

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTIETH YEAR

UN LIBRARY

FEB 2 1976

1834th MEETING: 6 AUGUST 1975

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1834)	1
Expression of thanks to the retiring President	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the text of a telegram dated 15 July 1975 from the President of the Provisional Revolutionary Govern- ment of the Republic of South Viet-Nam (S/11756)	14
Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the text of a telegram dated 16 July 1975 from the Prime Minister of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam (S/11761)	14

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

1834th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 6 August 1975, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Shizuo SAITO (Japan).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Costa Rica, France, Guyana, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1834)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the text of a telegram dated 15 July 1975 from the President of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet-Nam (S/11756)
3. Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the text of a telegram dated 16 July 1975 from the Prime Minister of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam (S/11761)
4. Note by the Secretary-General transmitting a letter dated 30 July 1975 from the Permanent Observer of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations and the text of a telegram dated 29 July 1975 from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea (S/11783)

The meeting was called to order at 3.55 p.m.

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

1. The PRESIDENT: It is my first duty as President of the Security Council—and a pleasant one indeed—to express to the delegation of Italy the gratitude and appreciation that I am sure all members of the Council feel for the outstanding services rendered to the Council during the month of July by Mr. Plaja, who occupied the Chair of the President of the Council. I am sure that my colleagues all share with me the sense of loss that his departure from our midst has caused and join me in wishing him success in his new assignment. I should like to request the representative of Italy to transmit the appreciation and best wishes of the Council to his former ambassador, and at the same time I wish to express to you, Mr. Cavaglieri, the admiration felt by all of us for the skilful manner in which you presided over the informal

activities of the Council prior to the formal meetings. Both members of the Italian delegation contributed substantially to the work of the Council on the important matters before it through their wisdom, tact, patience and impartiality.

Adoption of the agenda

2. The PRESIDENT: The provisional agenda is before members for adoption in accordance with rule 9 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. During the consultations that I have held, a request was made by a number of representatives on the Council that items be included in the agenda by a vote on each item, one by one. I therefore propose, with the Council's consent, to proceed to the adoption of the agenda by taking a vote on each item on the provisional agenda, one by one, in the order in which they are listed.

3. I now put to the vote the question of the inclusion in the agenda of item 2 of the provisional agenda, "Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the text of a telegram dated 15 July 1975 from the President of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet-Nam (S/11756)".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Costa Rica, France, Guyana, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

The inclusion of item 2 in the agenda was approved by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

4. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the question of the inclusion in the agenda of item 3 of the provisional agenda, "Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the text of a telegram dated 16 July 1975 from the Prime Minister of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam (S/11761)".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Costa Rica, France, Guyana, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania.

Against: None.

Abstaining: United States of America.

The inclusion of item 3 in the agenda was approved by 14 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

5. The PRESIDENT: I shall now proceed to put to the vote the question of the inclusion in the agenda of item 4, "Note by the Secretary-General transmitting a letter dated 30 July 1975 from the Permanent Observer of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations and the text of a telegram dated 29 July 1975 from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Korea (S/11783)".

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Costa Rica, France, Italy, Japan, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Iraq, Mauritania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania.

Abstaining: Guyana, United Republic of Cameroon.

The result of the vote was 7 in favour, 6 against, with 2 abstentions.

The inclusion of item 4 in the agenda was not approved, having failed to obtain the affirmative votes of nine members.

6. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the provisional agenda, as amended, as a whole.

7. I call on Mr. Malik of the Soviet Union of a point of order.

8. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I believe that there is no basis for voting on the provisional agenda as a whole. The point is that, in accordance with the generally accepted working procedure in the United Nations and its organs, after individual items of the agenda have been adopted there is no requirement for a vote on the adoption of the agenda as a whole, particularly since agreement on such a procedure did not exist at yesterday's meeting. Quite to the contrary, we all agreed—and there was no objection—to the proposal made at that informal meeting by a group of non-aligned States members of the Security Council, a proposal supported by a number of other Security

Council members, including the Soviet Union, that we should vote separately on each individual item included in the agenda.

9. Everyone was well aware that the main point of that proposal of the non-aligned countries was that the application of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the application of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam should be considered separately and independently, without any connexion whatsoever with the Korean question and the consideration of the application of South Korea.

10. I would add that, as all members are aware, there were some people at that meeting who attempted to make a connexion between these two questions and to have them considered as a package. However, as the majority of members of the Security Council made their views known, there was no basis for such a link. The admission of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam to membership in the United Nations has nothing whatsoever to do with the Korean problem. The practice in the admission to membership in the United Nations of two States situated on the territory of a separated country has been to admit them only if both have expressed their wish and agreement to take that step to become Members of the United Nations.

11. In contrast to the case of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam, there is no unanimity of view between South Korea and the Korean Democratic Republic with regard to their admission to membership in the United Nations. Therefore, the linking of the question of the admission to membership in the United Nations of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam with another completely separate question—completely separate by its very nature—can only be viewed as the deliberate creation of a complication in the resolution of the question concerning the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam. It was precisely as a consequence of this that the Soviet Union was unable to support the proposal to include in the agenda the question of the resumption of consideration of the application of South Korea for admission to membership in the United Nations.

12. As I have already said in referring to existing practice of United Nations organs, including the General Assembly and the Security Council, after a vote has been held on the inclusion of an item in the agenda there is no need whatsoever to vote on the agenda as a whole. It is precisely this system which makes it possible for every member of the Security Council to express its view and determine its stand with regard to each item on the provisional agenda. Therefore, the proposal to vote on the agenda as a whole in spite of the agreement achieved at yesterday's informal meeting of the Security Council is new and unexpected and it somehow suggests an attempt

arbitrarily to revise the agreement we arrived at yesterday among members of the Security Council and to reach a different decision.

13. I repeat that this kind of practice in the work of the Council would run counter to the existing practice of the General Assembly and the Security Council. We are all very well aware that when the question of the adoption of the agenda for sessions of the General Assembly is considered in the General Committee of the Assembly and then in plenary meeting, every item on the agenda is considered separately and a separate decision is taken to include or not to include a given question or item in the agenda. After the adoption of a decision on each individual item, no vote is held on the agenda as a whole. Therefore, I believe that the Council should proceed to a discussion of those items which have now been included in the agenda.

14. The PRESIDENT: The Chair ruled that the provisional agenda as a whole, as amended, be put to the vote. Now a challenge has been submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union. I should like to put the challenge to the vote.

15. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): In my statement I did not speak of any challenge. That is your interpretation, Sir. I just gave an explanation of why it was not advisable to hold a vote on the adoption of the agenda as a whole after, by a majority of votes, two items had been included in the agenda. So, without this intermediary stage of voting on the agenda as a whole, the procedure most clearly indicated would be a consideration of those items which by the desire and by the vote of the majority of the members of the Security Council have been included in the agenda of the Council.

16. The PRESIDENT: The Chair deems it normal practice to put to the vote the provisional agenda, as amended. Therefore, the Chair proposes to put to the vote whether the agenda as a whole, as amended, should be voted upon.

17. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Mr. President, I should like to raise a point of order. The President proposed that the amended agenda should be put to the vote. I should like to seek a clarification from the President as to whether this amended agenda includes only items 2 and 3 and not item 4, which has already been rejected. I should like some clarification on this, Mr. President.

18. The PRESIDENT: The original agenda had four items; now there are only three items. So the provisional agenda now before us is different from the original one. Therefore, it is proper to put to the vote the agenda as a whole, as amended. At the same time, it is normal practice in the United Nations. I therefore put to the vote the Chair's ruling, that is, to put to the vote the provisional agenda as a whole, as amended.

19. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, unless I misunderstood Mr. Malik, when he intervened he did not challenge the position of the President. All he said was that, in accordance with normal conventional practice, it is not necessary to insist on voting after separate items of the agenda have been adopted. Unless Mr. Malik is formally proposing that we challenge a ruling, I do not really see that it is necessary to start voting on whether or not the President's proposal of voting on the provisional agenda as a whole should be voted on first.

20. The PRESIDENT: Mr. Malik, I hope that you will not insist on your statement to me. You said that your statement does not challenge the Chair's ruling. Therefore, I should like to put to the vote the proposal the Chair made that the provisional agenda as a whole shall be put to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

The proposal was adopted unanimously.

21. The PRESIDENT: The agenda, as amended, is adopted. The Chair was wrong. It is decided that the Chair's proposal is now put to the vote.

22. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): On a point of order, Mr. President, I do not see how we could have possibly voted on whether or not the President's proposal should be put to the vote when, after my intervention, Mr. Malik never challenged your decision. You stated that we were proceeding to the vote on the provisional agenda as amended, and we were voting on the provisional agenda as amended. Certainly I can assure you that if we had been voting on whether or not your proposal should be put to the vote, I would either have voted against or abstained. I think now that this confusion is most unwarranted and I want to make it very clear that, when we voted, we voted for the adoption of the agenda as amended.

23. Mr. MOYNIHAN (United States of America): We believe the Chair was right in both its understandings, first that we were voting on whether to vote and secondly that we would now proceed to vote to adopt the agenda as amended. That is our understanding.

24. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): As far as we were concerned, our position was very simple. We voted on the question that you put to us, Mr. President, and the question that you put to us was whether or not your ruling as President—that there should be a vote on the agenda as amended—should be supported. With a delightful display of unanimity around the table, all the members of the Security Council apparently seem to have supported your ruling that a vote should now take place on the amended agenda. Certainly that was our understanding of it and that was that we voted for. If that was not the question that we were voting on, then perhaps we had better get the question put, and then we will vote on it,

but I am quite clear in my own mind what it was you asked us to vote on.

25. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I heard the Russian interpretation to the effect that the President simply stated that he was putting to the vote the agenda of the Security Council as a whole, as amended by the previous votes. That was my understanding, and everyone had that understanding. If two members of the Security Council did not share that understanding, that is their business. There is no basis whatsoever for voting again on an already adopted decision. It would be unprecedented if some members of the Council are making a proposal to the effect that this already unanimously adopted proposal of the Council is not acceptable to them, then this is a challenge to an already adopted decision. In order to admit this challenge we would have to have another vote on their proposal. If it is a challenge, we have to put that challenge to the vote and then see what the results are, but an adopted decision is legitimate, and the Council must, in accordance with that decision, proceed to the consideration of those items of its agenda adopted by the previous vote. This is the situation. If some members of the Council have a different interpretation of the decision adopted, Mr. President, let us listen to the tape of your words and the exact formulation of what you put to the vote.

26. Mr. MOYNIHAN (United States of America): With respect to my distinguished and senior colleague, it seems to me that the two members of the Council to which he referred share the pleasant understanding that not only do we agree but what we agree on is that we agree with the President and that it was your statement, Mr. President, that we had just unanimously agreed to proceed with the vote on the amended agenda, which we welcomed and which we hope may now take place.

27. Mr. JACKSON (Guyana): Mr. President, it is not my intention to delay these proceedings inordinately or in any way try to confuse what is already a confused situation, but, since we are baring our souls as to our understanding, I think I should, on behalf of my delegation, put on record what my understanding of the vote we have just taken is.

28. If my memory serves me correctly—and I hope this will be confirmed by the verbatim records when they are produced—immediately before you put the question to the Council, you expressed the hope that Mr. Malik would not insist and that his statement was not to be regarded as a challenge to your proposal. Our recollection of the formulation is clear, and it is that what you were putting to us—certainly when we voted this is what we understood—was the adoption of the agenda as amended by the previous voting. In those circumstances, since it appears that we all agree on the agenda, I think we can consider that vote as taken and proceed now with the consideration of the substantive aspects of the agenda.

29. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): Like my colleague and friend, the representative of Guyana, we really do not want to start an unnecessarily long-winded debate on an issue which is so clear. I believe it was clear to you, Mr. President, because when you announced the result of the voting you went further and announced that the agenda was adopted. Somehow only after a noisy intervention from my colleague to the left and to some extent from my colleague to the right—I am not referring to my colleague on my immediate right—we had the problem that you were mistaken. I think we are setting a rather bad precedent. I have no very strong views but I think it is a very bad precedent for the Security Council to take a decision and then for one or two members to say that they did not understand the decision correctly and for us to go back again and give a different interpretation to the decision we have taken. I want to make our position clear. It was very clear that when you asked us to vote we were voting on the adoption of the agenda. It is clear now, and I believe it was clear to the President. It may not have been clear to some of our colleagues, but I do not think it is fair that, because one or two of our colleagues did not understand so clearly, all of us should be subjected to such a misunderstanding.

30. The PRESIDENT: I apologize for the confusion that has arisen. I now propose to put to the vote the provisional agenda as amended—the provisional agenda I now propose to have the Council vote upon is the provisional agenda containing items 2 and 3.

31. I call on the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic on a point of order.

32. Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): We have already voted on the agenda as amended, Mr. President. You said so yourself, both before the voting and afterwards. Do you see how many members of the Security Council have confirmed this fact? You announced the result of the vote. Do you now want to change the results of a vote we have already held on this matter? You cannot put the same question to the vote again, as has been correctly pointed out by the representative of the Soviet Union. If you did so, you should have to raise the question of a challenge on the part of those representatives who, apparently, have decided to challenge the results of the voting just completed. I would request an explanation, Sir.

33. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): Mr. President, the Chinese delegation agrees entirely with what was said by the representatives of Guyana and the United Republic of Tanzania. Just now, the President, in putting the agenda to the vote, stated very clearly that he intended to put to the vote the agenda as amended. Therefore the vote has already been carried out. There is no need to carry it out again.

34. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): To me there seem to be only two ways of resolving this issue,

if I may say so. One is that the vote be taken now, which is, as I understand it, what you propose to do, and I entirely agree with you, since the vote has in our view not yet been taken at all. Alternatively, we could adjourn until we get the verbatim record so that we can see exactly what it was that was put to the vote.

35. There seems to be a clear division in the Council as to the form of the question you actually put to the Council. I have no doubt in my mind—and this is confirmed by all those sitting behind me, at any rate—that, as far as the English version is concerned, we were voting on whether a vote should be taken. We were not voting on whether or not we adopted the provisional agenda as amended.

36. Therefore, if some members around this table are really going to seek to take advantage of the understandable confusion that has arisen, I would suggest that the only thing we can do is adjourn this meeting until the verbatim records—perhaps in all languages—have been made available. Then, no doubt, we would have an opportunity to decide precisely what it was that you actually put to the vote, Sir. If that is what the representative of the Soviet Union wants, very well, so be it.

37. Mr. AL-SHAikhLY (Iraq): Mr. President, we think the position is very clear. You made a ruling. The Soviet representative made a comment but not a challenge, which was further emphasized by Mr. Salim. Then you requested Mr. Malik not to insist on his position. When the representative of the Soviet Union did not object, you proceeded to put to the vote the amended agenda, which was adopted as you have mentioned. I agree with Mr. Malik that we should refer to the tapes to clear up the confusion.

38. Mr. LECOMPT (France) (*interpretation from French*): If I have understood correctly, we have a proposal to suspend the meeting because of a possible misunderstanding on the votes that were cast. I believe that the request that we consult the verbatim records is reasonable, and I should like it to be very seriously taken into account by the President.

39. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): It appears Mr. Richard did not quite understand me. I did not propose suspension of the Security Council meeting. I have no doubt as to how you formulated your proposal, Mr. President, and what you put to the vote. I am absolutely clear about it, and so are many other members of the Council that, after I said I was not putting forward a challenge, you put to the vote your proposal concerning the vote on the adoption of the agenda of the Council as a whole, as amended by previous votes. I said that if any member of the Council had any doubts about the formulation of your proposal, about what you actually put to the vote, then they could listen to the tape. But there is no need to

suspend the Council proceedings in order to do that, thus giving a pretext for a delay, or for any other connivances to reverse the adopted decision of the Council. The agenda has been adopted, as a result of this vote, and I propose that we discuss the items on it. Those who have any doubts about the formulation of your proposal can listen to the tapes without the meeting of the Council being suspended.

40. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): I wonder if I might make two points of order. One is that it is a little difficult for us to continue to consider the provisional agenda items until we know whether we have in fact adopted the provisional agenda, and the only way in which we can know that is, as I see it, to suspend the meeting and get the transcript.

41. Secondly, might I point out that under rule 33 of the provisional rules of procedure, a motion to suspend the meeting or to adjourn the meeting is one which should have precedence in the order named over all principal motions and draft resolutions relative to the subject before the meeting. Therefore I say again that if the representative of the Soviet Union insists on trying to capitalize on what is an obvious misunderstanding on the form of the question and the vote, then I propose to move to suspend this meeting under rule 33 until the transcripts in all relevant languages are prepared and ready for inspection.

42. The PRESIDENT: In reply to the point of order raised by the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, I would say that there seems to be confusion. I clearly proposed again what I intended to do. Now there is a proposal by Mr. Richard to suspend the meeting. If there is no objection...

43. I call on the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic on a point of order.

44. Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, in connexion with your explanation I should like to point out once again that the Security Council held a vote on the amended agenda. The results of the vote were announced by you after the vote. After that, two members of the Security Council decided to challenge the result of the vote, and you, Sir, as it now emerges, decided to change your initial view as announced to us both before and after the vote—that is, that the Council had voted on the amended agenda. I repeat: as a result of the fact that two members of the Council decided to change the vote, you are now once again proposing to the Council that it vote on the issue on which it has already voted. In the view of our delegation this is quite illogical and wrong, and is indeed unprecedented in the history of the Council.

45. The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, I shall now suspend the meeting...

46. I call on the representative of the Soviet Union on a point of order.

47. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, if you are accepting Mr. Richard's proposal, you should put it to the vote. Let us see who is in favour of suspending the meeting and who is not.

48. The PRESIDENT: As there is an objection to the suspension of the meeting...

49. Mr. HUANG Hua (China): Point of order.

50. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of China on a point of order.

51. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like to make a remark on a point of order. In accordance with rule 33 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, if the meeting is to be suspended, then the motion for suspension itself should first of all be put to the vote, and we should not vote on the objection to the suspension. As for the Chinese delegation, I would only wish to clarify that we are opposed to the suspension of the meeting.

52. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the motion to suspend the meeting.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Costa Rica, France, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, Iraq, Mauritania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Tanzania.

Abstentions: United Republic of Cameroon.

The result of the vote was 6 in favour, 7 against and 1 abstention.

The motion was not adopted, having failed to obtain the affirmative vote of nine members.

One member (Guyana) did not participate in the voting.

53. Mr. MOYNIHAN (United States of America): Mr. President, this is not a distinguished moment in the life of the Security Council. We are 15 grown persons capable of letting our views be known. An understandable misunderstanding has occurred. What is the point of pursuing the possibilities of further misunderstanding in the way some of our colleagues have done?

54. Mr. President, the representative of the United States and the representative of the United Kingdom

have stated that we share your understanding of what you put to the vote. Now, surely, courtesy to the President of the Council suggests concurrence with the President's understanding as to what just happened. All that remains to be done, if this courtesy is shown you, is to proceed to the question: Do we accept the agenda as amended?

55. The PRESIDENT: Now, it is the President's understanding that the votes we have had separately on each item of the provisional agenda were to confirm the inclusion of each item in the agenda. As a result of the vote on the agenda, items 2 and 3 have been adopted for inclusion on the agenda, but the adoption of the agenda as a whole has to be voted on. With the Council's permission, I now propose to put to the vote the agenda as a whole, as amended.

56. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): I entirely agree that we must show courtesy to the President, and if we agree to your suggestion, Mr. President, it is specifically because of our wish to show courtesy to you. But I do not agree, in the light of the intervention of the representative of the United States, that those who have taken up the question have perhaps by any implication shown discourtesy to the President. What did the President say concerning the voting? I think the record will show that he said that the proposal for the adoption of the items was put to the vote, and that then, after the voting had taken place, he clearly said—and I think no one in the Council will have forgotten that he clearly said it—that the agenda had been adopted.

57. I agree that this is not a very distinguished moment in the life of the Council, for the 15 of us to be labouring on whether or not we really had agreed on something. But I think it would be equally undistinguished for the Security Council were we, after the Council had adopted a decision, somehow or other to go back to vote on the same decision. I therefore reluctantly respond to the appeal made by the representative of the United States, but making it very clear that by doing what we have done today we may have created a bad precedent for the procedure of the Council.

58. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, we certainly have a rather unusual situation here. Some speakers have said that this is not one of the distinguished moments of the Security Council's work. I cannot agree with that. Perhaps this is one of the undistinguished moments as concerns attention part by some Council members to the President's proposals. But this has nothing to do with the Security Council itself. I should like to remind you of what I said before. We here decided not to suspend the Council meeting, and I think it would be a good idea if you asked the Secretariat, very speedily, to present us with the tape of what was actually said—just the few words before the vote concerning what we were voting on,

and the results that you announced after the vote. Everything would then be clear, and those who are attempting to revise this decision would realize that they were wrong.

59. Mr. LECOMPT (France) (*interpretation from French*): I have asked to be allowed to speak in explanation of votes—in the plural. I should like to explain what I have done. I fear that as this discussion continues we tend to forget what we ourselves have done.

60. I voted in favour of referring to the Committee on the Admission of New Members the agenda as presented. Quite frankly, that was how I understood your question, Mr. President.

61. Then I voted in favour of suspending the meeting because there were some doubts on the part of two of our perfectly honourable colleagues, and those doubts in turn caused me to have doubts about what I had really voted on. I have a certain impression, but I no longer have any certainty, since two of our most honourable colleagues have had an understanding different from mine. I therefore voted in favour of suspending the meeting so that we could at least examine the tapes and let the actual facts rather than a majority decide. It would, after all, be totally inadmissible to hold a vote on an actual occurrence.

62. That was why I voted in favour, as I recall, of referring to the Committee on the Admission of New Members the amended agenda—that was my understanding—but then I also voted in favour of suspending the meeting to enable us to ascertain what we all had done, and I first of all. We can, of course, ascertain this tomorrow, but it seems to me to be perfectly possible to try to do it now.

63. That is the explanation of my votes and I hope there will be no misunderstanding.

64. Mr. JACKSON (Guyana): I too, on behalf of my delegation, would like to explain our vote—if it can be called a vote—in relation to the motion to suspend this meeting.

65. I think Guyana ranks no lower than any other member of the Council in terms of having respect for the office of the presidency. It was with that consideration in mind that we sought, through our intervention, to lend weight to what we consider to be a majority view in the Council: that what you, Mr. President, had originally put to the vote was the adoption of the agenda. We were concerned that a misunderstanding, no matter how genuine, could itself be interpreted as a form of discourtesy to the President, and it was with that in mind that we decided not to participate in the vote on suspension because we felt that we should lean on your guidance here this afternoon, Mr. President, to see how we could find a way out of this impasse.

66. Mr. President, you have proposed that we take another vote. Without in any way altering the position we have taken, and wishing to emphasize that this procedure should not be taken in any form to represent a precedent where a decision of the Council can be challenged through misunderstanding, we would, out of extreme courtesy to you, agree with your proposal to put the motion to the vote again.

67. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): It is a rare occasion, but I am delighted for once to agree with the representative of the Soviet Union. He said we should consult the tapes. Mr. President, we have a tape recording of what you actually said immediately before you took the vote. We have managed to obtain it within the course of the last 20 minutes. I would suggest, therefore, that the proper course for the Security Council to resolve this is that we should now perhaps hold informal consultations in your room where the representative of the Soviet Union and everybody else can listen to the tape recording. If that does not resolve it, then no doubt we will have to consider what our next step should be, but if it does resolve it, then no doubt we can continue with the meeting in the proper way.

68. I therefore make that proposal, which I hope will be acceptable to everybody around this table.

69. Mr. KANE (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has refrained from speaking from the beginning of the debate because we have felt that the various proposals that you, Mr. President, have made were sufficiently clear and the votes were conducted equally clearly.

70. Earlier we voted on the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom for a suspension of the meeting, and the majority expressed a clear feeling. Its wish was that the Council meeting should proceed in the normal manner.

71. The representative of Guyana has made a proposal which, in my opinion, is quite specific and at the same time enables delegations which did not understand your proposal to vote again according to their wishes. It does not seem to me necessary, therefore, to suspend this formal meeting of the Council and proceed to consultations since delegations have an opportunity to vote again and, in so doing, even to take a position contrary to the one they took in the first vote.

72. Therefore my delegation, which cannot accept the proposal of the representative of the United Kingdom, believes that we should proceed to a vote, as just proposed by the representative of Guyana.

73. Mr. SUNDBERG (Sweden): I wish just to explain that my delegation could not support the idea of a suspension of the meeting until the time when we have the verbatim records in all the languages. The matter

that is before the Council today is a very urgent one and we are anxious to press ahead with its solution.

74. With regard to the future procedure, we can go along with the Council with reference to the proposal for a new vote. We could also go along with the idea of the representative of the United Kingdom for private consultations in order to solve this matter.

75. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*Interpretation from Russian*): I should like to make a clarification. In my last statement I stressed that I wanted those who had some doubt about the formulation to check the tapes. I have no doubt. I voted for a clear-cut formulation of the proposal by the President of the Security Council that after the voting on the individual items of the provisional agenda a vote be taken on the agenda as a whole, as amended—that is, without item 4. That was the understanding of us all. I also explained before the vote why this should not be done. The President did not agree and insisted on having his vote.

76. I said that my statement did not constitute a challenge, and there was additional explanation from the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania, Mr. Salim. The picture was extremely clear. The President stated his ruling that there should be a vote. He put the matter to the vote, and we all voted in favour of the adoption of the agenda as a whole, including those who were not paying close attention to the formulation of the President's proposal.

77. So I see no basis whatsoever for voting again, since to do so would create a highly undesirable precedent. I remember previous occasions when, by a majority of votes, decisions were taken, without any objections being taken into account. An adopted decision is law; it can be rescinded only by means of a challenge. If anyone does not like it, well, challenge it please, and put your challenge to the vote. That is the only way out of the situation.

78. Mr. BOOH BOOH (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): I should like briefly to explain the meaning of the vote we have just cast. When you, Mr. President, requested the representative of the Soviet Union not to insist on his interpretation of your wish in guiding our debates, there was no doubt that the proposal submitted to us for a vote was on the amended agenda, and we proceeded accordingly. There is no doubt on this subject, and my delegation sees no reason why we should suspend the meeting and listen to the tapes.

79. However, in order to facilitate your work, and since we bear heavy responsibilities when we cast a vote in the Council, I would be inclined, as a courtesy, to support the proposal made by the representative of Guyana to give another opportunity to our colleagues to vote in accordance with the instructions they have received from their Governments.

80. Having said that, my delegation believes that this procedure should not be considered to be a precedent for the Council.

81. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy): Mr. President, very briefly, I should like to thank you and the Council sincerely for the very kind words addressed to Mr. Plaja and me. I shall not fail to convey your messages to Mr. Plaja.

82. Regarding the question now being debated, it seems to me that there is one thing that is very clear to everybody: that there has been a misunderstanding in the interpretation of what we are going to vote on. It is also clear that some members, as a result of that misunderstanding, voted in the conviction of supporting your ruling, Sir, and then there were some misgivings about it.

83. Now, I think that in the Council we cannot continue our work on the basis of a very clear misunderstanding of which everybody is convinced. It is therefore the view of my delegation that this matter should be cleared up before we take further action. Whether we need to wait for the tapes to be consulted, or whether informal consultations are necessary before we can continue, I would leave to you, Mr. President, to decide. But it seems quite clear to me that we cannot go on as if the misunderstanding which has occurred had not occurred.

84. The PRESIDENT: Before listening to the statements of other representatives, may I repeat that I should like to have the co-operation of all members of the Council, because this question is important and we have to take decisions as soon as possible on the sincere requests of the applicants.

85. It seems to me that the confusion started immediately after the Council had voted on item 4. As a result of that vote, item 4 has been rejected. I should make it clear that there should be no misunderstanding about my intention that the affirmative votes on items 2 and 3 would lead to their inclusion in the provisional agenda.

86. The Council having thus voted, I now propose to put the provisional agenda, as amended—with only items 2 and 3—to the vote for adoption as a whole. If I hear no objection, I shall so proceed.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, China, France, Guyana, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: Costa Rica, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The agenda as a whole, as amended, was adopted by 12 votes in favour, 1 against, with 2 abstentions.

87. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote.

88. Mr. MOYNIHAN (United States of America): We are at the end of another day in a dubious time in the history of the United Nations. The Security Council has had before it the simplest of matters. We have been asked to carry forward our duty under the Charter to consider the admission of new members. The applications of these nations were before us. The United States was of course prepared to vote for the consideration of each of these three nations. The essential thrust of the Charter towards universality required nothing less of us. Verily, it is a duty of a Security Council member to ensure that the application for admission to the United Nations of any entity bearing any resemblance to statehood be referred to the Committee on the Admission of New Members. It is the role of the Committee to consider whether the applicant in fact meets the requirements of the Charter for membership.

89. Today we have had before us three applicants. The United States has been prepared to see each considered by the Committee and, as the United States has made clear, we have been prepared to vote for the admission of each and all of those applicants. We were prepared to see each of them admitted as all were admitted. Clearly, the Security Council's action forecloses this opportunity for the General Assembly at its thirtieth session, and we can only regret it.

90. Mr. CAVAGLIERI (Italy): My delegation has been constantly inspired in this debate by the principles which I have already had the opportunity to set forth. The first is the universality of the United Nations. We should have liked to see all the applications examined by the Committee on the Admission of New Members and decided upon according to their merits by the Council. We feel that each of those applications was entitled to go through the whole procedure. For our part we were ready to vote in favour of each of them.

91. The agenda as finally adopted refers only to two of those applications: those of South and North Viet-Nam. My delegation voted in favour of each of them during the procedural debate on the agenda and will favour the admission to the United Nations of those two countries, with which Italy has established friendly relations.

92. However, we regret that the admission of South Korea was not kept in the agenda. We hope that it will very soon be possible for the Council to give favourable consideration to this application also.

93. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I am obliged to you for allowing me to speak after the somewhat lengthy debate on procedures that we have just had. I do not want to reopen it, but I should be very happy indeed to let the representative of the Soviet Union and anybody else listen to the tape recording which is now in our possession, should they so wish.

94. My delegation voted in favour of the inclusion in the agenda of items 2, 3 and 4 of the provisional agenda when separate votes were taken. We abstained on the final vote on the adoption of what one may call a truncated provisional agenda.

95. Our views on the three communications listed on the provisional agenda put before us by the President have been made clear to members of the Council. Three applications for membership were received. In accordance with procedures of long standing, and indeed in accordance with the fairness of the matter, we considered it the duty of the Council to look at those applications on their merits.

96. I regret that, as a result of the procedural manoeuvres this afternoon, one application—that of the Republic of Korea—will not even be considered. In our view, the decision not to consider the third request for admission was a discriminatory procedural tactic, a misuse of the rules of procedure contrary to the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations which we were not prepared to condone.

97. My delegation believes—and I think that many other delegations share this view—that our aim should be to make the United Nations a genuine world forum where the views of all countries can be heard whether they be large or small, rich or poor, or whatever their political system may be. Our goal, at any rate, is a world organization that genuinely represents the people of this world. In this spirit we welcomed the three requests for admission to the Organization before us today, and it was in this spirit that we were prepared to look at the applications on their merits.

98. We have also made clear in the past our readiness to support an application for membership from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, had that been brought again to our attention. Indeed, may I say that we believe that the admission of all four States to the Organization would have constituted an important step towards the promotion of peace and security in both regions.

99. Let me make my Government's position absolutely clear. We have today been considering the agenda for this meeting. This is a procedural matter. But the effect of the decision just taken is not procedural but goes to the heart of the substantive issue. It is in effect a decision not even to study the case for membership of one of the applicants. This is entirely contrary to the detailed provisions set out in the rules

of procedure for taking substantive decisions on the admission of new members. We believe that the decision just taken was both unjust to the Republic of Korea and damaging to the reputation of the Organization.

100. Mr. LECOMPT (France) (*interpretation from French*): Yesterday, in the course of our consultations, I said that our decisions on the applications included as items on the agenda should be taken, at one stage or another, on the basis of the merits of each applicant by the expression of separate political judgements. Separate judgements have been pronounced by our votes, and the delegation of France participated in the expression of these judgements. It has just voted in favour of transmitting to the Council's Committee on the Admission of New Members two requests for admission that have obtained the number of votes required by the provisional rules of procedure, with the exclusion of a third application for membership which did not receive the necessary number of votes.

101. For the record, I wish to state that we regret that the consideration of an application of which we were quite properly seized was interrupted at a very early stage of our work. We did in fact eliminate one of the candidates before the curtain rose. My delegation, which voted in favour of the inclusion of the item on the application of the Republic of Korea, would have preferred—and it wishes to emphasize this here—the Council to discuss the questions of substance raised by that application. The General Assembly regularly and without prior opposition deals with the question of Korea, and I do not see why this body should not have the authority to do the same on a matter in which its responsibilities are specifically set forth in Article 4 of the Charter.

102. Having said this, I am happy to see that the result of our work will be the transmission to the Committee on the Admission of New Members of the applications of two countries friendly to France. This being so, my delegation will have the opportunity to speak again on the response it wishes to see accorded to these two applications, to which it quite naturally attaches importance.

103. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation firmly supports the application of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the application of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam for admission to membership in the United Nations. That is why the Chinese delegation has voted in favour of the inclusion in the agenda of items 2 and 3 of the provisional agenda. On the other hand, the Chinese delegation deems it necessary to point out that certain countries have arbitrarily tried from the very beginning to link up the so-called application of the South Korean puppet régime with the applications of South and North Viet-Nam for admission to membership in the United Nations, questions that are entirely different in nature, for a so-called package deal.

104. This is not only in total violation of the explicit provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolution of the General Assembly but, to put it bluntly, is really aimed at the adamant pursuance of its "two Koreas" policy in an attempt to solidify and perpetuate the division of Korea, thus stubbornly obstructing the Korean people's cause of independent and peaceful reunification. This is also contradictory to the "consensus" on the Korean question adopted at the twenty-eight session of the General Assembly,¹ which clearly affirmed the need to promote the independent and peaceful reunification of Korea in accordance with the three principles provided for in the joint communiqué agreed upon by the North and South of Korea in 1972.² This is of course absolutely unacceptable to all the justice-upholding countries and peoples. Therefore the Chinese delegation is against the inclusion of the so-called application of South Korea in the agenda.

105. Mr. BOOH BOOH (United Republic of Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): As a non-aligned country, the United Republic of Cameroon has always favoured universality and democratization of the United Nations. Speaking at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, President Ahmadou Ahidjo declared on this subject:

"I have in mind the complete universality of the United Nations, which the evolution of events makes more and more necessary. I have in mind also the general democratization of the work of the United Nations and of international relations in general. The road that leads to that end passes through concerted action in which all must actively participate."³

It is in the light of this policy that my delegation has approached this debate, without prejudice towards any of the countries applying for membership in the United Nations.

106. In voting in favour of the inclusion in the agenda of the requests for admission of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, on the one hand and abstaining in the case of the inclusion of the request for admission of the Republic of Korea, on the other hand, we did not want to adopt an attitude which might compromise the chance of having the Council consider the three applications before us, which should be done without any discrimination and without any attempt at a package deal on the basis of political considerations not shared by all the members of the Security Council or arguable precedents which go back to the sorry times of the cold war.

107. In our view, therefore, the Security Council should have had an opportunity to consider the merits of each application in the light of the principles of the Charter and on each case to take the appropriate decision in the interests of the international community.

108. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): Mr. President, first, in speaking in explanation of vote, I should like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. In welcoming you to this post on behalf of the Soviet delegation, I wish you success in your conduct of the responsible proceedings in the Security Council. I should like to take the opportunity also to express my satisfaction at the development of relations of co-operation and good-neighbourliness which exist between our two countries.

109. We also take great pleasure in expressing our gratitude to your predecessor as President of the Security Council for last month, the representative of Italy, Mr. Plaja, and his deputy, Mr. Cavaglieri. They had many complicated problems to deal with in July and coped very successfully with them both in the official meetings and unofficial consultations of the members of the Council.

110. With regard to the position of the Soviet delegation in connexion with the voting which has been held today, the Soviet delegation would like to make the following statement. The Soviet delegation considered it completely inadvisable to include in the agenda of today's meeting of the Security Council item 4, relating to a resumption of consideration of the application of South Korea for admission to membership in the United Nations. As everyone is very well aware, the question of the admission of South Korea to membership in the United Nations is something which dates back many years. The Council has repeatedly considered it, first in 1949 and then in 1955, 1957 and 1958, each time with the same negative results. After this the question was not considered by the Council for 17 years, in spite of the fact that, beginning in 1949, more than 80 States were admitted as Members of the United Nations.

111. In order to renew consideration of this matter, as was already pointed out by the delegation of the Soviet Union yesterday in the course of the unofficial consultations and today in an opening statement, it is necessary to clarify the following fundamental situation: Have conditions been created for renewing consideration of this matter and taking a positive decision on it by the Security Council? What concrete changes have occurred in this matter up to the present time in comparison with the consideration of it in previous years? Everyone knows that the discussion of the Korean problem is going on in the United Nations and has gone on since the inception of the Organization up to the present day. Everyone knows also the incomplete nature of the consideration of this matter in the United Nations. New confirmation of the failure to resolve the Korean problem and the need once again to devote attention to this problem at the forthcoming thirtieth session of the General Assembly is the introduction by a group of States of a new proposal to include the item on Korea in

the provisional agenda of the thirtieth session of the General Assembly.

112. At the same time, we cannot disregard the fact that at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, with the participation of and upon the initiative of precisely those States Members of the United Nations which now insist on the admission of South Korea to membership in the United Nations, a decision was adopted to promote the unification of Korea with the aim of changing it into a single Korean State. This, as we know, was preceded by the joint communiqué of South and North Korea of 4 July 1972, containing the well-known three principles for the unification of Korea. These principles are: that the reunification of the country should be achieved independently, without reliance upon outside force or its interference; that the reunification of the country should be achieved by peaceful means, without recourse to the use of arms against the other side; and that great national unity should be promoted.²

113. Those positive principles were subsequently approved at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly. They are therefore decisions of the United Nations. However, we find ourselves in a paradoxical situation. On the one hand, those States proposing the further consideration of the Korean question in the Assembly with the aim of reunifying Korea and eliminating the so-called United Nations Command are at the same time insisting on the separate admission of South Korea to the United Nations.

114. For our part, we believe that, apart from the condition of the reunification of Korea and the elimination of the so-called United Nations Command, another necessary condition for that—and this is the view of the overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations—is the withdrawal of foreign troops from South Korea. That is the situation with regard to South Korea.

115. It is easy to see that in the circumstances the proposal to admit South Korea to membership is unfounded and unjustified. A considerable obstacle to the consideration of the application of South Korea for membership in the United Nations is the fact that the Seoul régime is systematically and feverishly increasing its armed forces and is constantly committing innumerable acts of hostility and provocation vis-à-vis the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In order to cover and justify this policy, that régime is systematically using the false and hypocritical pretext of the so-called danger from the north. It is easy to see that in the circumstances there is absolutely no basis for talking seriously about the sovereignty of that State and its peace-loving nature or for saying that its policy is in keeping with the conditions required by the Charter for the admission of States to membership in the United Nations.

116. The implementation of the agreed principles set forth in the joint North-South communiqué of

4 July 1972 for the reunification of the country, the implementation of the decision adopted at the twenty-eight session of the General Assembly regarding the reunification of Korea, together with the elimination of the so-called United Nations Command in Korea and, finally, the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of South Korea, are the most important and necessary conditions for implementation which could open the way for the admission of a united Korea to membership in the United Nations. We are deeply convinced that an application from a united Korea could be supported by all peace-loving States Members of the United Nations without exception.

117. We should like to express our solidarity with the friendly and heroic Korean people with regard to the peaceful reunification of their country. The Soviet Union categorically supports the constructive proposals of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea concerning the further easing of tension on the Korean peninsula and the creation of the circumstances necessary for the peaceful democratic unification of the country, which would guarantee the necessary conditions for the entry of a united Korea into the international community as a Member of the United Nations. Those are the reasons and circumstances as a result of which the delegation of the Soviet Union was unable to support the proposal to include in the agenda the item on renewed consideration of the application of South Korea for admission to membership in the United Nations.

118. On the question of the applications of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam for admission to membership in the United Nations, the Soviet delegation considers it necessary to express its deep satisfaction at the fact that the time has come when these two Vietnamese States, having achieved independence and sovereignty, have every opportunity to apply to the United Nations for full membership. The Soviet delegation wholeheartedly supports the applications and will vote in favour of admitting these States to membership in the United Nations.

119. These two sovereign States have suffered in a long struggle for sovereignty and independence, and have indeed demonstrated that they are ready to assume the obligations of membership contained in the Charter of the United Nations. Along with other peace-loving States Members of the United Nations they are ready to fight for the establishment on earth of genuine international peace and security and to strive to extend the easing of international tension to the whole globe. We fraternally and cordially welcome the official representatives of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam who recently came to New York as official observers for their States in the United Nations. If they are present in this chamber, it is a great pleasure for me on behalf of the Soviet delegation to welcome them here personally.

120. In the view of the Soviet delegation there are absolutely no grounds whatever for the proposal made by some members of the Security Council to link the question of admission to membership of the two sovereign Vietnamese States with the Korean question. The admission to membership of the two Vietnamese States has nothing whatever to do with the Korean problem. The existing practice in the United Nations for the admission to membership of two States situated on the territory of a divided country is that such States are admitted to membership in the United Nations only—and I stress “only”—if both have expressed their desire and their agreement to become Members of the Organization.

121. In contrast to the case of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam, between South Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea there is no unanimity with regard to their admission to membership in the United Nations. Therefore the linking of the question of admission to membership in the United Nations of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam with another question completely different in substance and nature cannot be viewed except as the deliberate complication of the question of the admission to membership in the United Nations of the two Vietnamese States.

122. Mr. SUNDBERG (Sweden): Mr. President, let me first of all congratulate you on your assumption of the office of President of the Security Council for this month and assure you of the complete co-operation of my delegation in our important deliberations.

123. My delegation has made Sweden's position clear through its votes here today and I can therefore be fairly brief. We have voted in favour of all the three applications which have been received by the Council. It is my Government's traditional policy to support the admission of all qualified applicants and we have always been a firm proponent of the principle of universality. In the light of this established policy, my Government would have liked to see agreement emerge here for the inclusion of all the three applications before us. We regret that this has not been possible this time with regard to the Republic of South Korea. However, we greet with great satisfaction indeed the fact that we have now agreed on taking up for substantive consideration the membership applications of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

124. We hold the view that the admission of these two countries, with which my Government has firmly established relations, would be not only an important step towards the universality of the Organization but also an important contribution to the restoration of stable and peaceful conditions to this so sorely tried part of the world.

125. Mr. KUDRYAVTSEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*):

Mr. President, in speaking in explanation of vote I should like, first, on behalf of the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR to congratulate you, the representative of Japan, upon your assumption of the important post of President of the Security Council.

126. We would like to express our gratitude to the representative of Italy, Mr. Plaja, and his deputy, Mr. Cavaglieri, who presided over the Security Council and also over the consultations held by the Security Council in July.

127. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR supported the application of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam for admission to membership in the United Nations. These sovereign States in practice have demonstrated their attachment to peace and compliance with the requirements of the United Nations for admission to membership. The victorious conclusion of the just struggle of the people of Viet-Nam is a brilliant page in the history of the national liberation movement of peoples, an example of militant solidarity with the countries of socialism, and moral and political support on the part of progressive forces throughout the world. This victory shows, too, that with the circumstances of further strengthening the countries of socialism and the growth of solidarity of all progressive forces, no forces can check the development and progress of the national liberation movement.

128. Our delegation opposed the inclusion in the agenda of the Security Council of the item on the application of South Korea for admission to membership in the United Nations. As is well known, the Council has repeatedly dealt with the question of admitting South Korea to membership in the United Nations and has not succeeded in solving this problem. Now, once again, an attempt has been made to involve the Council in the discussion of this topic. But what has changed since that time which would be a new element in this problem? Absolutely nothing. South Korea is still occupied by foreign troops in violation of all the sovereign rights of the Korean people. There is still a continuation of the forcible division of the Korean people into two parts.

129. For the Security Council to consider this question once again there must be new circumstances, because otherwise the Council would still do nothing more than mark time. But these new circumstances do not exist. When the just aspirations of the Korean people are fulfilled for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea using the cover of the United Nations flag, when the whole Korean people enjoy conditions of stable and lasting peace on their soil, when they really enjoy their sovereign right to determine their own fate without anyone else's intervention, on the basis of their free, expressed will, they can decide to apply for membership in the United Nations.

130. Furthermore, it is well known that the Seoul puppet régime represents no one. It cannot be viewed as a sovereign State freely exercising and pursuing an independent policy. Therefore, there is no basis whatsoever for thinking that the position of that puppet régime at Seoul in any way is in keeping with the requirements of the Charter of the United Nations for membership. As has already been pointed out by many previous speakers, the Korean question is not new to the Security Council. For many years the Korean question has been considered by the General Assembly too. Any attempt to prevent the Assembly, by means of considering the so-called application of South Korea for membership in the United Nations, from resolving the Korean question on a proper basis will appear to be nothing but an attempt to do damage to the Korean people.

131. Thanks to the active and stable consistent policy of the Democratic Republic of Korea, a joint communiqué was agreed upon between the North and South on 4 July 1972 in which agreement was achieved on the principles for the reunification of Korea. As is well known, at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, there was approval by consensus of a decision which favourably viewed the joint North-South communiqué of 4 July 1972² and the principles it contained for the reunification of the country. In the same decision the general hope was expressed that the South and North of Korea would try to continue their dialogue and expand their comprehensive exchanges and co-operation in that spirit so as to accelerate the independent and peaceful reunification of the country.

132. We cannot help coming to the conclusion that the attempts undertaken here on the part of certain States to impose on the Security Council discussion of the so-called question of admission to membership of South Korea simply show that they want to resist the implementation of a decision taken by consensus at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly on the Korean problem. The just struggle of the Korean people for the withdrawal of foreign troops occupying South Korea under the United Nations flag, the elimination of foreign intervention and the unification of the country on a peaceful democratic basis has always enjoyed broad support among the Byelorussian people. From the very beginning of the discussion of the Korean problem in the United Nations, the Byelorussian SSR has consistently defended the genuine interests of the Korean people. That is why the Byelorussian delegation categorically opposed the inclusion in the agenda of the Council of the so-called item on membership of South Korea in the United Nations as something which contradicts the genuine interests of the Korean people.

133. Mr. SALAZAR (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): First of all, my delegation wishes to associate itself with the congratulations extended to you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the

presidency of the Security Council for this month, and we wish to assure you of our co-operation in the discharge of your duties.

134. At the beginning of this meeting my delegation voted in favour of the inclusion in the agenda of the three items regarding the application for admission of the Republic of South Viet-Nam, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of Korea. My delegation abstained when we voted on the agenda as a whole, as amended, because we disapproved of according different treatment to one of the applications, by excluding it from the agenda without even giving the applicant the benefit of the normal procedure of having its application considered in the Committee on the Admission of New Members. That fact, which represents discriminatory treatment in respect of one of the applications for admission, led to our abstention, because we would have preferred the Council to have adopted all the items on the agenda, giving equal treatment to all applications for admission to membership in the United Nations.

135. The PRESIDENT: Since no other representative wishes to speak at this time, in my capacity as representative of JAPAN I now wish to explain my votes on the decisions just taken by the Council.

136. My delegation voted in favour of the inclusion in the agenda of all three items listed on the provisional agenda. These consisted of the applications for membership in the United Nations of the Republic of South Viet-Nam, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of Korea. My delegation's votes in favour of including the three agenda items reflected its belief that the Council should give prompt and full consideration to such important questions as applications for membership. The inclusion in the agenda of the applications was the indispensable first step towards substantive consideration by the Council, and my delegation therefore wished to see all three applications included in the agenda.

137. Now that the Council has placed two of those items on the agenda—the applications of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam—my delegation is prepared to consider them in accordance with Article 4 of the Charter.

138. As regards the long-standing application of the Republic of Korea, my delegation strongly regrets that the Council failed to place it on its agenda. Although we are not unaware of the special circumstances surrounding that application, my delegation is convinced that this question should not remain unresolved in disregard of the wishes of the people of the Republic of Korea. We continue to hope that the Council will agree to take up this application at the appropriate time.

Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the text of a telegram dated 15 July 1975 from the President of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet-Nam (S/11756)

Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the text of a telegram dated 16 July 1975 from the Prime Minister of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam (S/11761)

139. The PRESIDENT: Speaking as PRESIDENT, now that the Security Council has adopted the agenda for this meeting I propose, in accordance with rule 59 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, immediately to refer the items adopted to the Committee on the Admission of New Members. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees.

It was so decided.

140. Mr. RICHARD (United Kingdom): Mr. President, on a point of clarification—for which I am indebted to the facilities of Reuters, their tape recording and their transcript—I wonder if you would allow me to read into the record the precise proposal that you in fact made, since some representatives in the Council this afternoon took the view that I had not been listening to it properly. On this point of order that I am raising, namely to be sure of what was said, the transcript is: "I should like to put to the vote the proposal the Chair made that the provisional agenda as a whole shall be put to the vote." It was on that, Mr. President, that we voted.

141. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): This matter has already been settled in the past, and the Council has confirmed with a second vote its decision on the adoption of the agenda. However, in connexion with the statement of the British representative, I consider it necessary to state that, in order officially to inform the Security Council concerning a tape recording, what we need is not a report from an individual member of the Council but a communication from the United Nations Secretariat.

142. I therefore envy the British representative who has such good contacts with the translation Service that they gave him the tape so that he could report to the Security Council. I do not think that is right. For official confirmation of what was said by the President and what we voted for, what we need is an official communication from the Secretariat and not from an individual member of the Council.

143. Mr. MOYNIHAN (United States of America): This may be somewhat outside the agenda but I would like to say that it is a long-standing tradition in my country to prefer the word of Reuters to the word of any Government.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

Notes

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2181st meeting, para. 8.

² *Ibid.*, Twenty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 27, annexe 1.

³ *Ibid.*, Twenty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1845th meeting.