

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTIETH YEAR

1846th

MEETING: 30 SEPTEMBER 1975

UN LIBRARY

MAY 2 1984

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1846)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
Letter dated 19 September 1975 from the President of the General Assembly to the President of the Security Council (S/11826)	1

UN LIBRARY

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.

NOTICE

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.

1846th MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 30 September 1975, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Moulaye EL HASSEN (Mauritania).

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/1846)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. Letter dated 19 September 1975 from the President of the General Assembly to the President of the Security Council (S/11826)

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 19 September 1975 from the President of the General Assembly to the President of the Security Council (S/11826)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken previously [1842nd-1845th meetings], I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Laos, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Sri Lanka, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Yugoslavia to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, according to Article 31 of the Charter and the relevant provisions of the provisional rules of procedure. I invite the representatives to whom I have just referred to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Rahal (Algeria), Mr. Ghelev (Bulgaria), Mr. Sarin Chhak (Cambodia), Mr. Alarcón (Cuba), Mr. Vejvoda (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Adjibadé (Dahomey), Mr. Florin (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Hollai (Hungary), Mr. Jaipal (India), Mr. Sipraseuth (Laos), Mr. Tiandraza (Madagascar), Mr. García Robles (Mexico), Mr. Puntsagnorov (Mongolia), Mr. Chis-

sano (Mozambique), Mr. Jaroszek (Poland), Mr. Datcu (Romania), Mr. Fall (Senegal), Mr. Amerasinghe (Sri Lanka), Mr. Shevel (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) and Mr. Petrić (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before continuing our discussion this afternoon, I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the Permanent Observer for the Republic of South Viet-Nam, dated 30 September 1975, which I shall read out:

"I have the honour to request you to be kind enough to authorize me to address the Council on the question of the admission of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and of the Republic of South Viet-Nam to the United Nations."

3. I should also like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter from the representatives of Guyana, Iraq, the United Republic of Cameroon and the United Republic of Tanzania requesting that, during the present discussion held by the Council in accordance with General Assembly resolution 3366 (XXX), an opportunity be afforded to the Permanent Observers for the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam to present their views on the question under discussion.

4. It is my intention to request the Observer for the Republic of South Viet-Nam to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement after the vote is taken, if there is no objection.

It was so decided.

5. The Council will now continue its consideration of the item on its agenda, and, with the Council's permission, speaking as the representative of MAURITANIA, I shall make a brief statement.

6. The correctness of the position taken by the majority of the members of the Security Council during the meeting of 6 August last [1834th meeting] was strikingly confirmed by the General Assembly. In resolution 3366 (XXX), the General Assembly recommended that the Council immediately and favourably reconsider the requests for admission of the two Viet-Nams. Undoubtedly the Assembly thereby

wished, in a solemn manner, to draw the attention of the Council to the injustice of using the veto, particularly when it was a question of bringing the United Nations even closer to its ideal of universality.

7. The General Assembly, which is sovereign as far as the admission of a new Member is concerned, has recognized, for its part, that the two Viet-Nams fulfil the conditions laid down by the Charter for becoming Members of the United Nations. Hence we cannot but regret that the United States has seen fit, by a practice which we believed was a thing of the past, to link the admission of the two Viet-Nams to that of South Korea.

8. Destiny perhaps intends that the Vietnamese people, having scored a victory on the battlefield, should continue their struggle in the diplomatic sphere. But what we are sure of is that the Vietnamese people, thanks to their determination and strengthened by the soundness of their cause and the unanimous support of the international community, will finally once again prevail. Already the resolution of the General Assembly, which I referred to just now, constitutes a valuable support to them and an undeniable victory over the refusal their applications have met with.

9. True the United States has put forward certain arguments, to justify its attitude. As for the linked admission of two States, while such a practice was used in the past and in a well-known international political context, we do not believe that it can be justified today. We thought that the progressive disappearance of the cold war and of the mistrust which was a characteristic of it was going to mean that small countries would not be the subject of confrontations which appeared to us to be obsolete and which have been condemned many times. At any rate, to link the question of Korea with the question of the two Viet-Nams can only be reminiscent of the unfortunate methods used during that era.

10. The Korean question, by its origin, its peculiarities, its political implications and the controversies which it has engendered and continues to engender in the Organization, is surely not a question that should be politically or legally linked with the request for admission of the two Viet-Nams. The Korean question is still one of the major preoccupations of the United Nations because of the commitments that the Organization was obliged to assume after the signing of the Armistice Agreement of 27 July 1953.¹

11. The General Assembly, which is the supreme body of the Organization, must bear the main responsibility in seeking a solution of the Korean question, because every State Member of the United Nations is concerned over the situation prevailing at present in the Korean peninsula. The various resolutions adopted in recent years by the General Assembly,

some calling for the dissolution of the United Nations Command, others requiring the withdrawal of foreign troops stationed in South Korea under the United Nations flag, are themselves enough to demonstrate the concern felt by the Organization as it confronts the responsibilities that have fallen to it throughout the existence of the Korean problem. This ambiguity must be cleared up and the responsibility of the United Nations has to be clearly defined before the Security Council examines the validity of a request for admission from either of the two parts of Korea to the United Nations.

12. In speaking of Korea, one fact should be emphasized: it is that both parts of Korea have frequently expressed their will to do everything in their power to bring about the peaceful reunification of their country. Such a desire would *a priori* exclude any resort to force or violence and should therefore be encouraged. The joint communiqué of 4 July 1972,² in which both North and South Korea pledged themselves to continue the dialogue that had already been initiated, should be supported and encouraged.

13. To try to force the entry of either of the two parts of Korea into the United Nations is an attempt to perpetuate the division of Korea. If such a step were adopted by the Organization, we would have the heavy responsibility of having created an irreversible situation that contradicts the deep aspirations and the higher interests of the Korean nation.

14. The basic role incumbent on the United Nations is to encourage everything which brings peoples together and which further strengthens the unity of nations. It is in the name of that principle and in the evident interest of the Korean people as a whole that my delegation felt it its duty to oppose the inclusion in the agenda of the request for admission of the southern part of Korea to the United Nations. We shall be entirely prepared to support the request for admission of Korea when both parts together have jointly expressed their desire to make that request. It is in that way, moreover, that the United Nations, and particularly the Security Council, has had to resolve the cases of divided nations that have come to request admission to the Organization.

15. The admission of the two Viet-Nams cannot be connected with the question of Korea. Furthermore, the Vietnamese peoples deserve special treatment because they are peoples that have made enormous sacrifices in order to reconquer their liberty and their dignity. Such sacrifices, imposed on them by a war unprecedented in our history, deserve our gratitude and our admiration.

16. Despite the passive attitude adopted by the Organization throughout the entire period of the Vietnamese tragedy, the Vietnamese peoples have, with-

out any bitterness, come to request their admission to the United Nations, seeking to prove by this gesture that once the war was over they intended to forget the past and to forge links of friendship and co-operation with all countries, including the United States. Our duty—and I think this is the duty of the United States in particular—is to help them to forget the past and to look with us towards the future. Therefore, we appeal to the United States to display generosity towards the Vietnamese peoples which have suffered so and who have tried not only to forget the past but also to stretch out the hand of friendship and co-operation.

17. And now, in my capacity as PRESIDENT, I call on the next speaker, the representative of Mozambique, to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

18. Mr. CHISSANO (Mozambique) (*interpretation from French*): It is a great honour for me as the representative of a country which has recently become a Member of the Organization, to be able directly to greet the members of the Security Council, this body which is so important for the life of the United Nations. I wish to extend by greetings to you, in particular Mr. President, as the representative of Mauritania, a country which has done its duty inside and outside the United Nations, both in its own capacity and in co-operation with other members of the Organization of African Unity, for the liberation of my country and other countries which were under Portuguese colonial domination.

19. It is for that reason, Sir, that my delegation is extremely gratified to see you presiding over these meetings of the Security Council, instructed, as it is, by the overwhelming majority of the members of the General Assembly favourably to reconsider the requests received from the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam for admission to membership in the United Nations.

20. The people of Mozambique carried on for 10 years an armed struggle against Portuguese colonialism. Our people was subjected to massacres and torture, and our country was devastated. During that period of struggle Portugal was our enemy and all those countries which supported Portugal were also our enemies. But, since ours was a struggle for peace and to create conditions which would make it possible for us to initiate friendly relations with all peoples and States throughout the world, today we are in the United Nations working side by side with Portugal and with the United States, for example, building a new world, one in which there is harmony and greater security.

21. We believe that the United States of America is as pleased at this fact as are all the other members of the international community. Despite the distance separating us, we struggled side by side

with our comrades-in-arms in the heroic country that is today the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. We know full well that we were fighting in the same cause: peace and security in the world. They struggled above all for their independence, for a chance to represent their own interests themselves everywhere throughout the world. We believe that when they request, as we did, admission to the United Nations, they are but giving further concrete expression to their independence and their resolve to continue to work for the consolidation of peace—not only in Indo-China but throughout the world. They have resolved to share their experience with us all.

22. We are surprised to see that the United States and the United States alone refuses to admit that the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam are entitled to be independent and to be represented among us. This isolated attitude causes my delegation and my people to feel some doubt about the sincerity of the United States in its relations with countries such as my own and its desire to consolidate peace in Indo-China. Would not the United States stand to gain more by way of privilege and esteem by demonstrating through its goodwill to the people of Viet-Nam that the massacres, the heavy bombing and the humiliations inflicted on it throughout many years are now part of history? Why should military aggression against Viet-Nam be turned into diplomatic and moral aggression?

23. Does not the United States want complete peace? Must the rage of the people of Viet-Nam against the United States be perpetuated? Or is this a continuation of the cold war? If so, let us not talk about détente; let us not fool each other. We in Mozambique, like the people of Viet-Nam, are independent, and we have struggled to become so. We and other countries like us suffer more from the consequences of the cold war between the major Powers. That is why we struggled and still struggle to continue to get rid of the causes of cold war. That is why we are wedded to our independence.

24. My delegation believes it is completely wrong to judge the merits of a country for admission to membership in the United Nations on the basis of the merits of other countries. We noted that the delegation of the United States made a statement during these meetings in order to discuss another matter which was not on the agenda. Korea is not Viet-Nam. The Council decided that the question of the admission of the Republic of Korea would not be discussed during these meetings. Why, then, are we discussing it?

25. Mozambique, Cape Verde, and Sao Tome and Principe were admitted, yet the Republic of Korea was not. The United States says it is not against the admission of the two Viet-Nams. In that case let their actions match their words. Let us admit

both Viet-Nams now; subsequently we can take up the question of Korea on the basis of the merits of that particular case.

26. My delegation entirely agrees with those who have already stated that admission of the two Vietnamese States to the United Nations would be a guarantee that the principle of universality would be realized. But universality is not the only valid criterion for the admission of Members; therefore in all cases we have to weigh the question of the admission of a particular country on its own merits. Otherwise the existence of the bodies and committees of the United Nations which study and recommend the admission of new Members would be unjustifiable.

27. My delegation believes that the admission of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam should be decided by unanimity among the Members of the United Nations and that it was only in order to act in accordance with normal procedures that this problem was referred back to the Security Council for immediate and favourable consideration. My delegation cannot see why the report of the Council should still be a negative one, since there are not, nor can there be, any fresh arguments to lay before the General Assembly.

28. It would not spell defeat for the United States were it to reconsider its position, because it is only a question of reconsidering an opinion in order to bring it more closely into harmony with the process of history and the sacred goals of the United Nations.

29. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now invite the representative of Mexico to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

30. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, may I begin by expressing my delegation's pleasure at seeing you in the presidential chair of the Security Council at this time and thanking you and all the members of the Council for having granted our request to speak in this debate. On the agenda of the meeting is a very specific item—the letter dated 19 September 1975 from the President of the General Assembly to the President of the Security Council. In that letter, the President of the Assembly informed the President of the Council that at its 2354th plenary meeting, on 19 September, the General Assembly adopted its resolution 3366 (XXX), the operative paragraphs of which are very short. In paragraph 1, the Assembly "Considers that the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam should be admitted to membership in the United Nations". In paragraph 2, the Assembly "Accordingly requests the Security Council to reconsider immediately and favourably their applications in strict conformity with Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Charter of the United Nations".

31. My statement will deal with that highly specific question. My delegation voted in favour of resolution 3366 (XXX)—which, I might say, did not receive a single opposing vote—and we would venture to hope even at this late hour in our debates that the result of the voting which will take place in a few minutes will be different from the result we had earlier. Of course, we know that it will be different with regard to the single abstention which was registered last time, since the representative of Costa Rica, in a gesture which deserves our full support and sympathy, has announced that his delegation will this time vote in favour of those draft resolutions.

32. It is our hope, I repeat, that the result will be different from last time. That hope is chiefly based on three reasons. The first is the fact that General Assembly resolution 3366 (XXX), which is self-explanatory and whose operative paragraphs I have just read out, was adopted by an overwhelming majority. There were only a few abstentions and there were no opposing votes.

33. The second reason is one which I have already stated in the plenary meeting when I explained our vote there, on 19 September, but now I should like to expand on that explanation. The second reason is that we believe, as I then stated:

"that if there is any people in the world which should indeed occupy a place—a place of honour, I would say—in the United Nations, it is the people of Viet-Nam. Throughout history there is no people who have struggled with greater heroism and at the cost of greater suffering in winning their full rights to independence and self-determination."³

The third reason stems from our conviction that:

"any permanent member of the Council who attempts to impede entrance to the United Nations of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam would be seriously violating commitments which those members explicitly undertook at the United Nations Conference on International Organization, held at San Francisco in 1945."³

34. I shall now very briefly recall those commitments. For this purpose I shall quote a few paragraphs which I wrote in 1945, following that Conference, when the memory of my participation in the work of the committee of the Conference dealing with the Security Council was still fresh in my mind. This, then, is what I said on the subject:

"In order to clarify the rather cryptic Yalta text which is incorporated in the Dumbarton Oaks draft, and accepting the invitation extended by the inviting Powers at that time to shorten the discussions in the committee, those delegations that

had submitted amendments on the voting procedure formed a sub-committee and put together a questionnaire containing 23 specific questions on the application of that procedure.

"For more than two weeks, from 22 May to 7 June, representatives of the four inviting countries"—at that time France was not yet a Member of the United Nations—"worked tirelessly to try to arrive at an agreement as to the replies they were to give to the aforementioned questionnaire.

"Finally, on 8 June, we distributed to the members of the committee the text of a joint statement by the sponsoring Powers⁴ whereby those Powers, without specifically replying to each one of the 23 questions put to them, defined their 'general attitude' with regard to the veto.

"The text of the first paragraph of that statement, which was included in an annex to the report of the committee, reads as follows:

"Specific questions covering the voting procedure in the Security Council have been submitted by a sub-committee of the Conference Committee on Structure and Procedures of the Security Council to the delegations of the four Governments sponsoring the Conference—the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of China. In dealing with those questions, the four delegations desire to make the following statement of their general attitude towards the whole question of unanimity of permanent members in the decisions of the Security Council." ⁴

35. The rest of the statement was by and large devoted to an explanation of the reasons why the matters contained in what would become Chapters VI, VII and VIII of the Charter had to be subject to the rule of unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council. Those reasons in the last instance were that, as was stated in paragraph 4 of the four-Power statement to which I have referred, the decisions and measures which the Security Council would adopt in implementation of those Chapters might have "major political consequences" which might initiate "a chain of events which might, in the end, require the Council under its responsibilities to invoke measures of enforcement".⁴

36. Obviously, the decisions of the Council which have to do with the admission of new Members are not included in that category of decisions, and therefore the commitment entered into by the permanent members of the Security Council in their statement of 8 June 1945 is doubly applicable to those decisions. In paragraph 8 of that statement, they said that:

"It is not to be assumed, however, that the permanent members, any more than the non-permanent members, would use their 'veto' power wilfully to obstruct the operation of the Council."⁴

37. Another reason for taking this commitment very seriously is that, as all those who took part in the San Francisco Conference will recall, this declaration was a decisive element in ending the crisis which was endangering the very outcome of the San Francisco Conference.

38. In the same way, it is appropriate to recall the advisory opinion handed down in 1948 by the International Court of Justice⁵ to the effect that when a request for admission is discussed the permanent members of the Security Council do not have the right to base themselves on another State's support or rejection of another applicant. We jurists certainly sometimes allow ourselves too much freedom in the manner in which we interpret texts, but in this case, even if we used not only the greatest freedom, but even licence, it would not be possible to change the meaning of the advisory opinion of the Court.

39. That text, the text which the advisory opinion itself says is the genuine, authentic text, is the French text. In order to avoid any possibility of doubt, I think it might be useful to conclude this statement by reading the authentic text, the French text.

"The Court, ... is of opinion that a Member of the United Nations which is called upon, in virtue of Article 4 of the Charter, to pronounce itself by its vote, either in the Security Council or in the General Assembly, on the admission of a State to membership in the United Nations, is not juridically entitled to make its consent to the admission dependent on conditions not expressly provided by paragraph 1 of the said Article;

"and that, in particular, a Member of the Organization cannot, while it recognizes the conditions set forth in that provision to be fulfilled by the State concerned, subject its affirmative vote to the additional condition that other States be admitted to membership in the United Nations together with that State."^{*}

40. These are the three main reasons why my delegation, even at this late hour in our debate and, not forgetting a statement made here two or three days ago, is still hopeful that this time the Council will be able to adopt draft resolutions S/11832 and S/11833.

41. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): If no other representative wishes to speak at this stage to explain his vote before the vote, I shall take it that the Council is prepared to proceed imme-

^{*} Quoted in French by the speaker.

diately to vote on draft resolutions S/11832 and S/11833. I shall therefore put to the vote the first draft resolution, which appears in document S/11832.

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: United States of America.

The result of the vote was 14 in favour and 1 against.

The draft resolution was not adopted the negative vote being that of a permanent member of the Council.

42. I shall now put to the vote the second draft resolution, which appears in document S/11833.

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: United States of America.

The result of the vote was 14 in favour and 1 against.

The draft resolution was not adopted, the negative vote being that of a permanent member of the Council.

43. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Several representatives have asked to explain their vote after the vote, and I shall now call on them.

44. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): In disregard of the Charter of the United Nations and the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the Member States as expressed in General Assembly resolution 3366 (XXX), the United States representatives has once again vetoed the applications of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam. The Chinese delegation considers that such a practice of the United States is completely unjustifiable. We cannot but express deep regret at it.

45. We believe that obstructionists are bound to fail and that the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam will ultimately obtain their legitimate seats and rights in the United Nations. The Chinese delegation will continue to work together with all justice-upholding Member States for the attainment of the full rights of the Vietnamese people in the United Nations.

46. Mr. MOYNIHAN (United States of America): The Security Council has again declined to consider the application of the Republic of Korea, a State fully qualified for membership in the United Nations. The United States has accordingly again vetoed the membership applications of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

47. In this era of dialogue, which was underlined so distinctly during the recent seventh special session of the General Assembly, the United States cannot accept that the admission of a fully qualified applicant should be dependent on the wishes of a non-Member State.

48. The Republic of Korea, with a population of over 35 million persons, has been duly constituted as a State since 15 August 1948. It has had observer status in the United Nations since 1949. It enjoys diplomatic relations with over 90 States which are Members of the United Nations. The Republic of Korea has repeated its assurances that its admission to the United Nations would in no way dilute its hopes for peaceful reunification on the Korean peninsula. Indeed, membership in the United Nations, with its dedication to peace and harmony, should promote unification, not set it back.

49. The United States favours the admission of all qualified States desiring membership, including, I repeat, the Viet-Nams. The United States hopes that the parties directly concerned in this impasse will discuss the question urgently so that it may be resolved.

50. I should like to conclude, Mr. President, with a statement of personal, and if I may say so professional, admiration for the dignity and graciousness with which you have guided us through this difficult if unavailing exercise.

51. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Since no other member of the Council has asked to speak in explanation of his vote, I invite the Observer for the Republic of South Viet-Nam to take a seat at the Council table, in accordance with the decision which the Council took a short time ago, and to make his statement.

52. Mr. DINH BA THI (Republic of South Viet-Nam) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of Mr. Nguyen Van Luu, Permanent Observer for the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, and on my own behalf I should like first of all, Mr. President, to thank most heartily you and the members of the Security Council who were kind enough to invite me to participate in this discussion. We should like also to congratulate you warmly on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council, an important office in which you have demonstrated the full measure of your competence and authority. We are particularly gratified at seeing you occupy that post, since your country, the Islamic Republic of Mauri-

tania, has always, under the enlightened guidance of President Moktar Ould Daddah, given firm support and assistance to the Vietnamese people in their just struggle for national liberation, and since a firm relationship of deep friendship and militant solidarity exists between our countries and is developing further.

53. Once again defying the majority opinion of the General Assembly, clearly expressed in its resolution 3366 (XXX) and adopted by almost all the members of the Security Council, the United States has wrongly imposed a veto on the admission to the United Nations of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. The tendentious allegations of the American Government regarding universality and representivity can deceive no one, as has been quite properly shown by the many delegations which have taken part in this discussion.

54. Quite obviously, the United States is deliberately pursuing a policy of hostility, which it has stubbornly practised for decades, against the Vietnamese people, now preventing that people from occupying its proper place and making its voice heard within the United Nations, just as previously it sought by all means in its power to oppose the basic national rights and the right to self-determination of the people of Viet-Nam.

55. This abuse of its powers by the United States is part and parcel of the manoeuvres undertaken to perpetuate the division of Korea. Thus the constantly manifested goodwill of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, which have frequently stated their readiness to establish normal relations with the American Government on the basis of the Paris Accords on Viet-Nam,⁶ has been answered by the United States by the use, four times, of the veto, by an embargo and even by a refusal to allow American organizations to send humanitarian assistance to the people of Viet-Nam. Such a policy is quite obviously contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, to the will of the peoples and even the legitimate interests of the American people. Does this not constitute the sole reason for the deadlock on other problems existing between Viet-Nam and the United States, problems which could be solved now that peace has returned?

56. We are convinced that, following the veto thus used for the second time against the admission of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, many voices will be raised to denounce this erroneous policy and demand that the United States finally act in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and the will of almost all the States Members of the United Nations as

clearly expressed in General Assembly resolution 3366 (XXX).

57. So far as we are concerned, the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam will continue to work, as they have in the past, with all the forces for progress, to ensure the defence of peace and security throughout the world, the independence and freedom of peoples and the development of relations of friendship and co-operation among nations.

58. Once again we express our deep gratitude to the socialist countries, to the non-aligned countries and to all the other peace-loving and justice-loving countries that agreed with and supported the admission to the United Nations of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. The adoption of resolution 3366 (XXX) by the General Assembly, which constitutes a victory for the Vietnamese people and the forces of progress, is a severe condemnation of the retrogressive policy and obstinate attitude of the United States.

59. Finally, we should like warmly to thank the 14 members of the Security Council that have just voted in favour of the draft resolutions recommending the admission of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, as well as the many delegations that were kind enough to speak during the discussion in order forcefully to support the just cause of the Vietnamese people.

60. There can be no doubt that the United States cannot in any way prevent the Vietnamese people from playing their legitimate part and raising their just voice for the common cause of all peoples: peace, independence, democracy and progress in the world.

61. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I thank the Observer for the Republic of South Viet-Nam for the friendly words he has addressed to Mauritania and to me personally. I would assure the Observers for the two Viet-Nams that they can count on the active solidarity and unfailing support of the Government and people of Mauritania.

62. As no other member of the Council wishes to speak, we shall now consider the Council's report to the General Assembly. In conformity with the third paragraph of rule 60 of its provisional rules of procedure, "if the Security Council does not recommend the applicant State for membership... it shall submit a special report to the General Assembly with a complete record of the discussion". Following my request, the Secretariat has prepared a draft special report. Members of the Council have before them, in all the working languages, a provisional text of the draft special report of the Security Coun-

cil on the admission to the United Nations of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. This report must be submitted to the General Assembly.

63. I would draw the attention of members of the Council to paragraph 7 [*subsequently paragraph 8*] of the draft report, which contains a number of blanks that must be filled in with the results of the votes that have just taken place on draft resolutions S/11832 and S/11833. Those blanks will be filled in by the Secretariat before the report is submitted to the General Assembly. Moreover, the following paragraph must be inserted after the present paragraph 5 of the draft report:

“In accordance with a decision taken at the 1846th meeting pursuant to a request of the representatives of Guyana, Iraq, the United Republic of Cameroon and the United Republic of Tanzania the Council agreed without objection to invite the representative of the Republic of South Viet-Nam to present his point of view on the question included in the agenda.”

64. Are there any representatives who wish to comment on the draft report? The representative of Iraq has the floor.

65. Mr. ZAHAWIE (Iraq): My delegation would suggest that in paragraph 8 [*subsequently paragraph 9*] of the draft report the phrase “As the Security Council therefore does not recommend” be replaced by the phrase “As the Security Council therefore was unable to recommend”.

66. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Are there any objections to the amendment just suggested by the representative of Iraq?

67. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): I agree with the amendment suggested by the representative of Iraq. I would simply say that it is my understanding that

the phrase will read: “As the Security Council therefore was unable to recommend”.

68. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Are there any objections to the amendment proposed by the representative of Iraq, as supplemented by the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union?

69. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): I have no objection to the amendments that have just been put forward. However, as now drafted the beginning of paragraph 8 would read: “As the Security Council therefore was unable to recommend any of the applicant States”. We propose that the word “any” should be deleted, and that it should be stated specifically that “the Security Council... was unable to recommend the admission of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam to membership in the United Nations”.

70. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): As there are no objections to the various amendments that have been proposed, I declare the amendments approved. If no member of the Council wishes to make any comments on the draft special report, and if there are no objections, I shall declare the draft report approved as amended.

It was so decided.¹

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.

Notes

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Eighth Year, Supplement for July, August and September 1953*, document S/3079.

² *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 27, annex I.*

³ *Ibid.*, *Thirtieth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2354th meeting.

⁴ United Nations Conference on International Organization, III/1/37.

⁵ *Admission of a State to the United Nations (Charter, Art. 4), Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1948*, p. 57.

⁶ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 935.

⁷ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 22, document A/10273.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم. استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف.

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
