearly debate stems to a great extent from a policy adopted by certain Member States of blocking any invitation to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to appear before the United Nations, to expound its views and to give its suggestions on how to remedy the situation.

47. A lengthy defence of the Soviet Union suggestion is hardly necessary. Is the Democratic People's Republic of Korea an essential party to the question, or is it not? Not only do we answer in the affirmative, but we submit that without the active participation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and without its legitimate interests being taken into consideration, our examination of the question would revolve in a total vacuum.

48. Year after year it is decided to extend invitations to the representatives of South Korea. Does not the refusal to

hear the other party constitute a discriminatory measure that, at the least, contradicts the principle of justice upon which the United Nations is supposed to be based?

49. The particular merit of the Soviet Union suggestion is that it goes further. It implies that an invitation in advance to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would introduce a smooth element into the discussion that might be instrumental in rendering it constructive to some degree. How many obstacles and difficulties would be removed if we decided to treat the parties equally, to decide to listen to both of them, and thereafter to engage in a new and effective form of examining the question?

50. That is why we support the suggestion and look forward to other delegations supporting it as well. Of course, we are not pressing for a vote. We are merely expressing the hope that the First Committee will take this suggestion fully into consideration before engaging in the debate on the question.

51. Mr. YOST (United States of America): Madam President, since this is my first opportunity of speaking in the General Assembly under your presidency, with your permission I should like to begin with a word of tribute, on behalf of the United States, both to you and to your late distinguished predecessor.

52. During the twenty-third session of the General Assembly the presidency was conferred on the able young Foreign Minister of our good neighbour in the Western hemisphere, the Republic of Guatemala, the late Mr. Emilio Arenales. We admired his devoted service in that post, we followed anxiously his gallant fight against the illness that struck him during the session and we learned with deepest sorrow last April of his untimely death.

53. Now, Madam President, in your person the General Assembly has chosen to preside over its twenty-fourth session another outstanding young leader. In this choice we do honour to Africa, that vast continent which has played in recent years, and will long continue to play, such an important part in the affairs of the United Nations. Likewise we honour your country, the Republic of Liberia, one of the oldest independent States on the African continent and one with which my own country claims a special and historic bond of friendship.

54. But most particularly, Madam President, this choice is a tribute to your personal qualities. For fifteen years in the United Nations community, you have been known and honoured for service to your country, to the United Nations, and especially to that cause so dear to your heart, the movement for self-determination and independence of subject peoples. You have proved your ability in many responsible posts, including the chairmanship of the Fourth Committee and the Presidency of the Trusteeship Council. Those of us who know you personally can testify also to your kindness and friendliness and your passionate devotion to freedom and world order. On behalf of the United States delegation let me extend to you our warmest congratulations and assure you of our faithful co-operation in the conduct of the business of this Assembly.

55. As to the question before us, the United States delegation had hoped that it would be possible this morning

for the Assembly to consider and adopt a report of the General Committee in a prompt and harmonious fashion. We felt, as I am sure do the majority here, that the General Committee has carried out its consideration of the draft agenda submitted by the Secretary-General in his memorandum [*A/BUR/174 and Corr.1, para. 5*] in a responsible manner and that its recommendations both on the inclusion and allocation of items deserve prompt acceptance by the Assembly.

56. However, the Soviet representative has chosen once again to reopen the question of the inclusion of the sub-item under the Korean question dealing with the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. Inclusion of that item was considered fully in the General Committee and the decision reached by the Committee—I might add by an overwhelming majority—to recommend inclusion of the item and to group it with the other clearly interrelated items on Korea under a single heading was both logical and correct. Now, the Soviet representative repeats his delegation's Alice-in-Wonderland view of Korean history and its distortion of the role that the United Nations and the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea have and should play there.

57. We are aware that this is not the appropriate time or place to engage in a discussion of the substance of the Korean issue. That being so, no useful purpose would be served in taking the Assembly's time this morning to rebut in detail.

58. We are prepared, of course, to discuss this issue in detail at the appropriate time and in the appropriate forum—the First Committee. That discussion will reveal the Soviet view of Korea for what it is: an attempt through gross distortion of the record to get this Organization to end its constructive role in Korea and to withdraw the protective shield which hinders North Korea from attaining the subversive and aggressive objectives which it first demonstrated so shockingly by its unprovoked military aggression in 1950.

59. It should suffice at this point to note, as the General Committee agreed, that elementary logic dictates that any discussion of the Korean question, and especially consideration of sub-item (b), which calls for the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, cannot be considered in the absence of consideration of the reports of the Commission itself. We recognize that consideration of the Commission's reports—both the one received recently and the one submitted in May—put the lie to the Soviet assertion of the non-existence of the Commission. This explains the Soviet attempt to delete this item from the agenda.

60. The Commission, as we all know, is a reality; its reports are a reality; its continuing efforts to achieve a peaceful reunification in Korea under democratic circumstances and under open United Nations supervision are a reality. Soviet efforts to obscure that reality—with which the United Nations has for so long been so intimately concerned—can have no chance of success. I am confident, therefore, that this Assembly will decisively reject the Soviet move to delete sub-item (c) from the item entitled "Question of Korea".

61. Finally, as to the reiterated suggestion of the representative of the Soviet Union on the question of invitations to participate in the debate on the Korean question, this is, in our view, not properly a subject to be considered here in connexion with the report of the General Committee. Our purpose here is clear: to consider the report of the General Committee on the inclusion and allocation of items. Under the rules of procedure and past practice, it does not go beyond that.

62. With reference to the general question of invitations, the clearly established precedent was unanimously stated by Ambassador Buffum when this issue was raised in the General Committee on Wednesday. I quote:

“This question of invitations to members or States to participate is the function of the Committee to which the specific item is allocated. There is no legal precedent or logical justification to pre-empt that function of the Committee which is ultimately given responsibility for dealing with an item.”¹

63. With regard specifically to extending invitations to participate in the Korean debate, we are willing, as we have frequently stated in the past, to give full consideration to that question at the appropriate time in the First Committee. And lest there be any misunderstanding of the United States position, we are neither opposed to discussing the invitation question fully and at an early stage, nor opposed to extending an invitation to a representative of North Korea. In view of the complicated past history of the Korean question, we are, however, keenly interested in the exact circumstances under which North Korea might be invited. Therefore, the invitation question should be decided in the context of the debate on the Korean question in the First Committee.

64. To sum up, we urge that the Assembly approve the recommendation of the General Committee on the inclusion of the Korean question, and that the decision on invitations to participate in the debate on this question be left, in accordance with well-established practice, to the First Committee.

65. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): Madam President, since this is the first time that my delegation has spoken during this General Assembly, although on a matter of procedure, I cannot pass over in silence the great event of having a distinguished representative of an African country presiding over our General Assembly. On behalf of the Hungarian delegation, although in a preliminary way, I extend briefly my congratulations to you on your election to this high office, and I express the best wishes and hopes for your successful activity in the interest of international peace and progress.

66. I have asked to speak in order to explain the position of my delegation on agenda item 99: “Question of Korea” appearing in the first report of the General Committee [A/7700, para. 12]. The title of this agenda item, thus recommended to us at the proposal of the United States delegation, is a misnomer. My delegation, along with a

number of others, has asked for the inclusion in the agenda of the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly of two items which, in the draft agenda submitted by the Secretary-General in his memorandum [A/BUR/174 and Corr.1, para. 5] appear as item 99 entitled “Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations”, and item 100 entitled “Dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea”. Following those initiatives, an agenda item was hastily produced by way of sending a report—hitherto unknown—of that so-called Commission to the Secretary-General. That report appeared as item 104 under the title “Question of Korea” in the memorandum submitted by the Secretary-General. As can be seen from the explanatory memoranda on the two items proposed by my delegation conjointly with others [A/7642 and Add.1-5, A/7643 and Add.1-3], the purpose of these two items is the termination of the organized intervention into the affairs of the Korean people. This purpose is to be achieved by withdrawing those foreign armed forces, primarily United States forces, which up to this day have been occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations.

67. Without entering into the substance of the matter, I cannot but point out that the United States armed forces stationed in South Korea have no genuine link with the United Nations—a fact which my delegation and others have had occasion to prove in the First Committee proceedings of previous years. For this reason alone, the United Nations is in duty bound to extricate itself from a situation which has been most harmful and humiliating to it.

68. As for the dissolution of the so-called United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, I cannot do better than refer to a part of your opening address, Madam President. You stated that:

“The sense of satisfaction, upon adoption of a resolution pleasing the purposes of one delegation or of a homogeneous group of delegations, has helped to perpetuate the mythology of achievement...”. [1753rd meeting, para. 54.]

Nothing can better illustrate the fallaciousness of the reports of that unfortunate Commission and the discussion growing out of them than that statement of yours, Madam President. Seemingly entrusted with the task of unifying Korea, that mythical body has done nothing to achieve it, but has tried to do its best to perpetuate its division. It is a classical cold war organ: sterile, unilateral; and clearly designed from its inception to work against the letter and the spirit of the Charter, it has been doomed to complete failure. It is for this reason that my delegation has asked that its dissolution be discussed and decided upon by the General Assembly.

69. Following a long-standing practice, the delegation of the United States has asked the General Committee that the moves to end the unlawful intervention into the affairs of Korea be discussed conjointly with the very manifestation of that intervention: that is, the report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea. The majority of the General Committee working

¹ This statement was made at the 180th meeting of the General Committee, the official records of which are published in summary form.

under the self-delusion which you, Madam President, so aptly characterized in your opening address, have seen fit to accomplish the absurdity expected of it by the moving spirits behind the Commission. As a consequence, the Assembly is now confronted with an item called "Question of Korea", which, by its very title, reveals the true nature of the discussion that some expect—a discussion of the internal affairs of a sovereign State, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

70. It is symptomatic that one of the delegations supporting that illegality has lost no time at a later stage of the discussions in the General Committee in protesting energetically against the inclusion of another item in the agenda by stating that the General Assembly is not competent to discuss internal matters falling within the domestic jurisdiction of sovereign States.

71. That delegation, representing a permanent member of the Security Council, by using such a double standard has pointed to the true purpose of the discussion on the sovereign affairs of the Korean people: to continue the intervention into the affairs of that socialist State. Such an attempt openly defies the Charter of the United Nations, and for this reason my delegation is duty bound to protest against the attempts to revive the "cold war" in our Organization.

72. The Hungarian delegation opposes the merging of three independent items under the heading "Question of Korea" and the inclusion in the agenda of sub-item (c), "Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea". We fully support the proposal of the representative of the Soviet Union and a separate vote is formally requested on the heading of the item and on sub-item (c).

73. Finally, I cannot fail to refer to a very important issue, which is the presence of the duly qualified representatives of Korea when the discussion on this matter begins. In demanding that an invitation be sent in good time and in proper form, without any conditions, to representatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea, we are acting in accordance with the appeal launched by the representative of the United States in the General Committee when this matter was raised in that body. He said, and we agree, that we should observe order, logic and economy when taking a decision on the invitation issue. It is for this reason that the invitation issue must be decided first, as order requires. Logic demands that no discussion should take place without the parties concerned participating in it. And, if I may be allowed to say so, economy of time, costs and other factors demand that, with the assistance of duly qualified representatives of the Korean people, an end should be brought to foreign intervention in the affairs of Korea. We express our hope that when the issue of invitations is decided, we shall not see the earlier delaying tactics repeated and basic principles of fair play and equity violated. I regret to note that certain representatives have seen fit to assert that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not respect the Charter. I would simply call the attention of those representatives to the letter dated 24 September 1968 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the Secretary-General.² In that statement it is

declared officially that the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has always respected and continues to respect the Charter and the lofty aims of the United Nations. No allegation to the contrary can stand against this clear and constructive position.

74. I appeal to all delegations anxious to help in lessening international tensions in general, and particularly in the Far East, to take a positive stand on the invitation issue also.

75. Mr. SHAW (Australia): Madam President, allow me also to take this opportunity, since it is the first time I have been here, of joining others in congratulating you on your election to the important and influential position of President of the General Assembly. I and all members of my delegation are quite sure that you will fill this position with grace, dignity, courage and ability.

76. I come to the rostrum briefly to express our support of the inclusion in the agenda of the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly of item 99, as amended, as it appears in paragraph 12 of the report of the General Committee [A/7700].

77. While giving this support I should make it clear that my delegation is not in full agreement with the terms in which that item as amended is now expressed. My delegation considers that the wording of sub-items (a) and (b) of the amended item are tendentious, biased and prejudicial. It may be remarked that it is only one group of Members who habitually frame their proposed agenda items in such propagandistic terms. Nevertheless, in principle, my delegation has not sought to prevent the discussion of items in terms proposed by Members. If such tendentious items as sub-items (a) and (b) have to be accepted on the agenda at all, it is preferable that they be dealt with in the most practical manner possible. That is what the General Committee has recommended in paragraph 10 of its report.

78. Australia regards the Korean item as an important one. It deals with the lives and welfare of the people of South Korea, an able and dynamic people that lives in a strategically important and exposed country. South Korea, with the help of the United Nations, fought successfully to resist a terrible war of aggression from its communist neighbours. Its people are now engaged in remarkable achievements of national reconstruction and economic growth. They require only peace and security in which to pursue their aims.

79. In our view, a proper framework for the consideration of this item is the examination of the reports submitted by the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea—in other words, sub-item (c) of item 99. It might be argued that these reports present a picture of events and developments in only one part of Korea. I would reply that the report describes events and developments in that part of the country to which the Commission, an organ of this Assembly whose mandate was reaffirmed only last year, was allowed access. That its activities are limited to the southern part of Korea is not the fault of the Commission.

80. Sub-item (b) of item 99 proposes the dissolution of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and

² Document A/C.1/1966 (mimeographed).

Rehabilitation of Korea. This is surely an extraordinary proposal. What is needed is not its dissolution, but that it be given an opportunity of exercising the functions for which it was intended over the whole of the territory of Korea. The North Korean régime continues to reject this prospect.

81. Sub-item (a) of item 99, headed "Withdrawal of United States and all other foreign forces occupying South Korea under the flag of the United Nations" is even more misconceived. The communist régime in North Korea has already made one attempt to achieve its goal of unifying Korea under its own authority by force of arms and it continues to conduct warlike propaganda and outrageous acts of terrorism and infiltration into its southern neighbour. These acts are kept in check by the determination of the people of the Republic of Korea, supported by many Member Governments of the United Nations, including the Government which I represent.

82. What indeed are the motives of those who seek this withdrawal of United Nations forces from the Republic of Korea?

83. Those who might be asked to support the sub-item on the grounds of general principle might reflect very briefly on the facts of history. Following the occupation of Korea at the end of the Second World War, all United States forces were withdrawn from South Korea in 1949. In 1950—and the facts are attested by a United Nations commission—the North Korean armed forces invaded the south and almost succeeded in overrunning it. It was only through the heroic sacrifices of the Korean people themselves and the help given them by sixteen Member nations of the United Nations that this aggression was repelled.

84. We therefore support the inclusion of sub-item (c) of item 99 "Report of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea". We are prepared to accept the inclusion of the other two sub-items, (a) and (b), although we disagree with the wording and the substance of both of them. We do not press our objections at this time to these two tendentious items, on the assumption that the General Assembly accepts the recommendation of the General Committee in paragraph 10 of its report to the effect that all sub-items regarding Korea shall be taken together in the First Committee.

85. There is also the question regarding invitations which might be issued to both parts of Korea to attend discussions in the United Nations, that is to say, representatives of both North Korea and South Korea, when the item is taken up in the First Committee. Certain remarks made by some speakers this morning have been directed at creating quite a false impression of what has been done in the past. I would remind the Assembly, first of all, that this matter is one which has been discussed frequently in the First Committee. This is the body competent to consider the handling of agenda items which are passed on to it. In fact in the past, last year for example, both parties, both parts of Korea, were invited to participate in the debate provided only that they accepted the competence and authority of the United Nations, within the terms of the Charter, to take action on the Korean question. Furthermore, in the arrangement of its business last year the First Committee

allowed ample time for travel from Korea to New York for all those who chose to participate in its discussions on Korea. And there is no disagreement on this point. I may say that members of the Australian delegation do not require any lectures on geography. I think that no one lives further from New York than we do.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Denmark, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Against: Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Haiti,* Hungary, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Burundi, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, Finland, Guinea, India, Jordan, Lebanon, Nepal, Pakistan, Portugal, Singapore, Uganda.

The title "Question of Korea" was retained and sub-item (c) was included in the agenda by 76 votes to 26 with 15 abstentions.

Item 99 as a whole was included in the agenda.

86. So we believe that the stipulation about acceptance by the representatives of Korea of the competence of the United Nations is a reasonable and indeed a fundamental one. We cannot overlook the United Nations past commitment to Korea and its involvement there in terms of the lives of soldiers who fought under the United Nations flag. The decision of the North Korean authorities so far to refuse to accept United Nations competence in this matter is theirs to make, but they must not expect such a decision to have no significance in this body.

87. Madam President, I am not sure what your intentions are regarding procedure. We are content to place ourselves in your very competent hands. If you should decide that a separate vote is required or in order on sub-item (c) of item 99 we would ask that that vote be a recorded vote.

88. The PRESIDENT: I take note that the representative of the Soviet Union has said that at the proper time the

* The delegation of Haiti subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of retaining the title "Question of Korea" and including sub-item (c) in the agenda.

question of invitations to North Korea would be taken up. He is asking only two things: first, that the title of the question in paragraph 10 of the report [A/7700], which covers item 99, should be voted upon and, secondly that sub-item (c) should have a separate vote taken on it as to its inclusion. We will therefore proceed to vote on the title "Question of Korea" and the question of the inclusion of sub-item (c). A recorded vote has been requested.

89. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to paragraph 11 of the report [A/7700]. The General Committee decided to defer a decision on whether or not to recommend the inclusion of item 102 of the draft agenda [A/BUR/174 and Corr.1, para. 5] entitled "The situation in the North of Ireland". May I consider that the Assembly takes note of that decision?

It was so decided.

90. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the agenda which the General Committee recommends for adoption by the General Assembly. In accordance with past practice we shall follow the numbering given in paragraph 12 of the General Committee's report [A/7700] and consider together several items whenever such grouping appears more practical and logical. It is understood that at present we are not discussing the substance of any item except when such discussion can assist the Assembly in deciding whether or not to include an item in the agenda.

91. Items 1 to 6 have already been acted upon in plenary meetings of the General Assembly. I shall therefore consider that their inclusion has been approved.

It was so decided.

92. The PRESIDENT: Let us now turn to item 7 "Notification by the Secretary-General under Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations". In that connexion, the Assembly is required only to take note of the communication submitted by the Secretary-General [A/7670]. If there is no objection, I shall consider that the General Assembly takes note of that communication.

It was so decided.

93. The PRESIDENT: I now submit to the General Assembly items 8 to 33 inclusive. If there is no objection, I shall consider that those items have been approved for inclusion in the agenda.

Items 8 to 33 inclusive were included in the agenda.

94. The PRESIDENT: Item 34 refers to the policies of *apartheid* of the Government of the Republic of South Africa.

95. Mr. BOTHA (South Africa): Madam President, allow me first of all to express my pleasure at the fact that we have elected you, a person of such wide experience and wisdom, to this high office. I wish to convey to you the best wishes of my delegation for your success in the performance of your arduous duties.

96. I have asked for the floor in order to place on record my Government's reservations with regard to item 34. It is

the position of my Government that both the inscription and the subsequent consideration of this item by the General Assembly will contravene Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, which precludes the United Nations from intervening in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State.

97. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has taken note of the statement made by the representative of South Africa. It will be included in the record of this meeting.

98. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana): One would have thought that the representative of the Pretoria régime who spoke a few moments ago would have had some respect for the normal preoccupations of reasonable men during the week-end and not have come here this morning to go through the usual motions of objecting to the inclusion of this item. The gentleman who has just spoken is known everywhere as the representative of a Government which stands for all that is irrational, all that is inhuman, all that is barbarous. The General Assembly has year after year been inflicted with the tedious and baseless reservations of the representatives of the Pretoria racist régime regarding the inclusion of this item. My delegation cannot remain silent while the representative of the Pretoria régime comes to this rostrum to invoke an Article of the Charter, the very Charter which his authorities have so shamelessly and defiantly repudiated by their continued oppression of the majority African population of South Africa.

99. Lest that representative forget, I would take this opportunity of reminding him of the wise decisions taken by this Assembly since 1948. Ever since that date international concern for the atrocities perpetrated by the racist minority régime of South Africa has justifiably been on the increase. Humane concern for the inalienable rights of the indigenous peoples of South Africa has been upheld as transcending the narrow and warped interpretation that the racist régime of South Africa is wont to lay on Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter. It may be enlightening and edifying for the representative of Pretoria to know that the whole civilized and humane world has recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of the African people of South Africa to wrest justice and their rights from the white supremacists based in Pretoria. The South African régime is recognized the world over as the enemy and foe of human rights—rights so nobly enshrined in the Charter of our Organization. Our duty and resolve in discussing the *apartheid* policies of the Pretoria régime and in fighting to eliminate it are born of our obligations derived from the Charter. This Organization was not set up to pander to the whims of the *apartheid* representatives. Nothing these representatives do should deter us as Members of this Organization from our noble decision to fight to obliterate the defilement represented by the inhuman policies of the Pretoria régime from South Africa and to restore to the indigenous people of South Africa their just right to human dignity, self-determination and independence.

100. It is in the light of the foregoing considerations that my delegation would call on this Assembly to reaffirm its previous decision on this item and to ignore the tedious and irrelevant reservations of the representative of the Pretoria racist régime. We do not blame the Pretoria régime so

much; we blame those powerful Members of this Organization that have given comfort and succour to that régime. If it were not for that comfort and succour, that régime would not be in this Assembly of civilized men for one day.

101. The PRESIDENT: If no other representative wishes to speak, I shall take it that item 34 has been approved for inclusion in the agenda.

Item 34 was included in the agenda.

102. The PRESIDENT: I now submit to the General Assembly items 35 to 98 inclusive. If there is no objection, I shall consider that those items have been approved for inclusion in the agenda.

Items 35 to 98 inclusive were included in the agenda.

103. The PRESIDENT: Item 99 has been included in the agenda by a previous decision of the Assembly at this meeting [see para. 88 above].

104. The PRESIDENT: I now submit to the General Assembly items 100 and 101. If there is no objection, I shall consider that those items have been approved for inclusion in the agenda.

Items 100 and 101 were included in the agenda.

105. The PRESIDENT: The last item on the list, item 102, has already been included in the agenda by a previous decision of the Assembly [see para. 9 above].

106. The General Assembly has thus adopted its agenda for the twenty-fourth session as proposed in paragraph 12 of the first report of the General Committee [A/7700].

107. We shall now turn to the allocation of items, which is dealt with in section IV of the report. The modifications indicated in paragraph 13 are reflected in the proposed allocation, as well as the recommendations in paragraphs 14 and 15. We shall consider them when we come to the relevant items. We shall now consider the items recommended for allocation to plenary meetings.

108. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): Madam President, since the delegation of Chile is now speaking in the General Assembly for the first time, and although the Minister of Foreign Affairs of my country will have an opportunity to pay a tribute to you, I should like to tell you at once how glad my delegation is that you have been elected President of this Assembly. I say this, Madam President, for a number of reasons, and should like to indicate some of them. First—and I would make bold to say this—essentially because you are a woman, and a woman from Africa. The other day Ambassador Vinci of Italy said that perhaps the most important peace corps in the world is its womenfolk, and you represent them worthily. Unquestionably it is the women who are most active in working for peace, because a woman knows from personal experience that rights go hand in hand with duties and that the most precious things in the world are obtained, not by talking of them, but by sacrifice. The women of the world know what self-sacrifice means, as do you, Madam President.

109. But you, as I have just said, besides being a woman are a woman from Africa, and that also has special significance. For us Latin Americans the legacy of Africa is something exceptional, and is revealed in cultural manifestations which are perhaps those nearest and dearest to men and women. African art and culture have made a lasting impression on Latin American culture, because they essentially express the men and women of Africa. And you, Madam President, in your splendidly-coloured African clothes, have proved to us daily that the artistic sense of Africa is unchanging and magnificent; and we are therefore grateful to you for reminding us daily that you are a woman, a deeply artistic and so a profoundly human woman.

110. I have asked to speak today because, as I said a few days ago at the meeting of the General Committee when the allocation of items to plenary meetings of the Assembly was discussed, my delegation submitted a proposal which was not a point of order or a procedural motion but a proposal of substance. That specific Chilean proposal was that the problem of the Development Decade should be included among the items allocated to plenary meetings along with the extremely important topics which will shortly be considered in plenary: the human environment; the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples—that great victory of the United Nations which we are about to celebrate, because it is almost ten years old; the situation in the Middle East, which grieves us all; the problem of Namibia, earlier described as a tragic problem by the Assembly, which by an almost unanimous resolution, opposed by only two countries, laid down what the future of Namibia should be. I repeat that, together with these problems of Namibia, the human environment, and the independence of colonial peoples, the Second Development Decade should also be considered in plenary meetings of the Assembly. I stress that it is the Second Decade, because the First, as everybody has acknowledged, was a failure.

111. On the eve of the Second Development Decade it seemed to me and to my delegation that this item should be given not merely an honourable but a priority position in the plenary meetings, so that when this problem, which affects fundamentally more than three quarters of mankind, is considered, not only its technical but also its social, cultural, political and human aspects should be discussed.

112. That was the proposal submitted by Chile in the General Committee to show the importance which it attaches to this question now that we are only a few months from the beginning of that Decade at the end of next year; and we have decided to take a decision on what the Second Development Decade shall be.

113. I am dwelling on this question because the Chilean proposal was not a mere procedural motion. We submitted it to the General Committee because the agenda and the discussion on the allocation of items are not routine work but are work based on considerations of substance, on political considerations in the broadest sense of the term.

114. A few days ago in the Assembly [1775th meeting] we heard what the President of the host country of this

Organization told us. Referring to the implications of scientific and technological development, he said that the gap between the technological and scientific development of those countries where it exists and those where it does not exist continues to widen day by day, and that this was a serious threat to economic co-operation. That is recognized by those very Powers which lead in technical and scientific progress—as they have proved by reaching the moon.

115. More was said. The Ambassador of Brazil also said [*ibid.*] that if we drew up a balance-sheet of the last decade—which we called the First—we should see that it had been the decade of frustration. These are not just words: they are actual facts proved by technical reports. The gap—now grown larger—between the countries which are technically and economically advanced and the many countries which are not is growing daily; and that is perhaps the greatest scandal of this third part of the twentieth century in which we are living.

116. After twenty-five years of the United Nations, after the First Development Decade, we are compelled to admit that all the aims included in the Charter to promote economic and social development—in other words human development, which is the foundation-stone of peace—far from having been attained are daily becoming more difficult to achieve. What lies ahead of us? The Second Development Decade. I believe that for more than three-quarters of the world's population this is the fundamental problem, since economic and social development, human development, are the foundation-stone for the building of peace.

117. I have already quoted President Nixon and also the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Brazil. I should like now to quote the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Sweden, who in a thorough analysis pointed out [*1757th meeting*] that harmonious economic and social development would be rendered difficult by the differences which are being generated between the development and the scientific and technological progress of the various countries. We all agreed on this point. I know also that there are difficulties, and I respect the positions taken by all the States. But we have set up a Preparatory Committee for the Second Development Decade which will have to report to this Assembly.

118. I should now like to reiterate Chile's position, as we explained it in the General Committee of the Assembly, on the importance that we attach to this item. In the General Committee we proposed that it should be discussed at the outset in plenary meetings, and our proposal was rejected. I am not going to ask for a vote by the Assembly at the present time. I am going to make a suggestion and a very modest but heartfelt appeal that, after the Preparatory Committee for the Second Development Decade has held its fourth and last meeting of this year at the end of September or the beginning of October, after the Economic and Social Council has analysed the report of the Preparatory Committee at its resumed session, which will start about 13 October, and after the Second Committee, about 15 October, has begun this debate—which will undoubtedly continue until the middle of November because this is a key item for that Committee—we may by a genuine collective

understanding and not by a resolution or a vote, calmly and taking our time, analyse what the Second Development Decade means.

119. For many of us the Second Decade may mean a strategy, the fixing of targets. It is necessary to repeat, as we have already done, that its meaning will not be determined by the growth rate of the world product. If this Second Decade achieves real results, it will do so because all States, starting with those which are most powerful economically, will have taken the political decision that there should be a better distribution of wealth in the world and a greater participation in it of all sections of mankind. If that political decision is not taken in the General Assembly, there will be no Second Decade and the technical reports will continue to pile up as they did during the First Decade, which many have called the decade of frustration.

120. For these reasons, and because the question is too important to be reduced to the mere procedural issue of whether it should be dealt with in a Committee or in the General Assembly, I am not going to press my delegation's proposal, which was rejected in the General Committee of the Assembly, to a vote in the Council; I am entitled to, but I will not. Instead, I am going to suggest that the work for the promotion of the Second Decade, which will be done at various levels—in the Preparatory Committee, in the Economic and Social Council, in the Second Committee, and certainly in the Third Committee also, because the problem is not only economic but also social, and lastly in the General Assembly—shall be directed towards effective co-operation to ensure that all the studies, and all the effort of processing statistics of education, health and labour, will bear fruit. I hope that the outcome—essential if there is to be a real Second Development Decade—will be a political decision of the developed countries, whether they have capitalist or socialist economies, that the Second Decade shall not be a monotonous repetition of the First but the starting-point for the building of peace.

121. Our Organization's chief duty is to maintain peace, but its duty to build peace is just as great; and this will not be done unless the most powerful take the decision that the men and women of the world may participate in all the outstanding benefits of scientific, technical and economic development. It means nothing to a Chilean man or woman that a train may take ten minutes less to run between Washington and New York; they still travel long distances on foot.

122. There will be no co-operation in the world as long as scientific and technological progress is the heritage of only a few and the vast majority, the peoples of the under-developed world, have no part in it.

123. As I said, I am not going to press my proposal to a vote, but to make a suggestion and an appeal. And I ask you, Madam President, as a woman and an African, to bring your talent to bear—and more than your talent: your courage and resolution, which you have so often proved—so that this debate on the eve of the Second Development Decade shall have constructive and not only realistic results, since realism is merely a substitute for a decision to defend effectively an ideal which is not only legitimate but is

proclaimed and wished for today by the majority of the international community. I have full confidence in you, Madam President, and in the General Assembly that the purposes for which the delegation of Chile made its request in the General Committee of the Assembly will be achieved.

124. Mr. SEN (India): Madam President, I shall not try to emulate our colleague from Chile in paying you compliments as a woman, mainly because I shall never succeed in competing with him in that field. I was, however, amused to hear the compliments paid to you by the representative of South Africa. I can only hope that his compliments will be carried in all South African papers, together with a picture of you.

125. Turning now to the subject before us, I was present at the meetings of the General Committee when this item was discussed, and I think that the Ambassador of Chile has now revised his proposal in a manner which I believe will meet with general approval. What he has in mind are simply two central or basic ideas. The first is that the Second United Nations Development Decade is a very important item on our agenda. I do not think there is any doubt of that in any quarter. The second basic assumption in his proposal is that there should be, at a suitable time and place, an opportunity for thorough and detailed debate on the political and other wider considerations to be entertained by this Assembly. Whether that stage should be reached before the Development Decade is discussed in the Second Committee or later, according to his present proposal, is left open. I think therefore that the proposal he has made is modest, moderate and entirely realistic, and my delegation hopes that a suitable opportunity will be given to this Assembly in plenary session to discuss not only the importance of the item but also the basic political and other broader aspects to which the item has to be related.

126. The PRESIDENT: As I understand the situation, we do not have a proposal, but rather an appeal, a suggestion.

127. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly approves the allocation of items 1 to 11 for consideration in plenary meeting.

It was so decided.

128. The PRESIDENT: We now turn to item 12 entitled "Reports of the Economic and Social Council". Chapters XIV and XV of the report to the twenty-fourth session [A/7603] have been recommended for consideration in plenary meeting. I should like to draw the attention of the Assembly to paragraph 13 (a) (i) of the General Committee's report, relating to chapter XIV of the report of the Economic and Social Council. In this connexion, the General Committee recommends that the Assembly should suggest that chapter XIV, section B, might be of interest to the Second, Third and Fifth Committees, and that, in considering that section, the Second Committee might take into account the decision by which the General Assembly, at its 1751st plenary meeting on 20 December 1968, took note of paragraph 40 of the report of the Second Committee concerning the organization of its work. Furthermore, chapter XIV, sections C and E might also be of concern to the Fifth Committee. If I hear no objection, I

shall take it that the Assembly approves the recommendations of the General Committee.

It was so decided.

129. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to items 14 to 20. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly approves the allocation of those items for consideration in plenary meeting.

It was so decided.

130. The PRESIDENT: Item 21 is entitled "Problems of the human environment: report of the Secretary-General." The General Committee recommends, in paragraph 13 (a) (ii), that the item should be allocated to the Second Committee and that it should also be discussed, at one or two meetings, in plenary and in the Third Committee. If I hear no objections to this procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly approves the recommendation.

It was so decided.

131. The PRESIDENT: Item 22 has been recommended for consideration in plenary. I take it that the Assembly approves the Committee's recommendation.

It was so decided.

132. The PRESIDENT: Concerning item 23, Members will note that this item has been proposed in paragraph 13 (a) (iii) for consideration in plenary meeting in order to enable the General Assembly to deal with the question of the implementation of the Declaration in general. All the chapters of the Special Committee's report relating to specific territories should be referred to the Fourth Committee. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly approves these recommendations.

It was so decided.

133. The PRESIDENT: Items 24 to 27 inclusive have been recommended for consideration in plenary meeting. I take it that the Assembly approves this recommendation.

It was so decided.

134. The PRESIDENT: With reference to item 64 on the question of Namibia, the General Committee recommends, in paragraph 13 (a) iv, that although the item would be allocated to plenary meetings petitioners requesting to speak on this item should be heard by the Fourth Committee, which would submit a report on such hearings to the Assembly in plenary meeting before the Assembly concluded its consideration of the question. I take it that the General Assembly approves this recommendation.

It was so decided.

135. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to items 95, 98 and 101 which are recommended for consideration in plenary meeting. I take it that the General Assembly approves this recommendation.

It was so decided.

136. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now examine the six items which the General Committee has recommended for allocation to the First Committee. I take it that the Assembly approves these recommendations.

It was so decided.

137. The PRESIDENT: The General Committee has recommended four items for consideration by the Special Political Committee. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly approves this recommendation.

It was so decided.

138. The PRESIDENT: I now invite Members of the Assembly to examine the list of items to be allocated to the Second Committee. With regard to the report the Economic and Social Council to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session [A/7603], the General Committee recommends that a number of chapters should be considered in the Second Committee. It considers that chapter XIII, sections A and B, might also be of concern to the Third and Fifth Committees. Furthermore, the General Committee recommends that the question of the amendment to the rules of procedure raised in paragraphs 764 to 770 of the Economic and Social Council report to the twenty-third session³ should after their consideration by the Second and Third Committees be transmitted to the Sixth Committee in accordance with the rules of procedure. I take it that the General Assembly approves these recommendations.

It was so decided.

139. The PRESIDENT: Agenda item 12 will therefore read "Reports of the Economic and Social Council".

140. We shall now turn to the proposed allocation of items to the Third Committee. Concerning the report of the Economic and Social Council to the twenty-fourth session [A/7603], the General Committee recommends in paragraph 13 (b) of its report that chapter VIII, sections A, C and E and chapter XI, section I, might be of concern to the Second Committee. I take it that the Assembly approves these recommendations.

It was so decided.

141. The PRESIDENT: With regard to item 92 entitled "The problems and needs of youth and its participation in national development", the General Committee recommends, in paragraph 15 (a) of its report, that the item should be allocated to the Third Committee on the understanding that it might be of concern also to the Second Committee. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly approves this recommendation.

It was so decided.

142. The PRESIDENT: Is there any objection to the proposed allocation of the other agenda items for consideration by the Third Committee? Since there is no objection,

I shall take it that the Assembly approves this recommendation.

It was so decided.

143. The PRESIDENT: Are there any comments on the allocation of the thirteen items to the Fourth Committee? Since there are no comments, I take it that the General Assembly approves this recommendation.

It was so decided.

144. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the proposed allocation of items to the Fifth Committee. With regard to the report of the Economic and Social Council to the twenty-fourth session [A/7603], the General Committee recommends, in paragraph 13 (c) of its report, that chapter XII, concerning the work programme of the United Nations in the economic, social and human rights fields and its budgetary requirements, might be referred to the Second and Third Committees for comment. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly approves this recommendation.

It was so decided.

145. The PRESIDENT: Is there any objection to the proposed allocation of the other agenda items for consideration by the Fifth Committee? Since there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly approves these recommendations.

It was so decided.

146. The PRESIDENT: Finally, I put before the General Assembly the proposed allocation of ten items to the Sixth Committee. Since there are no comments, I take it that the General Assembly approves the allocation of items to the Sixth Committee.

It was so decided.

147. The PRESIDENT: I now invite members to turn their attention to section V of the report [A/7700] containing suggestions by the Secretary-General concerning the general debate. These suggestions, relating to inscription on the list of speakers, the number of speakers in a day, the closing of the list of speakers, and exercise of the right of reply, were made "with a view to ensuring that the debates in plenary meetings proceed in an orderly manner and that the time assigned to debates is fully utilized" [A/BUR/175, para. 1]. These suggestions might also apply, to the extent possible, to debates in the Committees, at the discretion of their Chairmen. Since there are no comments, I take it that the General Assembly approves the General Committee's recommendation to apply the Secretary-General's suggestions concerning the general debate.

It was so decided.

148. The PRESIDENT: We have concluded consideration of the first report of the General Committee. I thank members of the Assembly for having made it possible for us to complete our task today.

³ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session, Supplement No. 3.

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

149. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Iraq, who has asked to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

150. Mr. RAOUF (Iraq): Madam President, the Chairman of the Iraqi delegation will, in due course, extend to you our congratulations on your election to the high office of the Presidency of the General Assembly. I should like, however, even in this brief intervention to express to you my confidence that, being endowed with such knowledge and experience, you will be able to conduct the proceedings of the Assembly with a firm yet tactful hand, to bring it to the successful conclusion we all desire.

151. Nevertheless, Madam President, it is extremely doubtful that any fruitful conclusion can be expected if we allow such dabbling in travesties as was carried out at our last meeting by Mr. Eban [*1757th meeting*]. I am not going to deal now with the travesty of facts and logic in his approach to the situation in the Middle East resulting from the Israeli aggression and occupation of the territories of three Member States of the United Nations, and from the persistent Israeli denial of the basic rights of the Palestinians to homeland and nationhood. There will be another occasion to expose this. I should like, therefore, to confine myself now to only two of Mr. Eban's assumptions and would express the hope that the totality of the membership of this Organization will not let them go unchallenged.

152. Mr. Eban, in his now customary distortion of facts, attempted to project the genuine grief and concern felt by Moslems all over the world in the wake of the burning of Al Aqsa Mosque as a result of "incitement" by the Arab States. No more grievous insult than that could be levelled against the feelings of Moslems and the intelligence of an audience. Yet, in a remarkable application of double standards, Mr. Eban, in his usual flowery language, attempted to arouse passions in his challenge of the sovereign right of the Government of Iraq to prosecute some of its nationals in accordance with the law. In the course of his lengthy speech, he elaborated on what he called "the persecution of Jews in the Arab world", citing as an example the execution of court sentences in respect of Iraqi nationals who, in due process of the law, had been found guilty of spying for Israel. He did not mention them all—only the Jews among them.

153. This brings me to his first assumption. His invocation of humanity can in no way hide the political motive behind his reference: and that is the extension by Israel of some kind of extra-territorial jurisdiction over Jews in other nations. Now, that is not a novel practice by Israel. In fact, the whole concept of the foundation of Israel was based on the cabalistic assumption of the Zionists that Jews, wherever they may be, owe allegiance only to the State of Israel, and, accordingly, only Israel could exercise sovereign jurisdiction over them. What would the principles of international law be if the United Nations allowed that assumption to pass?

154. It was natural for Mr. Eban to disown those Iraqis Jews, Moslems and Christians—who had been found guilty

of espionage for Israel. We did not expect him to admit the guilt of his Government—at least, not immediately. But in the face of his vehement denial of any connexion between them and Israel, and his categorical disclaimer of any responsibility, I should like to remind him of what Dana Adams Schmidt wrote in the Sunday issue of *The New York Times*, of 31 August 1969, barely three weeks ago. I quote:

"The Israelis frequently boast about the excellence of their intelligence in the Arab world, and the accuracy of some of their bombing during the June 1967 war suggests that the boasts are not idle.

“ . . .

"In 1955 Egyptian counter intelligence detected a group of young Egyptian Jews whom Israeli intelligence had employed to plant an incendiary bomb in the United States Information Center in Alexandria with the intention of undermining United States-Egyptian relations. The famous Lavon affair, which pitted David Ben Gurion against Pinhas Lavon on the Israeli political scene, ensued.

"One of the members of that early group of young Egyptian Jews who escaped was Elie Cohen. Israeli intelligence carefully prepared him for an espionage role by sending him to Argentina where he posed as a Syrian immigrant. Playing the role of a 'returning' Syrian, he then established himself in Damascus, an eminently successful businessman, it seemed, with ample means, who penetrated the highest circles of Syrian society. Since his apprehension and conviction in 1965 he has been celebrated in Israel as a hero.

"Before that, Lebanon had the Shula Cohen affair—a Jewish woman who was convicted for running a spy ring and is now in prison.

“ . . .

"The problems of Iraq were probably complicated by the fact that until 1958 she remained a pro-Western State in which Israel and the Western powers found it easier than elsewhere to establish contacts."

155. Needless to say, in each of those and other cases, Israel, and Mr. Eban himself, denied at the time that those individuals were Israeli spies—only to come later and acknowledge them with boastful pride. The pattern has not changed this time. We shall await the time when streets in Israel are named after the Iraqi spies—or at least those of them of the Jewish faith.

156. In his attempt to exculpate the Iraqis who have been convicted of espionage for Israel, and to deny any connexion between them and Israel, Mr. Eban does not only aim at exonerating his Government from any responsibility, but he also, and in a typically insidious fashion, attempts to give validity to his second assumption: that is, that Jews, by virtue of being Jews, must be above and beyond the due process of the law of any country.

157. It will be observed how those two assumptions of Mr. Eban are interdependent. By establishing the assump-

tion that Israel has a particular relationship with Jews of other nationalities, and by extending Israel extra-territoriality to those Jews, Mr. Eban would establish that Jews all over the world are, *sui generis*, subject to no other jurisdiction except that of Israel, even the jurisdiction of their own countries; and by claiming that dual allegiance of Jews, Mr. Eban wants to give the impression that Jews all over the world are suspect in the eyes of the law of any country.

158. The international community should totally and categorically reject that. As far as Iraq is concerned, Iraqi laws do not recognize any distinction between Iraqis because of race, sex or religion; all Iraqis are equal under the law, and, accordingly, no Iraqi can claim any particular exemption from the due process of the law, whether he be Moslem, Christian or Jew. If Israel feels any particular responsibility towards Jews of other nationalities, especially the Iraqi Jews, then the least that can be expected of it is not to expose them to the hazards of betraying their own country.

159. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Israel to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

160. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel): Madam President, Mr. Eban yesterday expressed to you the congratulations of the Government and delegation of Israel on your election as President of this session of the General Assembly. Will you allow me also to add my personal congratulations and good wishes?

161. In reply to the statement we have just heard, may I say—and I hope I will keep within the limits of the ten-minute rule which the General Assembly has just adopted—that incitement to religious hatred by Arab States has been adequately exposed in the recent debates in the Security Council, and I shall not take up the time of the General Assembly by repeating that here. In due course we shall take this matter up in the proper context, when we shall also detail Iraq's part in it. I would say now, however, that Iraq's general record on the treatment of minorities, including certain Moslem minorities in that country, is well known and is amply documented in the public record, especially in that of the League of Nations.

162. If I understood what the representative of Iraq was saying, he was really complaining about the fact that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Israel, when he yesterday enumerated how the prospects for peace in the Middle East were being threatened, referred specifically to the revolting public hangings which have recently taken place in the streets of Baghdad. With all that he has said, the representative of Iraq has not denied the facts. The facts speak for themselves; he cannot deny the facts. If he does not think that "revolting" is the appropriate way of describing public hangings—after secret so-called trials—of innocent victims of the dictatorial instability of the Iraqi régime, that is his business. I have no doubt at all what all right-minded persons in this hall and the world over think about that.

163. Now Iraq is encouraging mere youngsters in their early teens to train for and engage in indiscriminate killing

and bomb-throwing in European cities far away from the Middle East. It is encouraging them and it is giving them asylum. This is the contribution of Iraq to the participation of youth in national development. This is the contribution of Iraq to the advancement of human rights, to the administration of justice and to the education and development of the young. This is the contribution of Iraq to the law of asylum. I am sure that the appropriate Committees and Commissions would wish to take note of this when they come to deal with the items on their agendas.

164. But above all, this is the contribution of Iraq to the restoration of permanent peace in the Middle East, for the shattering of which Iraq bears such a heavy responsibility.

165. Here I wish to recall to the General Assembly what is already a matter of common knowledge in the Security Council, that the acceptance of the cease-fire ordered by the Security Council in June 1967 [*resolution 233 (1967)*] by Iraq was at best equivocal and ambiguous—if it was real at all—as we have pointed out several times in formal communications which have been circulated to the Security Council.

166. The main argument, if that is what it can be called, which the representative of Iraq repeated today, not for the first time, was that these trials and public hangings were a domestic matter for the Government of Iraq. That is the same argument that we were hearing thirty and thirty-five years ago from Hitler and Goebbels and from the other mentors of modern advocates and practitioners of racial and religious discrimination and hatred, which the United Nations is pledged to eradicate.

167. The United Nations is well aware of the fact that a legalistic and formal attitude on the question of domestic jurisdiction, to which defendant Governments so frequently have resort, is not what the Charter of the United Nations envisages. Nor is the position which the representative of Iraq just took consistent with an earlier position which he took this very morning in connexion with the adoption of the agenda. The Charter, learning from the Nazi experience, does not envisage the domestic jurisdiction argument when a Government's ostensibly internal activities constitute a threat to international peace.

168. My delegation will also deal at the appropriate time and in the appropriate place with all the other fantasies and *canards* which we have just heard and which do not relate to anything that Mr. Eban said yesterday.

169. The PRESIDENT: Yesterday I did not have an opportunity of thanking those representatives who had paid me compliments, since I was obliged to leave just before the meeting closed. To them and to those representatives who addressed the General Assembly this morning I should like to extend my deep appreciation of the kind words which they addressed to me.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.