

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**1971st  
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 20 October 1971,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 93: Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	1

*President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).*

AGENDA ITEM 93

**Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic  
of China in the United Nations (*continued*)**

1. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): For 22 successive years this lofty international forum, the General Assembly of the United Nations, has been debating the question of the restoration of the rights of China in the United Nations, rights usurped by a narrow group of private persons not representing anybody or anything. The Soviet representatives, both from this lofty tribune and in the Security Council, have constantly and unfailingly drawn attention to this flagrant discrimination against the People's Republic of China and have called for the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

2. As long ago as 10 January 1950, the Soviet Union introduced in the Security Council a draft resolution proposing that the credentials of the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek should not be recognized and that those representatives should be expelled from the United Nations.<sup>1</sup> On 19 September 1950, at the very beginning of the fifth session of the General Assembly, the head of the Soviet delegation proposed that the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek should be excluded from participation in its work "as having no right to represent China, the sole legal, authorized and sovereign representative of which is the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China,"<sup>2</sup> and that the Assembly should adopt a proposal "to invite the representatives of the People's Government to take part in the work of the General Assembly and its organs".<sup>3</sup>

3. Subsequently I often had occasion to speak on this point myself from the rostrum of the General Assembly to expound the consistent position of principle of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to defend a just cause

against those who, by a mechanical majority, were preventing the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations.

4. Unfortunately, the People's Republic of China is to this day deprived of the opportunity to participate in the work of the United Nations. The reason for this is the obstructionist tactics of those who, after almost a quarter of a century, have forgotten nothing and have learned nothing on this point.

5. Even now, 22 years after the creation of the People's Republic of China, when the failure of the attempts to isolate China has become completely obvious to all and when circumstances are forcing those States to seek to normalize their relations with the People's Republic of China, they still have not abandoned their attempts to retain the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek in the United Nations and at the same time to maintain their positions on the island of Taiwan, which is alien to them. They cling to the outmoded concept of "two Chinas" or, as they now put it, the "dual representation" of China in the United Nations. They assert that, since the Government of the People's Republic of China exists, and since power on Taiwan is in the hands of Chiang Kai-shek, the true state of affairs should be recognized and a place should be provided in the United Nations for the People's Republic of China and for the Taiwan régime, which they term the "Republic of China". They even attempt to frighten the Members of the United Nations by saying that, if the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek are expelled from the United Nations, any State Member of the United Nations could in the future find itself confronted with the prospect of exclusion. It is easy to see that a comparison of this kind is a foolish invention, a fairy tale hastily made up for children of pre-school age. Attempts are even made to present the expulsion of the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek as an important question requiring a decision by a two-thirds majority, whereas anybody who has any common sense will easily see and understand that this is basically just a procedural question, requiring a decision by a simple majority. Everybody understands that it is not a matter of excluding from the United Nations a State Member of this Organization. We are dealing with the removal of a group of private individuals who usurped another's seat in the United Nations and with the restoration of that seat to its lawful owner. This procedure has, and can have, nothing to do with the expulsion of a State Member of the United Nations. Anybody who claims the opposite is simply deluding himself and others, but it is clear that he is deluding others more than himself.

6. I am sure it is well known and clear to everybody that Taiwan is not a State. It is not the island of Taiwan, but

<sup>1</sup> Document S/1443. For the text, see *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, No. 1*, 459th meeting, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 277th meeting, para. 23.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 88.

China, which is one of the founders of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council. The island of Taiwan has never been admitted to membership in the United Nations and even one of the veterans of the United Nations who has already spoken from this rostrum could not give the date of its admission to membership. In his statement he expressed interest in the position of the Soviet Union. Well, I can remind him of a few facts. The Soviet Union has always been, and still is, firmly, constantly and unwaveringly in the front line of the struggle for a just solution to the question of the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations. I shall now quote my own words in this respect. At the 480th meeting of the Security Council, on 1 August 1950, I made the following statement as the representative of the Soviet Union:

"The question of the representation of China in the United Nations is, in substance, a matter of observance of and respect for the Charter, for which the Soviet Union has always contended and for which it is contending now. The Soviet Union is consistently pursuing a policy of peace and regards the United Nations as an instrument of peace . . .

"It is generally known and apparent that an abnormal situation has arisen in the United Nations as a result of the fact that the lawful representative of the People's Republic of China, as the representative of a Member State of the United Nations, is deliberately and in violation of the United Nations Charter being prevented from taking part in the work of the Security Council by the opponents of China, the enemies of China and the enemies of the Chinese people. It is a well-known fact that as a result of the circumstances, the so-called representative of the Kuomintang group was in the Security Council at the time of the establishment in China of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and that he illegally usurped China's seat with the protection of United States ruling circles. . . ."4

7. That has always been the position of the Soviet Union on this matter, and it is so today. It is time that this was understood and recognized even by that speaker who has been repeating from this rostrum, like a parrot, the words of others which are now second nature to him: vile slander and monstrous fabrications against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We, the Soviet representatives, consider it beneath our dignity to reply to him.

8. As far as the actual island of Taiwan is concerned, it is a well-known fact that it is an inalienable part of the People's Republic of China; it is a province thereof. The fact of the return of Taiwan to China after the Second World War is recorded in the most important international documents: in the Cairo Declaration of 1 December 1943 and the Potsdam Declaration of 26 July 1945, and it is recognized by a whole series of States, including the United States of America. It is only forcible foreign intervention in the internal affairs of China, the occupation of Taiwan by foreign armed forces and the continuing protection af-

forded by the United States of America to the Chiang Kai-shek clique which has led to the present situation in the United Nations, a situation which cannot be justified by any verbal niceties from the rostrum of the General Assembly.

9. The unseemly toying with the policy of "two Chinas" and the "dual representation of China" in the United Nations has always been and still is firmly opposed by us and by all those who remain faithful to the high ideals of the United Nations, who defend its universal character and uphold the principle affirmed by the United Nations of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force. That policy is quite obviously designed to wrest Taiwan away from the People's Republic of China and to continue to create obstacles to the return to the Chinese people in the form of the People's Republic of China of its seat in the United Nations. In this connexion, I should like to recall the statement made on this matter by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union in the general debate at the present session of the General Assembly:

"So far as the position of the Soviet Union is concerned, we have always consistently opposed any unlawful action in respect of the Chinese island of Taiwan, any deprivation of the People's Republic of China of its legitimate rights in the United Nations, the concept of 'two Chinas' and any notion of a 'dual representation of China'. This is our position of principle, and we shall uphold it at this session of the General Assembly." [1942nd meeting, para. 118.]

10. Whatever our relations with the Chinese leadership—and they are sometimes, as is well known, somewhat strained in the ideological and political fields, through no fault of our own—the Soviet Union remains faithful to the high ideals and principles of the peace-loving foreign policy of Lenin. Our position has always been, and still is, based on the fact that it is impossible to ignore the Chinese people and that they must be represented in the United Nations.

11. Time and the realities of life have conclusively shown and proved how far-sighted has been, and still is, the policy of the Soviet Union and of those States which have always consistently and firmly defended the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and demanded that the discrimination in the United Nations against the People's Republic of China and other States such as the German Democratic Republic and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea be ended. It is, indeed, the realities of life which have now forced the opponents of the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations to move towards a different viewpoint—although it is, of course, not easy for them to revise their opinions completely on this matter. They try to conceal their forced retreat by rearguard actions. But those actions are hopeless and will not win them the victor's laurels.

12. The Soviet delegation expresses the hope that common sense and an awareness of current realities will finally prevail, that the violated rights of the great Chinese people in the United Nations will be restored and that the People's Republic of China will make its contribution to the work of this Organization.

4 See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, No. 22*, 480th meeting, p. 3.

13. Mr. ESPINOSA (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Colombia wishes to reaffirm a position, to reiterate a policy. Few new or original things can be added in this debate, after so many speeches in which the conflicting parties must have stated every argument. But we believe it will be useful to recall the thesis which the spokesmen of my country have consistently put forward prompted by the desire to contribute to the solution of problems such as the one now occupying the attention of the Assembly. Accordingly, our reasoning will be based on the immovable foundation of faithfulness to some principles, a conception of the law, an idea of justice, a concept of equity. For these very reasons, it will deserve respect.

14. It does not matter that we lack the support of idle or threatening weapons which arouse fear in others. This Organization—although this is often forgotten—is founded upon the sovereign equality of its Members, and since it was constituted to maintain international peace and security we who have no war potential which might bring us to disobey or ignore its rules run less risk of violating its standards or running counter to its spirit. Because, being aware that we are protected only by law, we who represent medium-sized or small nations on the contrary feel inclined, out of an instinct of self-defence and survival, to ensure strict compliance with the principle of the sovereign equality of States and to form a common cause to preserve it from any possible threats from the mighty, who alone are capable of carrying them out.

15. For these reasons, and the persevering work of this Organization, we feel very far removed from the time when a single leader, barely emerging out of the embroilment of war, asked how many divisions would support the opinions of the Pope—as though the hecatomb had eliminated moral force and the spiritual values which, fortunately, mankind in its entirety later rescued in a perhaps unprecedented action of solidarity.

16. Of course, I am aware of the strenuous efforts with which some or many devote themselves to the task of preventing the faith proclaimed in San Francisco “in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small” from becoming a genuine reality. Not long ago a study prepared by distinguished personalities attributed the inoperativeness of the United Nations to the fact that two thirds of the votes are held by countries with less than 10 per cent of the gross national product of the nations of the world, thereby implying, if I am not mistaken, that wisdom is in the hands of the few—the rich, the industrialized and prosperous—which would disappear in the hazards of voting because of the stultifying attitude of the majority, which are barely developing and do not always progress because the systems established or the methods practised by the others smother their possibilities. But this very new attempt to differentiate will not prevail against the iron will that moves peoples and nations towards equality.

17. Gradually the mighty will begin to realize that they too bear some responsibility—indeed, a great deal of responsibility—for many of the failures, the confrontations, the frustrations; or they will be persuaded by the overwhelming weight of events that they did not act wisely, that they lacked a sense of timing, that they went too far—further

than wisdom would have counselled—in adhering to a *status quo* that was at once revolutionary and non-revolutionary, socialist and capitalist, only because of the privileges implied and the advantages generated. In the end it will be accepted that clear thinking does not depend only on amassing public or private wealth, even though that is proved, however sporadically, by communities or States, which struggle to leave behind them the disadvantages of under-development.

18. Thus there will be no arrogance or impertinence, and debates will move forward without acrimony in a spirit of conciliation, seeking that which is best for all and not for just a few, without being exclusive, without excluding, with a sense of universality. This “universality without restrictions” was advocated by Colombia at the highest level. On 16 June 1969, President Lleras Restrepo, after suggesting “a major reform that would unreservedly open the United Nations to all the countries of the world” as the primary condition for fulfilling the objectives set forth in the Charter, said:

“Leaving in the hands of Member States the acceptance or non-acceptance, on the recommendation of the Security Council, of another State, and designating or not designating it as ‘peace-loving’ means introducing a deeply disturbing political factor into the international legal machinery.”

*Mr. Molina (Costa Rica), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

19. We in the General Assembly who are now discussing this are well aware of this deep disturbance. Nevertheless the preference was to continue to be tied to the provisions of 26 years ago despite their obvious obsolescence and the fact that more than once they had been violated or mocked in practice or not talked of, as in the case of something shameful, so as not to have to blush even more.

20. Several of the States called “enemy States” in the Charter are today Members of the United Nations, that is to say, friends who co-operate in maintaining peace, promoting security, development and harmony. And instead of freeing the Organization from the character of a closed club which excludes outsiders, it being necessary to prove good conduct and peaceful inclination to enter—just as it is required to submit certain certificates and to have the support of certain sponsors to be admitted to some social centres—here the recourse is to disguise and even to ignoring the letter of the Charter, which one wishes not to amend, but simply to put aside at times because it disturbs and complicates.

21. But now, a quarter-century after San Francisco, instead of recognizing that circumstances have radically changed and that the time has come to give every people which acquires the category of statehood—through, let us say, a determination by the International Court of Justice—the right to enter an Organization where the co-operation of all is required for the maintenance of peace, there are those who prefer to persist in maintaining superseded and anachronistic ideas whose only virtue is to cause problems such as the one we now face. The logical result is that it is impossible to solve the problems that arise by regular channels and by orthodox methods; so it

becomes necessary to have recourse to subterfuge, to wring the neck of the law, to roam the blank spaces of the Charter.

22. This is what is happening with the representation of China. The delegation of Albania and the others who sponsored its draft resolutions for years have had recourse to the expedient of seeking the "restoration" of some rights so as to be able to bring the case of the representation of the People's Republic of China to the General Assembly without going through the Security Council because there the Republic of China would have exercised its right to the veto, no doubt alleging that the State aspiring to enter was not "peace-loving" or did not accept the obligations laid down in the Charter. An excessive attachment to the *status quo*, the immobility of the majority of the Members of the United Nations which has meant leaving in force rules of the Charter for which there is no reason any longer have led to this distortion of procedure and even of substance. But this is not the only case and almost like a chain reaction it could give rise to another or other cases, since in another case it would not be feasible to go through the Security Council either, because of the unnecessary disturbing political factor which I have already analysed. The expulsion of the Republic of China as a consequence of the so-called "restoration of rights" would not allow what a certain strictness recommends, namely, a request for later admission because in that case too the way would be barred by the veto. Hence, here again the question would have to be decided in the General Assembly without going through the Security Council.

23. For the reasons I have stated and for others which I shall mention in due course, my delegation does not consider the allegations of one sector against the legality of the procedure and the thesis of the other to be valid. I have already said that both proceed along courses that are not strictly orthodox. Colombia does not believe that it alone possesses the truth and has therefore agreed to go along with a given course, seeking justice in the case on which an expectant world opinion awaits a decision, and which this Assembly is working on.

24. On 20 November last year I said from this rostrum on behalf of my delegation some words which I would take the liberty of recalling because they constitute the background for the present position of Colombia. In explaining our vote after the voting I affirmed the following which appears in the verbatim record:

*[The speaker read out in extenso his delegation's explanation of vote at the twenty-fifth session. For the text, see the 1913th meeting, paras. 79-81.]*

Today I am happy to observe that several and even powerful delegations which last year did not agree with the point of view of Colombia today proclaim and defend like ideas.

25. The General Assembly at the twenty-fourth session did not agree with Colombia either when the then Foreign Minister, Mr. López Michelsen, maintained that it was impossible to organize world peace while excluding so important a nation as the People's Republic of China and said that it was necessary to respect the self-determination

of the people of Taiwan which could hardly be excluded from the Organization [1768th meeting, para. 34]. But later many recognized how right my country was when it pronounced itself as it did.

26. The present Minister for Foreign Affairs of Colombia, Dr. Vázquez Carrizosa, who, like myself, is a spokesman for the Government under the leadership of President Pastrana, has confirmed the same points, making clear the consistency which has been characteristic of the international policy of Colombia throughout its history. In his recent statement during the general debate, he said:

"To admit Peking China by expelling Taiwan China is neither a praiseworthy nor an advisable solution, for it would be tantamount to applying a punitive measure to a Government that has lawfully occupied a seat in this Organization . . .

" . . .

"The presence of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations must not mean the expulsion of the Republic of China, of whose capacity to govern itself freely and to accept the obligations imposed by the Charter we have no doubt whatsoever. Allowing a new and great State in the Organization would be in accord with the universality that Colombia has always advocated and would be in keeping with an undeniable reality of the contemporary world." [1952nd meeting, paras. 174 and 176.]

27. This is a reality which, I might add, supersedes any mental litigation as to whether it is a question to two Chinas, one China and one Taiwan, or two Governments of China. This is not just any reality, but a reality that has lasted for 22 years. Just as it was unreal to maintain that the Republic of China represented all of China, it now unrealistic to maintain that the People's Republic of China represents or governs Formosa (or Taiwan). No one can ignore the fact that two distinct territories exist, two distinct peoples, two distinct Governments. And here in the United Nations one cannot advance the argument that one territory is very large, the other very small; that one population exceeds 700 million, the other is barely 15 million; because proportionally equal differences exist between many States Members of the Organization, whose essence is the equal sovereignty of all of them.

28. The truth is that all the conditions laid down by international law for calling an entity a "State" are present in the People's Republic of China and in the Republic of China. It is very likely that the legal aspect is not expressly considered or contained in the Charter, but these are salient facts which cannot be concealed. They must be considered, or what will emerge will be what a great jurist called "the revolution of the facts against the code": the law, insensitive and cold as it is, is nevertheless more effective than anything else because it is irreversible and, what is more, creative.

29. The delegation of Colombia adheres to these salient facts: the existence of a great country with a massive population living on a vast continent and the no lesser existence of another country which is not as large but

which is respectable and equal under the law, a country located on a fertile and prosperous island, with millions of inhabitants—quite a few more than some nations needed for their capacity to comply with the obligations imposed by the Charter to be believed and for them to be admitted to membership in the Organization.

30. On the other hand, I repeat that my delegation believes in the desirability and the need for the entry of the People's Republic of China which has been delayed far longer—it is worth while noting—than the admission of the Soviet Union to the League of Nations. We agree with the affirmation of Secretary-General U Thant when, in the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization for this year, he comments with legitimate pride on the success achieved because of the action of the Organization, notes that in conflicts which have occurred outside the jurisdiction of the United Nations there are few opportunities to put an immediate end to bloodshed, and concludes:

"If the peoples of China and Viet-Nam had been represented in this Organization, I believe there would have been opportunities for earlier and more fruitful negotiations." [A/8401/Add.1, para. 9.]

*Mr. Malik (Indonesia) resumed the Chair.*

31. The same desirability and need can and should be advocated, in my delegation's opinion, to have the Republic of China remain as a Member of the United Nations, for the reasons which the representatives of Colombia have stated here at successive sessions of the General Assembly and for the reasons which I myself advanced in explaining our vote last year.

32. Some delegations have maintained that unless the Government of Taiwan is expelled, the Peking Government will not accept admission to the United Nations. Something similar was said by a distinguished journalist on 28 June last, in an article published in *The New York Times*, when after returning from a visit of several days to mainland China, where he had an interview with Premier Chou En-lai, he was emphatic in registering his opinion to the effect that there was no possibility of improving relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China so long as the problem of Taiwan remained unsolved. But exactly one week later, on 5 July, the President of the United States, Mr. Nixon, made the spectacular announcement that, on the invitation of the People's Republic of China, he would visit Peking before May 1972. And no one—here, at least—is unaware that his adviser Mr. Kissinger is now in that city for the final preparations, in association with the officials of the Government of Peking, for that historic voyage. A final solution of the problem of Taiwan will take some considerably more time. We are not prejudging that final solution.

33. In this Assembly there is practical unanimity in recognizing, as is logical, that the People's Republic of China should occupy the seat in the Security Council as one of the five great Powers. This is no longer a matter for discussion; all the draft resolutions provide for this. The Republic of China will merely remain in the Assembly. This is a fundamental difference, a faithful reflection of the facts

which serve as a basis for the opinions of my delegation and will guide its votes at the end of this debate. Quite obviously, had reality been different our conduct would also have been different.

34. My delegation is a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2, which provides that "any proposal . . . which would result in depriving the Republic of China of representation in the United Nations is an important question under Article 18 of the Charter."

35. Since we have not adopted a legal and automatic standard for deciding on the representation of States as Colombia advocates, my delegation believes it indispensable to take every precaution to prevent the adoption of unjust and punitive measures against the Republic of China, which would be inspired far less by the will to observe the Charter as a whole—starting with the standards in the Preamble and with the purposes and principles which serve as a guide for interpreting all the other parts—than by a spirit of retaliation and disturbing political considerations.

36. Always in the past such a proposal was voted with priority in respect of the substance, so that we should know in advance in what way the principal proposal would be adopted or rejected. That is the only way correctly to apply the rules of the Charter. The contrary would imply a flagrant violation of the constituent standards of the Organization and would entail an irreparable loss of prestige and loss, too, of the respectability which it deservedly enjoys. But since the Organization is not and will never be, as is repeated almost daily, anything more than what the Member States wish it to be, my delegation trusts that the decision will be satisfactory because we believe that the overwhelming majority of States still believe in the United Nations and consider the Organization as the last hope for mankind to move forward along the ways of peace towards the better life which all peoples assiduously seek.

37. On behalf of the delegation of Colombia I express the hope that that wisdom which frequently attends corporate effort, as a result of team work and a mutual desire for progress with justice, will not be absent from the General Assembly when the time comes to take one of the most important decisions in its history.

38. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Our delegation is taking part in this debate mainly because we are a sponsor of the draft resolutions which are before the Assembly in documents A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 and, as is natural, I should like to state as briefly as possible, but with the utmost possible clarity and accuracy, the reasons why we are sponsors.

39. Uruguay is an essentially peaceful country with an unassailable faith in the law and has on many occasions at the international level proved its concern to contribute to the efforts made by States which are inspired by the noble desire to reach solutions which will ensure peace.

40. In the present circumstances we wish to recall two of the actions of the external policy of Uruguay intended to achieve that lofty end.

41. Bearing in mind that repeated historical experience teaches us that war is a contagious phenomenon and tends inevitably to propagate itself, we are bound to recognize the indivisibility of peace and the need, if peace is to be maintained, to commit all States so that only a universal measure binding on the international conduct of all States can prevent the propagation of warlike conflicts and ensure the full enforcement of peace.

42. It was a measure of this kind, a universal one, which was proposed at the Hague Conference in 1907, by the representative of Uruguay, the eminent statesman of our country, don José Batlle y Ordóñez, to impose on all States, even by force, the peaceful solution of conflicts.

43. The formula, which has been called a formula for compulsory arbitration, proposed that when 10 States, half of which had at least 25 million inhabitants, each agreed to submit to arbitration the disputes among them, the said States would have the right to form an alliance to review the disputes between the other countries and to support the most just solution, to be decided by a mandatory arbitration tribunal.

44. Such an initiative is surely the only precedent of governmental origin for Article 17 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, which adopted the purpose of imposing a peaceful solution on international conflicts and of applying sanctions to States non-members of the League, whenever they illegitimately had recourse to war.

45. The same idea, with slight changes in so far as it creates or imposes obligations on States non-members of the United Nations, is in fact enshrined in paragraph 6 of Article 2 of the Charter.

46. It was precisely during the drafting of the Charter in San Francisco when the other action of Uruguay to which I wish to refer occurred; at that time Uruguay maintained the thesis of universality whereby the affiliation of States to the United Nations should be global, permanent and obligatory.

47. When during the drafting the question of the authority to expel a Member State which had repeatedly violated the principles of the Covenant—an authority which was ultimately enshrined in the Charter—was taken up, the delegation of Uruguay tenaciously objected and the representative of Uruguay, Mr. Payssé Reyes, who is a member of our delegation to this Assembly, maintained that the international community must be universal, obligatory and permanent, that it is not possible to live outside the international community, that the international community is inevitable and that, without prejudice to the organization of a system of sanctions, there should be no withdrawals or expulsions which would inevitably lead to the weakening and ineffectiveness of the international Organization.

48. The delegation of Uruguay is not unaware that certain provisions in the United Nations Charter do apply the criteria of universality. Thus paragraph 6 of Article 2 of the Charter which I mentioned earlier establishes that this Organization will see to it that States which are not members of the United Nations will act in accordance with the principles of the Charter "so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security".

49. Apart from this precept intended to regulate the conduct of States which are not members, the Charter recognizes certain rights for non-member States, such as: the right to take part in discussions of disputes to which they are parties (Article 32); the right to bring to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly any dispute to which they are a party (Article 35), and the right to consult the Security Council with regard to a solution of special economic problems arising from the carrying out of preventive or enforcement measures (Article 50). Furthermore, within our Organization the rights of non-member States have been broadened in connexion with the functioning of various organs of the United Nations family.

50. The obligation and the rights I have mentioned of non-member States authorize us to maintain that, strictly speaking, all States are Members of the United Nations, since some are in the category of active Members and others are in the category of passive Members.

51. Naturally, although it seems too obvious to have to mention it, the capacity and effectiveness of the United Nations will increase in the measure that its universality increases by way of having more active Members, not more passive Members.

52. What we are now dealing with in this Assembly is taking a great leap toward greater and more complete universality for the United Nations, affirming the right of the People's Republic of China to be represented and recommending that it occupy a seat as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council.

53. It would be neither just nor reasonable if this great step were related to the expulsion of the Republic of China, which exercises authority over a given territory and a population of many million inhabitants, which meets all the requirements of a normally constituted Government, which in its action since the founding of the United Nations has not violated any of its principles, and which has been recognized by other States with which it maintains normal diplomatic relations. Expulsion would obviously be contrary to the purpose of including all of mankind—a purpose which should naturally animate this world institution.

54. Is it not true that the Republic of China, which is on and in fact governs Formosa, has not applied for membership in the United Nations—nor has the People's Republic of China? But the United Nations cannot, must not, ignore the proof of well-known facts by negating or ignoring the reality of both Governments; far less can it disinterest itself from having both in the United Nations.

55. It is true that for the case which has been raised the solution is not provided for in an express text, nor does it unquestionably flow in a pristine manner from a comfortable and easy interpretative examination of the provisions of the Charter. But it is not less true that the standards, the structures, the legal categories do not, nor can they, provide for every solution applicable to the realities they must regulate, the realities which constitute in themselves—or because of the different approaches to which they may be subject—an ever-varying and changing scene.

56. In such situations—and the one we are analysing is one of them—the principles or rules of law which constitute the common foundation of all legal systems, the feeling of justice and the context of the standards of the Charter, can lead to the reasonable and just solution desired.

57. To decide, when there has been a revolutionary change in Government, whether the new authority adequately represents or not the State Member of the United Nations in which there has been such a change, appears to be indispensable because of the emergence of different centres of power which are in dispute and rivalry for supremacy.

58. That was the question originally raised in regard to the representation of China. I say “originally” because the question of the representation now is, as we shall see, not the same, in our opinion, as it was in the past, even though the competent organ to solve it continues to be this Assembly, which, under Article 10 of the Charter, is empowered to discuss any question or matter and to make recommendations in regard to the activities of all the other organs of the United Nations.

59. I wish to recall that the General Assembly at its fifth session took it upon itself to recommend to the other organs what should determine adequacy of representation of a State Member of the United Nations. It is of interest to recall, even today, that at that time two criteria were proposed to regulate the future decision of the Assembly on the subject.

60. Cuba, with the support of other countries, among them Uruguay, proposed that in order to determine the adequate representation of a State, the following requirements should be considered: first, effective authority over the national territory; second, the general consent of the population; third, ability and willingness to achieve the purposes of the Charter, to observe its principles of the Charter and to fulfil international obligations of the State; and fourth, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.<sup>5</sup>

61. The other criterion, which the United Kingdom proposes,<sup>6</sup> was that of effective government by the new Government because only such a Government could comply domestically with the obligations of the Charter and, in general, with international obligations.

62. After studying those criteria, the General Assembly adopted a resolution recommending that:

“... whenever more than one authority claims to be the government entitled to represent a Member State in the United Nations and this question becomes the subject of controversy in the United Nations, the question should be considered in the light of the purposes and principles of the Charter and the circumstances of each case” [*resolution 396 V, para. 1*].

63. When we say that the question of China at present is not what it was years ago, it is because in the intervening

time, and although both the parties involved in the question claim that they should have the right to represent China, the real, well-known, undeniable situation, confirmed by facts, is not that of centres of authority which are in rivalry and dispute for supremacy over the same territory and the same population, but of centres of power which exercise authority over different territories and populations, effectively governing their respective territories and fulfilling the requirements for recognition as Governments.

64. The fact that both Governments claim the right to represent China does not deprive this Assembly of knowledge of the political reality of each or of the existence in each of them of all the elements which characterize their respective entities. Therefore, the realistic solution, dictated by common sense and by the purposes and principles of the Charter and the circumstances of this case, in the light of which the General Assembly decided to consider the question must be purely and simply to recognize that both effectively are in existence and that both represent China and that both should be in the United Nations.

65. Is it arbitrary to allocate a seat in the Security Council to the People's Republic of China and a seat in this Assembly to the Republic of China? This attribute of arbitrariness vanishes if one considers that the seat in the Security Council would meet the same realistic elements which were taken into account when considering the recognition of the existence of the other permanent members.

66. In this Assembly, the action to be taken by the Republic of China, in representing China, would meet the same criteria and respond to the same qualifications as those applying to any other State.

67. My delegation believes, therefore, that what cannot and must not be done is to decide that the Republic of China is to be expelled, because that would be a violation of the principles of elementary ethics; because it is not or would not be authorized under Article 6 of the Charter regarding the expulsion of a Member State; because it would be a violation of principles of basic rights in every part of the world; because it would be contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter and the other provisions directly connected with those purposes and principles; and because it would bring discredit and loss of prestige to the United Nations.

68. From an ethical point of view, it would be a really singular case if Member States which for years have been sharing common tasks and concerns with the Republic of China and whose representatives have been seated next to the representatives of the Republic of China for a long time and have participated with them as equals at meetings intended to bring about close and friendly relations, were suddenly to meet and decide to expel, to cast out of the United Nations, the Republic of China—and, obviously, its representatives—without any justification for the abrupt change in attitude. Such a deed would rightly deserve a harsh description and would provoke general revulsion.

69. Would such expulsion be governed, not by moral reasons, but by political or legal interests and reasons derived from the presumed restoration of lawful rights,

<sup>5</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Annexes, agenda item 61, document A/AC.38/L.6.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, document A/AC.38/L.21/Rev.1.



from the struggle between and against imperialism, or from such other reasons. So much the worse, for as history marches on, no State is free from sin, and far less is anybody authorized to apply sanctions—unless a case is absolutely exceptional, which this one is not—sanctions which, whether one likes it or not, go beyond the moral order for faults not committed or presumed.

70. Furthermore, no delegation to this Assembly is unaware of the principle enshrined in universal legislation whereby penalties and grave sanctions are applied only in cases and situations provided for expressly in a text which cannot be extended by analogy and which are, therefore, governed by the application of a restrictive standard; and these situations are never handed for decision to the free will of the one who sanctions. And it is a well-known fact that in the case before us there has never been any repeated violation of the principles of the Charter, which is the only circumstance that warrants the expulsion of a Member State under Article 6.

71. If the Charter, because of the need to maintain international peace and security, determines that the parties to a dispute should try to seek a solution, above all, by negotiation, investigation, mediation, consultation, conciliation, arbitration, legal settlement, and so on; if, to maintain peace and security, the Charter prescribes taking effective collective measures to forestall and eliminate threats to the peace and to suppress acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace and, by peaceful means in accordance with the principles of justice and international law, to arrive at an adjustment or settlement of disputes or international situations which might lead to a breach of the peace; going further, if, in accordance with the enunciation of purposes, the United Nations is to serve as a centre which harmonizes the efforts of nations, it is the understanding of our delegation that the United Nations cannot legitimately in this case decide on any expulsion. Were it to do so, it would violate the letter and the spirit of the Charter by an act that, far from tending to harmonize relations and prevent threats to the peace, would be seen to be directly intended to create or encourage international confrontations and, in due course, new and renewed threats to the peace.

72. Moreover, beyond any doubt, the expulsion which is sought would more seriously harm the United Nations than the Member State which it would expel. The United Nations would, in our opinion, suffer loss of prestige by an act devoid of lofty inspiration and contrary to the very purposes of its creation, particularly in circumstances in which there is a draft resolution called "The dual representation draft resolution" [*A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2*], which does tend to harmonize efforts and safeguard peace. This dual representation draft merely by abiding by reality and accepting dual representation propounds a measure which would strengthen the United Nations, encourage and promote relations of friendship and co-operation among peoples, such as already exist among those represented here who, while having different political ideologies, can nevertheless act among themselves in co-ordination or in solidarity to defend their common interests.

73. On the other hand, when the two peoples at issue—which are politically and legally organized—claim to represent China, they are, paradoxically, both right, because

socially, culturally and historically both are China, and it would consequently be China which would be represented in the United Nations by the delegations of the Republic of China and the People's Republic of China.

74. It must be recognized that approval of this draft resolution, which faithfully interprets the loftiest goals of the United Nations, would constitute a first step along the path to be taken to do away with or overcome difficulties between two peoples or, more accurately, between sectors of a same people, whereby the United Nations would have served as the centre for harmonizing efforts to reach basic understandings in safeguarding peace.

75. On the other hand, the expulsion of a Member State would weaken the Organization, exclude a State from the international community and constitute an act counter-productive of peace, since it would lead directly to creating opponents of the Organization.

76. Furthermore, to decree so grave a measure as the expulsion of a Member State—a measure which, because of its importance, would require the support of two thirds of the votes of this Assembly—instead of weighing its full impact and adopting the realistic and conciliatory solution of dual representation for China, would openly and frontally run counter to the very spirit of peace and conciliation which should permanently inspire this Organization.

77. This conciliatory and realistic attitude, which would add to the universality of our Organization, and ensure the incorporation in the future of new Member States, thus enhancing its universality, is dictated by the circumstances in which the present-day world is developing.

78. The planetary system in which we all live has become notoriously smaller because of modern communications media and technological advances. Collective needs are determining multiple penetrations and integrations, and a vast network of international law regulates relations between States, which are becoming more interdependent every day. Therefore, in the present-day world there is not, nor can there be, a State outside or left out of the international community, whose loftiest and most significant expression is the United Nations.

79. It is true that there exist many differences in interests, ideologies, cultures, religions, politics and so on, which separate some States from others. It is precisely because of the existence of such differences that all States should be in the United Nations—were they all identical, that would not be necessary—to dedicate themselves to the task of defending, jointly, so that such defence should be effective, the common or reciprocal values and interests which unite them, irrespective of the differences which divide them.

80. All States aspire to freeing their populations from hunger, disease and housing shortages, and all States aspire to prevent war, to consolidate peace, to safeguard human life and the survival of the species.

81. For all those reasons it must be affirmed that the signs of the times point to the inevitable and peremptory need for all States to be active Members of the United Nations,



since they are all members of the international community and since the United Nations has set for itself objectives which can be attained only by means of effective international co-operation on a universal level sheltered by the supreme good of peace.

82. Mr. DÍAZ CASANUEVA (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Chile is fully aware that it is participating in a debate of enormous impact whose development is of concern not only to the delegations here present but also to the entire world. Chile is participating with faith and at the same time with a certain scepticism—with faith, because we have progressed so much that we are about to correct a grave historical error; with scepticism, because we are not really having a debate, that is a clear and objective examination of the situation, but rather a succession of statements as though each delegation, clinging to its own points of view, was preparing itself for a confrontation; instead of jointly seeking with all other delegations the most sensible and expeditious means to reach the objective to which undoubtedly the majority of this Assembly aspires: the presence in the United Nations of the People's Republic of China without restrictions or conditions.

83. One of the first acts defining the foreign policy of the new Government of Chile consisted in establishing diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China and, at the last session of the General Assembly, in voting for the restoration of its rights in the United Nations. That was a free and spontaneous expression of our sovereignty, in accord with the wish of our people, based on a fundamental question of principle and also on a realistic appraisal of the international situation. We could not continue to ignore a country which contains one fourth of mankind and which has made remarkable progress towards the goals set by the United Nations. Happily, as far as China is concerned, truth has been gaining ground over mystery making, and bridges are being built unceasingly between China and the other countries. This augurs well for more harmonious and productive international co-operation. At the same time, it enhances on a world-wide level the principles of the Charter.

84. With this debate the United Nations has come to a crucial point in its existence. The result of the final votes on the proposals submitted will intensely influence the directions and work of the Organization. We speak in the certainty that we are contributing to putting an end to the hostile and discriminatory policy which for so many years has been followed against a great country, the possessor of a centuries-old culture, one of the greatest of mankind, and which, at the same time, has promoted one of the greatest social revolutions of our century. For more than 20 years, openly or through subterfuge, the People's Republic of China has arbitrarily been prevented from occupying the seat which belongs to it in this General Assembly, in the Security Council, and in the various other organs of the United Nations. This was one of the deplorable consequences of the cold war. Now the tendency in the world is to normalize relations with China, bilaterally and in the evermore universal context of the United Nations.

85. Obviously, my delegation does not consider this problem only from the point of view of China's entry into

the United Nations. To this we give a broader perspective, related to the possibility of lessening tensions in Asia, favouring negotiations and co-operation among the great Powers in general, and achieving an atmosphere of peace and trust which will enable the international community to dedicate itself to the urgent and enormous task of eliminating poverty among so many peoples of the world. To this end, the presence of China in the United Nations is an indispensable factor.

86. My delegation expresses its satisfaction at the fact that, fortunately, the majority of countries have become convinced that it is impossible to continue to ban the People's Republic of China from our Organization and the entire international community. We all maintain this conviction in theory. The problem is how to implement it. As we see it, the time has come to liquidate an historical era which was characterized by fear, suspicion, isolation and the forcible grouping of States, and to begin another era based on broad and effective international co-operation, particularly now that the United Nations undertakes monumental tasks in response to the breath-taking renewal of our culture and our society. Chile, like other countries, expects a great deal from the active participation of China in the United Nations. It would be most painful and would cause tremendous disappointment if in apparently acquiescing to China's recovery of its rights, we were to see artifice triumph, thereby delaying or obstructing the final entry of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations. This danger exists; we feel it in this Assembly, and we anxiously hope that wisdom and a vision of the future will prevail so that we may arrive at a clean and clear solution.

87. We cannot, on the one hand, open wide the doors of the Organization for China to enter—with all its might and dignity—and, on the other hand, with China on our threshold, once again close the door with deceitful excuses and procedural artifice, which should be interpreted as a device rather than as a conviction. For many years the crafty stratagem of the so-called "important question" was used against China—not because it was in fact an important question, but because it was a means to appeal to two thirds of the Assembly and not to the majority. Now, with a new dimension, but with the same intent, an attempt is being made to use the same procedure to create situations which, while saving face, would in substance be tantamount to intercepting China's entry into the United Nations. As we all know, this would not damage China, which has waited for so long and which can still wait; it would damage the United Nations, which is conducting its work normally in the various committees of this Assembly and in the other organs, in which we now observe a kind of waiting time, a vacuum and expectancy, as if any decision we might adopt could not have its full value or effectiveness without the participation of the People's Republic of China.

88. In a quarter of a century China has achieved considerable success in overcoming hunger and poverty, feudal exploitation and foreign oppression. Not only has it succeeded in meeting the needs of its immense population, but it has also made scientific and technological conquests which have elevated it to the rank of a nuclear and space Power. Without China there can be no effective advance on the road to disarmament or to international security;

neither can the International Development Strategy be completely successful; nor can the effectiveness and authority of the United Nations be strengthened. If China is with us—that is to say, with another quarter of the human race represented in the United Nations—new possibilities will be opened for our Organization, which would acquire greater vigour by ensuring its universality and by conferring upon China its responsibility in accordance with the obligations laid down in the Charter. We are saying nothing new. We are repeating what each delegation present knows as a certainty, something that has become obvious. Nevertheless, at this session of the Assembly, more marked by destiny than others, we run the risk of wasting an opportunity history offers us.

89. For all the respect we feel for the authors of draft resolutions A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, we believe that their point of departure is a mistaken one that does not accord with the legal foundations of the Charter or, what is worse, significantly depart from it. In substance, what they aim to obtain is United Nations sanction for dualism for China—a bi-frontal China which, despite arguments to the contrary, would in the long run inevitably lead to there being two Chinas or one China and one Taiwan. Those are hazardous positions indeed, which, instead of promoting the calm, non-violent reincorporation of the province of Taiwan into China, instead of promoting national reconciliation, would encourage secession and create for the People's Republic of China a permanent threat which might rekindle the civil war that has already ended, and even run the risk of creating frictions among great Powers.

90. Only one China, one and indivisible, exists. That has been recognized by both the People's Republic of China and the representatives of the Taiwan régime. There is only one seat for China in the United Nations. That seat is being occupied illegally. We now run the risk of creating, also illegally, a special seat for a group which, displaced by the triumphant revolution, took refuge on the island of Taiwan and managed to settle down there thanks to special protection provided for strategic or economic reasons or because of political sympathy.

91. China is a founding Member of the United Nations, a permanent member of the Security Council, one of the five great Powers which in recent years have been reduced to four because of the absence of the real China, because someone who did not represent China was seated in the Security Council—someone with neither stature nor influence, someone who was not even recognized by all the other permanent Powers. That fact is so obvious that the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633, in its operative paragraph 1, affirms “the right of representation of the People's Republic of China and recommends that it be seated as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council”. The Powers sponsoring that text do not hesitate, without any considerations, to eliminate or remove—we would not say “expel”—the representatives of the Taiwan régime from the Security Council, to reduce them to a minimum role in a corner of the General Assembly. We have heard no protests from the representatives of the Taiwan régime against an action which would exclude them and contradict their claim that they represent China. Article 18 of the Charter is invoked but it is not

extended to the Security Council. This is a visible contradiction, since the basis should be the same. Article 18 and its two-thirds requirement are applied only so far as the Assembly and the other United Nations organs are concerned, thus using an arbitrary principle—the assumption that a Member is being expelled. It will tirelessly be repeated that the problem has nothing to do with the admission or expulsion of a Member: it is merely a matter of credentials, that is to say, of accepting the credentials of those who have the better right to represent a country—however painful that may be to those who believe they themselves have that right.

92. Invoking Article 18—the part relating to the expulsion of Members by a two-thirds vote—is a fiction with no legal justification at all. No one in this Assembly has claimed to expel a Member—that is to say a State. Nor has anyone the right to set up a Member, that is to say a State, on the basis of a given régime which has been rejected by the overwhelming majority of a country. The United Nations is made up of Member States. Articles 3 and 4 of the Charter clearly identify a Member with a State. The United Nations is composed of States which last no matter what the contingencies may be, and not of governments, which are transitory and change, not because of the will of the United Nations but because of the will of the people. When Article 18 is invoked regarding the expulsion of Members—that is to say States—my delegation wonders which State is meant.

93. Taiwan is not a State and the very delegation of the so-called Republic of China considers that Taiwan is Chinese soil and that it represents not Taiwan, but all of China. Taiwan is a province of China and the great allied Powers at the end of the Second World War resolved that Taiwan should be returned to China. That was confirmed in the Cairo Declaration of 1943 and in the Postdam Declaration of 1945. This Assembly cannot adopt an agreement which in substance would represent a threat to the unity and territorial integrity of China. It would represent something more: it would establish the precedent that, in a civil war, if one band managed to consolidate itself for a time on a limited corner of territory and enjoyed the devotion or clemency of a sector in the United Nations, it could be given the privilege of a Member, thus implicitly that of a State, and therefore representation, in return for its dismemberment of a country.

94. To justify all of this could lead to fallacy and inconsistency and also to the absurd, because, if it is the sincere will of the majority of this Assembly that the People's Republic of China take the seat which rightfully belongs to it, this would create difficulties for it will not do so. All would be simple if wills were united and the matter were reduced to what it is, a question of representation, namely of transferring representation from one Government to another, as has so often occurred among States Members of our Organization. A question of credentials has been transformed into one of the most odious political questions of our time.

95. According to abundantly known statements made by the Government of the People's Republic of China, if a seat is kept for the régime of Taiwan, that Government will refrain from sending representatives to the Assembly. It could not in fact condescend to accept a resolution which

would mean for China an abdication of its sovereignty, of its territorial integrity, and a submission to those who would interfere in its internal affairs. The question of Taiwan and its régime are internal affairs of China. What we wish most sincerely is that China should be reunited, with Taiwan returning to China peacefully and without foreign intervention.

96. For the delegation of Chile, the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China and the end of the functions of the delegation of the régime which now governs Taiwan constitute inseparable and simultaneous stages of a single procedure. We repeat, it is not a question of the admission of a new Member nor of the expulsion of another: it is a question of recognizing the lawful rights of the real Government of China, and this automatically implies not recognizing the representatives of the Taiwan régime. There is no other alternative, and any formula which anyone would manufacture simply confuses the precise and profound nature of the problem and starts a period of complications, frictions and frustrations which will do much damage to the United Nations and will hinder efforts towards diminishing tensions in the international community.

97. The delegation of Chile maintains a clear position without ambiguities of any kind. We shall vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 and we shall oppose any proposal, amendment or sub-amendment which would lead to dual representation, that is to say, any tactic whose implicit or explicit purpose is to delay or make impossible the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China fully to take its place within the Organization. My delegation considers that, by adopting this position, based on the firm conviction of the people and the Government of Chile, we are contributing to the soundness and prestige of the United Nations, which will increasingly become the fundamental instrument to strengthen peace and ensure new routes for the progress of mankind.

98. Mr. Mboni Naph DLAMINI (Swaziland): This Assembly cannot pretend that the past does not exist, because the existence of our Organization bears eloquent testimony that it does. Our Organization was founded 26 years ago after two devastating world wars for the primary purposes of peace, justice and progress—ideals to which this Assembly rededicated itself only last year in a series of Declarations. The immediate task for us who are here assembled is to deal with and put right a situation that has existed for over 20 years. For us the past is existing now and the present is in the future. Let it not be said by those who will assemble here 20 years from today that this august body failed to harmonize the actions of nations in accordance with Charter principles.

99. The issue now before this Assembly—the issue of China's representation in the United Nations—is a momentous one, and my delegation cannot understand why some delegations in this Assembly think that it is not an important question.

100. In supporting and sponsoring the non-expulsion draft resolutions contained in documents A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, my delegation is

seeking not a mood of confrontation, but a solution to an outstanding problem; not strife, but co-operation; not hostility, but friendship in the spirit of the Charter. The draft resolution that my Government supports and has agreed to co-sponsor seeks to seat the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and, at the same time, preserve the membership of the Republic of China in this Organization. It has been argued—perhaps rather laboriously—by some delegations here that these are incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations and the concepts of international law.

101. Twenty years ago China was divided by a civil war. From that strife there arose two Governments, with conflicting claims: one Government controlling mainland China and the other some parts of China but mainly the island of Taiwan.

102. The Swaziland delegation believes that the reality of the situation in China today is the existence of two Governments, the sovereignty of each of which is not acknowledged by the other but is certainly acknowledged by the world as, indeed, each of these Governments controls a people which acknowledges itself as Chinese through its accredited authorities. The superimposition of territorial claims, which raises conflicts of international law whenever alluded to, is perhaps bound to be confusing.

103. While it is true that the political and military presence of the Republic of China on mainland China is limited today, the fact remains that the Republic of China continues to exist as a legal and political entity; it continues to maintain all the attributes of a modern sovereign State; it has a territory, a people, a political organization and an effective Government; it has foreign diplomatic relations and United Nations membership, of which some Members here would like us to deprive it; it exercises effective control over a population of more than 14 million—not 2 million; and it represents the cultural and moral traditions of the Chinese people in a way that any effective Government would.

104. In this regard my delegation submits that this Organization cannot treat the representation of China as, in either substance or import, a simple matter of credentials, because of the clear existence of what my delegation would call a partial or dual State succession—not secession; I repeat, not secession.

105. The delegations which have argued from this rostrum for the expulsion of China cannot deny also that the People's Republic of China cannot claim to exercise present-day authority in Taiwan any more than the Republic of China can claim to exercise present-day authority in the mainland. The case of two effective Governments cannot, therefore, be denied; and the fact that each of these two Governments—effective Governments—represents a sectional interest of a great people likewise cannot be denied.

106. Nor can this Assembly negate the dynamic changes that have taken place in China during the last few years. For example, the People's Republic of China had always asked for changes in the Charter before its entry into the United Nations. There is eloquent silence on this point

today; that country would enter the United Nations without envisaging any changes in the Charter. And the mutual isolation between the People's Republic of China and the United States of America has been a wall of separation for years between those two Governments or peoples. Now, today, these two great countries are mutually breaking that wall of isolation. These are great changes that are taking place in our own time, and they point to a possible solution of the China problem—perhaps by the Chinese peoples themselves. Legalistic idealism and political ideologies should not stand in the way of a solution that relates to the human situation in China—and I should like to emphasize that we are concerned with a human situation in China.

107. The “non-expulsion draft resolution” that my Government supports, draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, seeks, in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the Charter, to preserve the substance of the principles of the Charter and to take into account those changes that have taken place in China since 1945.

108. The so-called “Albanian draft resolution” [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2], in the view of my delegation, does nothing else but seek to deprive the Republic of China of the international status that it has enjoyed for years and to treat Taiwan as a purely internal or domestic matter. We feel that if this were the case, inasmuch as the Republic of China is specifically named in the Charter as one of the permanent members of the Security Council, this would set the People's Republic of China free of any obligations towards the Republic of China, which actually inherited these obligations, these principles and these objectives of our Organization as a founding Member.

109. As a small nation and as a Member, Swaziland is gratified by the equality of nations in the United Nations and by the insistence on sovereignty over domestic matters that all nations very properly show in this Assembly. However, my delegation believes that many territories include several other distinct peoples by accidents of history; we also believe that the commitment of the United Nations to self-determination of all peoples would be a dream unrealized if all the peoples of the United Nations were not permitted to participate on the basis of equality, without prejudice to existing political relations.

110. My delegation has heard arguments advanced based on the fact that the People's Republic of China comprises one fourth of the world's population and that therefore its voice should be heard in these halls. My delegation agrees with this and is happy that this realization has come upon the international community. The draft resolution which my Government has agreed to co-sponsor takes care of this important development. My Government further agrees that if and when the People's Republic of China is seated in our Organization it should, as a matter of political principle, replace the Republic of China as a member of the Security Council. In our view that replacement would be logical. Inasmuch as the law of numbers should guide us it was by virtue of its authority over the mainland that the Republic of China was accorded the status of a permanent member of the Security Council in 1945. It had then the physical, political and military authority over that part of China. Furthermore, my delegation agrees that the People's

Republic of China has the badges of status as a spatial and nuclear super-Power. This should qualify it eminently for the role it has to play in the maintenance of international peace and security.

111. But neither the People's Republic of China nor any of the super-Powers has a monopoly on peace. Peace-loving and peace-keeping are the responsibility of us all. The moral quality and the sense of duty displayed by the Republic of China in the last 26 years on questions of peace and humanity have been impeccable in this Assembly.

112. Universality is one objective of the United Nations, but it is not the sole objective. In seating the People's Republic of China we would of course be closer to universality today than yesterday, but we cannot achieve this objective by proclaiming it in one breath and taking away from it in another. We cannot achieve universality by expelling from our midst a worthy Member having a population of over 14 million people—and again I repeat not 2 million. There is also the legal and moral authority of the United Nations which would be called into question and collapse if a worthy Member such as the Republic of China were expelled from our Organization, because thenceforth no Member could ever be sure that its membership in the United Nations was inviolable.

113. To sum up. First, because for the last 25 years this Assembly has affirmed and reaffirmed the continuous representation of China by the Government of the Republic of China, my delegation in co-sponsoring draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 does not consider itself out of order. We urge all others to vote in favour of this draft resolution for if and when this record of years has to be redone or rewritten it is logical that it should be written in the same manner as before. If a founder Member of the United Nations is to be expelled from our Organization I cannot understand why this should not be treated as an important question in accordance with Article 18 of the Charter.

114. Second, the Republic of China is not, in the view of my delegation, a government in exile or a secessionist government. It is a *de facto* government in full control of Taiwan and this has been so for the last 25 years. To say so is not to confirm secession or to create division among the Chinese people; it is just being realistic. The Chinese people on the island of Taiwan and the Chinese people on the China mainland seek to achieve different political aspirations. The draft resolution which my delegation supports seeks to ensure that all the people of China should be represented in our Organization.

115. Third, the United Nations is an Organization of “the peoples”. This is what the Preamble of the United Nations Charter says. Accordingly it must reflect that element. It must reflect the real world in which we live. Small peoples caught up by historical circumstances within boundaries of other sovereign nations must not be denied the right of self-determination if they be the governments that actually exercise authority. This is how my delegation understands the principle of universality. The people is not always a majority; the people can always be a minority.

116. Fourth, my delegation will vote against the so-called Albanian draft resolution because it is unnecessarily harsh,

it is unharmonizing, it is punitive and it seeks to "expel forthwith" from our midst a Member of good standing whose fault—perhaps whose only fault—is that it has been and is zealous for our Organization.

117. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): The seat in the United Nations which has been unlawfully occupied by the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek should have belonged to representatives of the People's Republic of China for a period of 22 years now. This should have been the logical outcome after the new Chinese nation was born with the victory of the popular forces led by the great leader of the Chinese people, Chairman Mao Tse-tung and the flight of Chiang Kai-shek, the leader of a feudal and reactionary régime. During the past 22 years there has been steady and spectacular progress in China and a growing realization of the significance of China as a great Power.

118. But thanks to the systematic opposition of the United States, People's China's representation has not been realized. At this late stage of our debate there is no point in providing the Assembly with a detailed recollection of the various manoeuvres by which the United States of America succeeded in avoiding the proper representation of China in the United Nations. It is all on record and everyone is aware of it. Suffice it to recall that throughout the 1950s, largely under the influence of the United States, when the question of representation should have been settled according to the law and practice of the United Nations by simply considering whether the new government of China exercised effective authority within the territory of the State, the matter was kept off the agenda of the General Assembly.

119. During the 1960s, United Nations membership having grown so as to make it difficult for the United States to continue taking for granted its control of the majority, the "important question" device was invented to thwart the anticipated trend in favour of according to the People's Republic of China its lawful rights. This manoeuvre worked satisfactorily until last year, when it finally became obvious that no amount of United States persuasion or threat could continue to stop the growing trend towards the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China.

120. We therefore have the present United States position. It is described by its spokesman as "a new approach". As the representative of the United States declared at the Assembly's meeting on 18 October:

"The time has come for the United Nations to settle this question and to do so in a way that will be just to all parties, realistic in its reflection of the facts and constructive for the United Nations and its Members." [1966th meeting, para. 78.]

121. We welcome the evolution of the United States position from outright opposition to the present situation where the existence of the People's Republic of China is recognized. There can be no doubt of the significance of the forthcoming visit of President Nixon in accelerating this evolution. But long before the recent conversion of those who are now "mindful of the industry, talents and achievements of the great people who live in that ancient cradle of civilization"—and here I am quoting a statement by Ambassador Phillips [1902nd meeting, para. 88]—the

Government of Tanzania has been consistent in its position of demanding the lawful rights of the Chinese people. We have steadfastly maintained this correct position since independence.

122. Given the current contacts between Peking and Washington and the projected visit of President Nixon to China, the world had every reason to expect that the position of the United States on the question of Chinese representation would reflect the more realistic approach that that Administration seemed to be embarking on by giving due recognition to the importance and significance of People's China. But we were to be disappointed. For it would seem that all that has changed in so far as the United States position on this question of representation is concerned is tactics. The strategy, lamentable as it is, is the same. And it is to dabble in further manoeuvres, procedural and otherwise, calculated to make it impossible for the 800 million Chinese people to be represented in our Organization.

123. The representative of the United States in his statement on Monday, 18 October [1966th meeting], appealed for realism. Yet he did everything in a desperate attempt to frustrate a realistic solution. What is the present-day reality? China is a great Power. The policy of quarantine and isolation perpetrated by the United States has miserably failed. More and more nations are establishing diplomatic and other relations with the People's Republic of China. Indeed, since the last session of the General Assembly, we have witnessed in many world capitals the dramatic, though by no means unexpected, expulsion of the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek. This process is irreversible and I am sure that this cannot escape the comprehension of the delegation of the United States. It is gratifying to note that in this very Assembly there is a growing awareness that the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is inevitable if this Organization is to address itself seriously to the problems of world peace and security. A year ago [1913th meeting] this new realism manifested itself in the vote by a majority of the Members of the Organization in favour of the draft resolution calling for the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China.

124. Realism dictates that it is high time that manoeuvres, in whatever guise or form, should not be allowed to frustrate the desire of the majority of Members of this Organization to have the lawful representatives of China in our midst. To advocate a "two Chinas" policy and to camouflage that policy by misplaced rhetorical assertions of the need for justice and reality, is to continue depriving the Chinese people of their place in this Organization.

125. Realism therefore further demands that no obstruction be placed in the way of the authentic voice of the Chinese people's being heard in this Organization. We listened very carefully to the pleas for justice made by Ambassador Bush in his address last Monday. But justice demands that that great nation should not be subjected to a further deprivation of its lawful rights.

126. We have also been told that China should come to the United Nations not on its own terms, but on United Nations terms. Fair enough. This is certainly valid and we

fully endorse such an assertion provided we are clear as to what the United Nations terms are. Listening to the representative of the United States, one is left with the impression that he wants this Assembly to believe that the United States terms are synonymous with United Nations terms.

127. The terms of this Organization cannot be different from those enshrined in the principles and purposes in the various Charter provisions. China is mentioned in our Charter and its rights recognized. Above all, our Charter does not condone intervention in the internal affairs of its Members. To pursue a course which arbitrarily intervenes in the internal affairs which are within the domestic jurisdiction of a Member State and then call that United Nations terms is, at best, to falsify the provisions of our Charter.

128. The People's Republic of China, consistent with its principles, has made it quite clear that it will have nothing to do with this Organization should it resolve to intervene in its domestic affairs and purport to know what is best for the Chinese people. Taiwan is a province of China, and even the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek régime have never denied that. Indeed, my delegation made it a point this time to listen to the statement made at the 1967th meeting by the representative of Chiang Kai-shek, and we did not fail to take note of the fact that at no time in his address did he fail to give the fallacious impression of representing China.

129. No self-respecting nation would allow the division of its country to be deliberately perpetuated by an Organization whose purposes it is required to serve. The People's Republic of China is no exception. This is not dictating terms to the Organization. It is simply a logical reaffirmation of that nation's legitimate rights and interests. It is, above all, insistence on the scrupulous observance of the provisions of our Charter.

130. The representative of the United States asserted that he was not advocating a "two Chinas" position or a "one China, one Taiwan" position. If this was not the case, one must frankly ask, what was Mr. Bush advocating? For if one is to make a logical deduction from his exposé, it would appear that the delegation of Chiang Kai-shek which the Americans are desperately trying to maintain in this Assembly represents neither China nor Taiwan. We are therefore being asked to allow the continued presence in our Organization of a delegation representing a group of individuals while in the process negating the authentic representation of the State of China. One can understand the dilemma in which Mr. Bush was placed by the inexorable trend towards recognition of the People's Republic of China. And perhaps one can even sympathize with his efforts to make the most of a very poor and logically untenable case. Furthermore, one could not have failed to note his efforts to cover up the bankruptcy of his case by such irrelevancies as referring to the representatives of the Generalissimo as "decent men". As if anyone has said that the gentlemen in question are indecent. But what has their decency or lack of it to do with the legitimacy of their claim to representation?

131. The call by the Americans for dual representation is morally impermissible, legally untenable, politically dangerous and practically impossible.

132. It is impermissible because such a solution would amount to an encroachment on the internal affairs of the great Chinese nation. The Charter is quite clear on the question of the Chinese seat. This seat belongs to China, and whoever exercises control over China is entitled to have it as a matter of right.

133. To argue that the régime of Chiang Kai-shek is a founding Member of the United Nations is to indulge in a shallow and most ridiculous exercise. For it was the State of China which was the founding Member. Were we for the moment to assume that a State is a Member of the Organization by virtue of its political complexion or by virtue of which particular Government is in power, then I submit that, obviously, most of the membership of this Organization would have long since relinquished the right to membership. For how many changes of Government have there been during the past two decades?

134. To allow two representatives representing one China would create a dangerous precedent. To open this road for one is to open it for many, to use the parlance of Secretary of State Rogers of the United States. All Members of this Assembly, and particularly those from small and medium-sized States, need to ponder over this very, very seriously. How many will tolerate a rival delegation claiming representation in this Organization? The argument on the multiple representation of Byelorussia, the Ukraine and the Soviet Union deliberately misses one essential point, namely, that the Government of the USSR requested and approved such representation. At no time has the People's Republic of China requested and approved dual representation. On the contrary, the Government of the People's Republic of China will not—I repeat, will not—be a party to the dismemberment of its country.

135. My Government recognizes one China and we also recognize that Taiwan is an integral part of China. But let me for a moment ponder over the preoccupations of those delegations which claim to have uncertain views concerning the future of Taiwan. To them we say this. We are here discussing the representation of China. The representative of Chiang Kai-shek in his address of 18 October made no reference to Taiwan. He purported to have spoken not on behalf of Taiwan, but on behalf of the whole of China. Thus, to confuse the so-called future of Taiwan with the question of Chinese representation is a deliberate manoeuvre perpetrated by the United States, which wants further to frustrate the wishes of the majority of this Organization. For this is a purely international affair and none of us here has any right to interfere in the domestic affairs of the Chinese people.

136. The question before this Assembly is to determine which of the two delegations is entitled to speak for the Chinese people. And the answer to this should decide the position on the voting. That is why my delegation once again has the pleasure to be one of the sponsors of the 23-nation draft resolution [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2] calling for the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China. In this connexion, we shall vote against any draft resolution, motion or amendment, such as the United States draft resolution contained in document A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, which is calculated to prevent the Assembly from adopting this rational and logical



decision. This Assembly owes it to its own prestige to defeat that motion.

137. It is clear that the concept of realism has a different meaning to the United States administration. Realism, it would seem, to the United States consists of procedural manoeuvres. This is the only interpretation that one can give to the so-called "important question draft resolution" sponsored by the United States [A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2]. This motion may differ in form, style and even substance from the previous similar motions espoused by the Americans in past sessions of the General Assembly. But the motives remain the same.

138. Throughout the past decade Tanzania's position in the procedural debate has been that the representation of China has never been an important question since China was already a Member of the United Nations—indeed a founding Member. Even then we had maintained that the issue was that of the credentials of the Chinese representative. Was the Assembly to continue giving recognition to a representation whose régime was overthrown 22 years ago by the Chinese people? Was it to condone the preposterous claims of those who, having been rejected by the Chinese masses, and while living in Taipei under the protection and tutelage of a foreign Power, cling desperately to the fallacy that they are the rulers of China? We maintained then, as we do now, that the Organization could continue debarring the true representatives of China from taking their rightful place in the United Nations only at the risk of its own prestige and effectiveness. Happily, the majority of the members of this Assembly are challenging the absurd pretences of Chiang Kai-shek and are demanding that the seat which his representatives now illegally occupy in the name of China should be restored to its legitimate owner—the People's Republic of China.

139. Thus there never was, nor is there now, a question of expulsion. For no one has suggested here that once draft resolution A/L.630, and Add.1 and 2, sponsored by 23 States from Africa, Asia, Latin America and Europe, is adopted by this Assembly, the total membership of the United Nations will be reduced from 131 to 130. The United States contention that the issue before this Assembly is that of expulsion and, to quote Mr. Bush's statement, "just that simple" [1966th meeting, para. 80], is clearly irrelevant and undoubtedly designed to confuse the issue by twisting the facts.

140. Members of this Organization, however, cannot have failed to note the irregular as well as the unconstitutional manner in which the United States seeks to increase the membership of this Organization by forcing its "two Chinas" policy on it. For the end result of voting for the United States draft will be to increase the membership of our Organization. Indeed, it will be a queer case of expulsion if, even after the rectification of Chinese representation, there are still 131 Members. The United States should have been honest enough to take this simple arithmetic into account.

141. In the course of this debate we have heard passionate, though illogical, pleas for justice, pragmatism and reality. Unless words have lost their meaning, one can only conclude that the United States, which is determined to

obstruct once again the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China, should address these pleas to itself. It is the Americans who wish to continue depriving more than one quarter of the human race of its rightful role in this Organization. It is the United States which wishes to arrogate to itself the right to provide superficial and unacceptable solutions to the Chinese nation. It is the United States which wishes to sacrifice principles. It is, finally, the United States which wishes to violate the Charter of our Organization. Rhetoric will not hide these realities. The world is watching to see whether this Organization has come of age or whether it will still succumb to the dictates of the so-called national interests and sense of pride of a single Power.

142. A vote for the United States draft resolution in document A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 is a vote for further obstruction. A vote for that motion is a vote to tarnish further the image of this Organization.

143. A vote for the United States draft resolution for dual representation, contained in document A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, is a vote for illegality. That is why we remain confident that the members of this Assembly, of all shades of opinion, will not allow the present serious anomaly to continue. We must decisively reject the United States manoeuvres, not for the sake of scoring debating victories, but for the interests of this Organization and mankind as a whole. We must not allow States, however powerful, to expect the Assembly to provide the chorus to suit their selfish motives. Only then shall we be truly a United Nations. And only then can this Organization grow in stature and expect to be treated with esteem and respect.

144. In conclusion, we should like to take this opportunity to launch a special and solemn appeal to our esteemed African colleagues to adopt a just and realistic stand. We in Africa have our rich but sad experience of how issues of vital and genuine interest to our continent do not—I repeat, do not—attract the automatic support of the United States.

145. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): There is an overwhelming feeling in the United Nations, in the United States and, indeed, in the world at large that what is now referred to as the China debate and what we insist on calling the "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations" merits the closest attention. Such attention has been rendered difficult by the fact that so many speakers have participated actively and dramatically on both sides. Now the realization arrives that this colossus, the People's Republic of China, may, after all the obstruction maintained over two decades, finally obtain justice. And certainly it is not without significance that voices which even last year were to be heard against us are coming to this rostrum this year to be heard with us.

146. There is also the fact that, after the majority vote at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly [1971st meeting], so many States in Europe, Asia and Africa shifted their stand. On the positive side, furthermore, we notice the absence of epithets formerly current among the United States delegation and its supporters who opposed the admission of the People's Republic of China, stigmatizing that nation as bent on aggression and not peace-loving. But perhaps the most arresting change in stand is



that the United States delegation itself has shifted from its old argument against acceptance of the People's Republic of China, and the obverse of its present stand calls for expulsion of the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the Security Council. That is implicit in the United States draft resolution of 29 September 1971 [*A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2*], which recommends its operative paragraph 1 "that it [*the People's Republic of China*] be seated as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council", which implies that the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek must be expelled from the seat they have unlawfully occupied in the Council. However, to this deceitful United States change, this semblance of a change, I shall return later in my statement.

147. For United Nations delegations, permanent missions and those who come to the General Assembly that have had very little chance to hear a typical political, electoral speech in New York or the United States, an excellent example of American political electioneering was given to us last Monday by the United States representative, Ambassador Bush, with all the characteristic flowery phrases, superlatives and multiplicity of adjectives, fogging the realities about China, beclouding the issue and confusing the American audience, especially with his reference to the representation of the Ukrainian SSR and Byelorussian SSR that altogether forgot the historical background of why those States are represented here. In short, it was a great speech indeed, beautifully delivered, but with no case or cause behind it.

148. The General Assembly, which started the China debate on Monday of this week [*1966th meeting*], has so far heard no less than 45 speakers. So it is only natural that the attention of the representatives may have been lulled, especially at the end of a long day like this one. Indeed, it is difficult to go beyond formulating and reformulating the arguments on either side. Allow me, however, to say that the attitude of the Syrian Arab Republic, which is too well known to need reiteration, is not dictated by expediency but by principle, not by sophistry but by a real concern that the provisions of the Charter should be put into practice, not by allegiance to this or that Power but by a consciousness of the imperative need for an international order based on law, justice and equilibrium.

149. The scores of speakers who have preceded me have summarized more than once the basic issues of the China debate. As memory—which is only too human—recalls what is nearest, I shall refer to the summary of the issue given yesterday morning in the brilliant statement of the representative of Ecuador, Ambassador Benites, who is well known for his great legal mind. I fully subscribe to his interpretation as follows:

"The problem if it is reduced to its fundamental aspects, has two facets: one, a political aspect, which consists of determining which of the two authorities that claim to constitute the legitimate Government of the Republic of China, to which reference is made in the United Nations Charter in Article 23, is the one which has the right to permanent representation in the Organization, including the Security Council; the other aspect, of a legal nature, involves a claim of territorial domination over the archipelago of Taiwan and the Pescadores, which

both Governments claim to be under Chinese domination." [*1968th meeting, para. 114.*]

150. I shall not attempt to, nor do I want to, labour the arguments underlying these two basic, fundamental issues, but they do suggest the following questions. No one so far has addressed himself directly to the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek. Through you, Mr. President, I shall put the following questions. First, do you recognize two Chinas, as does the United States? Second, have you ever come out in open support of a "two Chinas" policy? Third, have you not claimed all the time that you are the sole representatives of the whole of China? Fourth, did not your own leader, Chiang Kai-shek, at one time or the other—more than once—declare that mainland China is part of Formosa, and that he wants to liberate it and regain control over the whole mainland of China—thereby implying the existence of a single China?

151. Even in their main statement this week during this debate, these representatives never laid such a claim as that there are two Chinas—a claim that was laid by the delegation of the United States. If the Chiang Kai-shek representatives keep silent about these questions, it is an acknowledgement that there is but one China, as we maintain. But which China?

152. Here I come to my second set of questions, which are addressed directly to the United States delegation, although they also concern the whole membership of the United Nations. First, suppose a civil war takes place in a country, as a result of which two governments are set up. Is that not, according to Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, a purely internal matter, which does not give the United Nations—or the United States, which has become the police force of the world—the right to intervene? Second, suppose, furthermore, that the two governments are formed as the result of the secession of one party, helped by the military power of a third party. What principle would you invoke to determine recognition of one rather than the other?

153. If, however, that involved not a matter of principle—as it does not—but of expediency and arbitrary choice—as it does—then we would expect to hear what we heard from the representative of the United States in presenting his draft resolution and his arguments for it, stating that:

"All the people of China would thus at last be represented in the United Nations by the Governments which, for over 20 years, have actually governed them" [*1966th meeting, para. 66.*]

But that same stand is the very stand that has led the United Nations to be deadlocked in this debate for the last 20 years, and it will not today lead to a solution of the problem of two governments for one people.

154. Relative to these questions, let me recall to you how a President of the United States, President Truman, and a Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, both recognized that Formosa is a part of China; for in 1949-1950 what is now referred to as the "Chinese debate" was one of the predominant issues of American politics. Dean Acheson, in his book *Present at the Creation*—and I honestly recom-

mend to all our opponents that they read the chapter in that book concerning China—says the following:

“Early in the year,”—1949—“while talking with the President”—President Truman—“about congressional and press criticism of our policy in China, I suggested that much of it flowed from ignorance of the facts. General Marshall had been reluctant to present the full facts for fear of hurting further the Generalissimo’s declining fortunes.” The Generalissimo referred to is Chiang Kai-shek. “It was now clear that the Nationalist regime on the mainland was on the verge of collapse and that American disengagement from support of it as such must follow. Let us, I urged, prepare a thorough account of our relations with China, centering on the past five years, and publish it when the collapse came. The President agreed, and . . . the China White Paper was delivered to the President on July 29, 1949 . . . My letter . . .”—that is, Dean Acheson’s letter—“was also published separately, entitled *A Summary of American-Chinese Relations*. A short statement by the President underlined that his ‘primary purpose in having this frank and factual record released at this time is to ensure that our policy toward China, and the Far East as a whole, shall be based on informed and intelligent public opinion.’ After twenty years”—Dean Acheson, writing in 1969, says—“the China White Paper still stands up well as a fair, accurate and scholarly presentation and analysis of the facts. . . .”

“The conclusion of the summary was unpalatable to believers in American omnipotence, to whom every goal unattained is explicable only by incompetence or treason.”

Quoting from the *Summary*, Dean Acheson goes on to say:

“The unfortunate but inescapable fact is that the ominous result of the civil war in China was beyond the control of the government of the United States. Nothing that this country did or could have done within the reasonable limits of its capabilities could have changed that result; nothing that was left undone by this country had contributed to it. It was”—and I underline this—“the product of internal Chinese forces, forces which this country tried to influence but could not. A decision was arrived at within China . . .”<sup>7</sup>

Let me repeat that sentence: “It was the product of internal Chinese forces, forces which this country”—namely, the United States—“tried to influence but could not. A decision was arrived at within China . . .”.

155. Dean Acheson goes on to say:

“On January 5, the day following his State of the Union message to Congress, he”—President Truman—“put out a four-paragraph release in which, after declaring that the United States Government regarded Formosa as Chinese territory without qualification, he went on:

“The United States has no predatory designs on Formosa or on any other Chinese territory. The United States has no desire to obtain special rights or privileges

or to establish military bases on Formosa at this time.’”—I underline “at this time.”—“Nor does it have any intention of utilizing its armed forces to interfere in the present situation. The United States Government will not pursue a course which will lead to involvement in the civil conflict in China.”<sup>8</sup>

156. Again, these are the words of Dean Acheson reporting on President Truman:

“First of all, the President had pointed out, our Government regarded Formosa as Chinese territory. Four years earlier we had captured it and, in accordance with promises publicly made, had turned it over to the Government of China, which had administered it since. Whatever political or legal quibbles others might wish to raise, as far as the United States Government was concerned, Formosa was Chinese.”<sup>9</sup>

Dean Acheson went on to say:

“My statement ended with an explanation of the President’s phrase ‘at this time’—because times change—“as used in the sentence, ‘The United States has no desire to obtain special rights or privileges or to establish military bases on Formosa at this time’: ‘That phrase does not qualify or modify or weaken the fundamental policies stated in this declaration by the President in any respect. It is a recognition of the fact that, in the unlikely and unhappy event that our forces might be attacked in the Far East, the United States must be completely free to take whatever action in whatever area is necessary for its own security.’”<sup>10</sup>

157. We must draw our conclusions. Are there more clear-cut proofs from United States statesmen themselves—no less than a President and a Secretary of State—that there is one China, that Formosa is part of it, that there is one Chinese people and that, according to President Truman himself, “whatever political or legal quibbles others might wish to raise, as far as the United States Government was concerned, Formosa was Chinese”?

158. Returning to the question of which Government to recognize in case of a civil war and the secession of one party, I should not need to remind the Ambassador of the United States of the history of his own country’s Civil War. He must certainly be familiar with Lincoln’s first inaugural address, on 4 March 1861. But for those representatives who are not, I would quote these few lines. Lincoln said:

“I hold that, in contemplation of universal law and of the Constitution, the Union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. . . .”

And, referring to the causes of the Civil War, he said:

“If a minority in such case will secede rather than acquiesce, they make a precedent which in turn will divide and ruin them; for a minority of their own will

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 351.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 352.

<sup>7</sup> Dean Acheson, *Present at the Creation* (New York, W. W. Norton & Company, 1969), pp. 302-303.

secede from them whenever a majority refuses to be controlled by such minority. . . .”<sup>11</sup>

159. Coming to the year 1900 and an irony of history, the Boxer Rebellion in China, we recall that the United States sent American troops with an international army of British, French, German and Japanese soldiers to put down the rebellion. John Hay, United States Secretary of State under Presidents McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt, took care to explain, in a note to the European Powers of 3 July 1900, that United States participation had as its objective to “preserve Chinese territorial and administrative entity”. Of course, now we look upon all that as ironical.

160. Furthermore, the United Nations recognizes sovereign States but does not interfere in the form of government they choose. That is up to the peoples themselves, and is solely within domestic jurisdiction. When a change in government takes place, either by revolution or by constitutional process, steps are usually taken by the new government to inform the United Nations, and that is what the Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of China, Chou En-lai, did on 18 November 1949 when he addressed telegrams to the President of the General Assembly and to the Secretary-General of the United Nations announcing the formation of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and demanding that the United Nations

“...deprive the ‘delegation of the Chinese National Government,’ in accordance with the principles and spirit of the United Nations Charter, of all rights to further represent the Chinese people in the United Nations, so as to conform to the wishes of the Chinese people”.<sup>12</sup>

Did the United Nations arrogate to itself the power or the competence to question the right of the new Government because its name had changed? Let us look at the two voting boards here in the General Assembly Hall: how many names have been changed even recently? The speaker who preceded me represents the United Republic of Tanzania, which used to be called Tanganyika and Zanzibar. The United Arab Republic is now the Arab Republic of Egypt. And there are many other instances. Does that give the General Assembly the right to question the legitimacy of the Governments of those States? Does a change of name alter their right to be represented at the United Nations?

161. I wish now to point to some of the glaring contradictions in the two United States draft resolutions—first with respect to draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2, requesting the application of Article 18 of the Charter to our draft resolution [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2] on the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

162. Article 18 of the Charter mentions the expulsion of a Member State as being an important question, but the expulsion of a Member State is unequivocally referred to and defined in Article 6 of the Charter, which makes

expulsion by the General Assembly conditional upon a recommendation of the Security Council. Yet the Security Council has not been called into session to recommend the expulsion of the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek. As has clearly been stated by many representatives, the vacating of the seat of China by the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek is a legal, logical consequence of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

163. Now, suppose I were to present the representative of the United States with one or more States that qualified for expulsion under Article 6 of the Charter because, in the words of that Article, they had “persistently violated the principles contained in the present Charter”. Suppose I cited one or two States which have utterly disregarded no less than 120 resolutions of the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Commission on Human Rights and other bodies of the United Nations from 1947 to 1971, thereby trampling underfoot the principles contained in the Charter. We should find that the United States Government once vetoed a resolution in the Security Council which called for sanctions against one such State. We would find that the Government of the United States had done everything in its power, including the granting of arms and billions of dollars to these States, and to one of them in particular, to enable it to persist in its arrogant defiance and law-breaking. There is one term in the English language for this, namely, “double standard”.

164. When the United States draft resolution contained in document A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 “affirms the right of representation of the People's Republic of China and recommends that it be seated as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council”, that means that the United States delegation—if we understand the English language—has after 20 years recognized what was given to China in Article 23 of the Charter. The remarkable thing is that the United States draft resolution, by acknowledging the name of the People's Republic of China, instead of the Republic of China, has finally accepted what we have been urging it to accept for the last two decades. What it has retreated from recognizing is that the Government of the People's Republic of China is the sole Government of China. And to recognize it as such is the only solution to the problem. There can be no other solution. And by not recognizing this fact the United States delegation has in one and the same draft resolution negated the right which it has acknowledged in one previous operative paragraph.

165. All Members of the United Nations have heard what one American said first in the United States Senate and then echoed later at United Nations Headquarters itself. He threatened that if the People's Republic of China were admitted to the United Nations, the United States Government would have no choice but to reduce its contribution to the United Nations. I wish to apologize to the representative of the United States, Ambassador Bush, who has lectured and admonished us not to use harsh language. But, labouring as I am doing in a language which is not my native tongue, I cannot find in the statement of the American Senator echoed here anything except what is known in the English language as “political blackmail” or perhaps “dollar diplomacy”. But if I could think of another term or terms to describe such a pronouncement I should

<sup>11</sup> H. S. Commager, *Documents of American History* (New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963).

<sup>12</sup> See document A/1123 (mimeographed).

use it. But the People's Republic of China will undoubtedly one day occupy its rightful place in the United Nations.

166. Now if we take into consideration the fact that for 10 years in the General Committee the United States has been able to prevent the discussion of the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and from 1960 has been able by its obdurate stand to obstruct the entry of that State into the Organization, and if we take into consideration the amount of money spent from the budget of the United Nations in these debates, the time consumed and efforts devoted to solving this problem, and the amounts which the People's Republic of China might have contributed during this period, then it might be not only logical but legal and practical to expect the United States to make up for such losses, if the basic approach is one of money.

167. The United States has delayed acquiescing in the admission of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations because it did not like the Government of that State. Yet, a former United States Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, told the Council on Foreign Relations on 6 February 1931:

"We certainly cannot deny to other nations that principle whereon our own Government is founded, that every nation has a right to govern itself internally under what forms it pleases, and to change these forms at its own will; and externally to transact business with other nations through whatever organ it chooses, whether that be a king, convention, assembly, committee, president, or whatever it be."

168. One last point. It is of great significance that the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lusaka from 8 to 10 September 1970, and attended by 53 States Members of the United Nations from Africa, Asia and Latin America and by 12 observers from Latin America and Europe, adopted the following resolution:

"The Heads of State or Government declare that for the United Nations to be more effective member States must recognise and accept the principle of universality in terms of its membership. In this regard, they stress the urgent need of restoring to the People's Republic of China her rightful place in the Organisation."<sup>13</sup>

169. The only avenue which really lies open to us if we are to do away with an injustice against China that has lasted now for 21 years is to reject the two United States draft resolutions and to adopt the 23-Power draft resolution.

170. In casting our vote we will be voting for a principle. Let me, in ending, remind our American opponents of what their sixth President, John Quincy Adams, said: "Always vote for a principle, though you vote alone, and you may cherish the sweet reflection that your vote is never lost."

171. Mr. SZARKA (Hungary): The position of the Hungarian People's Republic regarding the restoration of the

rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations has always been clear, consistent and well known to Member States. This position does not require explanation; it is in full conformity with the spirit of the Charter and the principles governing the foreign policy of the Hungarian People's Republic. As we have categorically stated a number of times during the debates in earlier years, my Government regards the Government of the People's Republic of China as the sole legitimate representative of the Chinese people. The People's Republic of China is entitled to the exclusive right to be represented in all organs of the United Nations, including the right to hold one of the five permanent seats in the Security Council. As a logical consequence of this consideration, our delegation strongly opposes dual Chinese representation and hence draft resolutions A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 as harmful proposals which seek to hinder the just and final settlement of the question. It follows from this that the Hungarian delegation will vote for draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 demanding the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

172. It has been proved in the past 22 years that those who are responsible for the fact that a great Power representing a people of 800 million, the People's Republic of China, has been excluded from the world organization, as was pointed out by the Foreign Minister of the Hungarian People's Republic in his statement during the general debate:

"... did harm to this Organization, to international relations in general, to the People's Republic of China and, last but not least, to themselves" [1964th meeting, para. 115].

173. It is therefore understandable that, as a result of the growing awareness of the realities, an increasing number of Member States are taking a stand in favour of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. It was in consequence of this awareness that the draft resolution calling for the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China obtained a majority of votes in the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session [1913th meeting].

174. Those positive developments, as we can see now, have prompted the forces which wish to keep the People's Republic of China out of the United Nations to new efforts. Their objective has not changed; their tactics have. These tactics are based on the old and false "two Chinas" concept, and consist of misleading manoeuvres which divert attention from the essence of the problem. Those tactics became quite obvious and unequivocal when, at the General Committee's 191st meeting dealing with the adoption of the agenda of the current session, the representative of the United States tried to have adopted a so-called more neutral title, simply to perpetuate the existing state of affairs and to frustrate the effective solution of the issue. The question could have been rightly raised at that time whether the United States has ever been to any extent neutral in the matter of the representation of the People's Republic of China.

175. The arguments put forth by the representative of the United States during the present debate in support of the

<sup>13</sup> See *Lusaka Declaration ... and Resolutions of the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries* (Lusaka, 8-10 September 1970), p. 19.

United States initiative for dual Chinese representation are just as unfounded as those advanced during the procedural debate. That is why it is impossible to accept the view stated by him that "a vote for the Albanian draft resolution would be a vote against universality" [1966th meeting, para. 75].

176. It is a fact of history that it is precisely the United States that has consistently impeded the attainment of universality since the establishment of the United Nations. In keeping with that effort, during the past 22 years that country has always come out against the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. It still does essentially the same thing by submitting to the General Assembly draft resolutions such as those contained in documents A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2. The historical truth is that since the establishment of the world Organization the United States has never been a spokesman of universality. I can mention in this connexion that the admission of many States to membership in the United Nations has been and is being delayed as a result of well-known manoeuvres.

177. The attempt to impose the concept of dual Chinese representation by invoking the representation of the Soviet Republics, which live in a brotherly federation, is equally false and unacceptable. There is not and there can be no federal ties between Chiang Kai-shek and the People's Republic of China.

178. Nothing could better illustrate the grave responsibility that the United States assumes in this debate than the view of the former Permanent Representative of the United States, Mr. Charles Yost, who is well known to representatives here. In the September-October issue of *Vista* magazine he writes:

"From the perspective of history our children and grandchildren will no doubt be amazed that the government which unquestionably controlled the whole of China except Formosa was denied representation in the United Nations for more than two decades after it won the civil war. This prolonged exclusion was an impressive, though hardly an inspiring, demonstration of the power the United States exercised during those decades, for there seems little doubt that but for its opposition the People's Republic of China would have been represented in New York many years earlier."<sup>14</sup>

He states further:

"Insofar as the UN aspects are concerned, the Administration has chosen to straddle, to try to have its cake and eat it too; in other words, to breathe new life into the old concept of 'Two Chinas'."<sup>15</sup>

179. All this proves that the position adopted by the United States seeks nothing but to prevent once again the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. This position is therefore unacceptable to all Member States which sincerely try to

find a solution to the problem and believe in the role and the future of our Organization.

180. The United Nations is faced with an important issue. The General Assembly has to redress a serious injustice which has existed for more than two decades and to secure the restoration of the rights of a founding Member, the People's Republic of China. Its decision will bear witness to the degree of its own maturity. It is an individual and collective responsibility of all Member States, by rejecting the various manoeuvres, procedural or other, to deliver the United Nations from the shackles put on it by the selfish policies of a certain great Power. My delegation is confident that the majority of Member States, conscious of their responsibility, will vote in favour of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China.

181. Mr. FACK (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation has followed the course of the debate on the agenda item concerning China with great interest and attention. My delegation is aware that a series of momentous decisions lies ahead and, in order to avoid any misunderstanding about our views, I wish to explain the position of my delegation on the questions at issue and on the draft resolutions before us, and at the same time explain how we are going to cast our vote and why.

182. At the outset I should like to state that none of the three draft resolutions is entirely satisfactory to the Netherlands delegation. We, for our part, would have preferred to see a text which would have invited the People's Republic of China to occupy, forthwith, the seat of China in our Organization and which would at the same time have requested the Secretary-General, or perhaps a small body of wise men, to study the residual problems in the light of the principles of universality and of self-determination and to report on their findings to the General Assembly for further consideration.

183. My delegation is well aware, however, that such a course of action would not find enough favour in the General Assembly at the present time and we have therefore abandoned the notion of submitting a draft resolution to this effect for the Assembly's consideration. The battle lines appear to be drawn and the mood of the General Assembly does not seem favourably inclined towards cool consideration and study of political and historical facts and their effects. On the contrary, it is clear that almost all members wish to proceed to the vote as soon as possible on the texts before us.

184. What are the main factors on which, after careful consideration, the Netherlands delegation bases its position? Evidently a factor of the greatest importance is the recognition by the Netherlands, as long ago as March 1950, of the Government of the People's Republic of China as the *de jure* Government of China and the simultaneous withdrawal of our recognition of the Nationalist régime. Her Majesty the Queen declared in her recent speech from the Throne to Parliament, on 21 September: "The Government considers it indispensable to the easing of political tension in the world that the People's Republic of China takes part in United Nations deliberations". These words were reflected in the address of the Netherlands Minister of Foreign Affairs in this hall on 1 October [1948th meeting].

<sup>14</sup> Charles W. Yost, "China, the U.S. and the UN", *Vista*, vol. 7, No. 2 (September-October 1971), p. 14.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 17.

The objective of the Netherlands Government is clear: it wishes to see the People's Republic of China occupy the seat of China in all relevant organs of the United Nations and of the United Nations family, at the earliest possible date. On 14 October, before Parliament in The Hague, the Netherlands Prime Minister described this objective as a factor of decisive significance in the present circumstances.

185. The question may be asked: What remaining difficulties are exercising our mind? It would appear that the problem facing my delegation, and indeed this Assembly, is twofold. In the first place, we see a territory, an island territory of considerable size, inhabited by a population of 14 million people under the factual authority of a Government claiming to represent the entire Chinese people. The Netherlands Government is of the opinion that the existence of this factual political entity is undeniable, although we, for our part, do not maintain relations with it, nor do we recognize its professed claim. Secondly, the Netherlands Government attaches great importance to the principle of the universality of the United Nations as a world-wide organization. In this respect we are by no means alone, as has transpired during the general debate at this session. The question seems justified, therefore, whether at any time in the future a solution can be found to meet the particular requirements of the people of Taiwan, as this problem finds no final answer in draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2.

186. However these two questions—the factual existence of a political entity and the universality of the United Nations—are looked upon by the General Assembly and by individual Member States, the Netherlands Government is firmly of the opinion that, after the General Assembly has decided the question of the representation of China in the United Nations, the use of violent means to alter the present state of affairs concerning the island of Taiwan should not be countenanced. I am convinced that this view is shared by an overwhelming majority, if not by the entire body, of the members of this Assembly.

187. The Netherlands Government does not know what lies in store for the people of Taiwan, but for its part the Netherlands Government could envisage various possible future developments.

188. In conclusion, the Netherlands delegation wishes to make the following points.

189. The Kingdom of the Netherlands recognized the People's Republic of China many years ago and maintains diplomatic relations with Peking. In the view of my Government, the Government of Peking is the only legal Government of China. My Government deems it in the interest of the international community, of the United Nations and of China itself, that the Government of the

People's Republic of China should occupy its seat in the United Nations forthwith.

190. As my country recognizes the Government of the People's Republic of China as the only legal Government of China, the Netherlands delegation cannot associate itself with any proposal which makes mention of some other Government of China.

191. Although the Netherlands entertains serious doubts about expulsion of any delegation from these halls, as long as no thorough inquiry has been completed into the political and historical elements of the case, and into the effects and repercussions of such an expulsion for all parties concerned, the Netherlands delegation will nevertheless cast its vote for the draft resolution submitted by Albania and others [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2]. My delegation will cast an affirmative vote, first of all because we regard this draft resolution as a means to assure the allocation of the seat of China to the Government of the People's Republic of China, an objective with which my Government associates itself whole-heartedly. Secondly, it is our view that the last phrase of the draft, beginning with the words "and to expel" is intended to convey the meaning that there is only one Government of China, and that others claiming to represent China are not entitled—for that very reason—to occupy the seat of China in this Assembly.

192. It logically follows from my previous remarks that the Netherlands delegation cannot associate itself with draft resolutions A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2. After careful consideration of the implications of the former draft, particularly its built-in legal inconsistency and its possible delaying effect, I must announce that the Netherlands delegation will abstain in the vote on it.

193. We do not expect the latter draft resolution to be put to the vote, but if it is we intend to abstain on that text too, for the reasons I have just explained. We strongly feel that, in the interest of fair play, the Assembly should ensure to all parties concerned every opportunity for an open debate and should not impede efforts by a number of our fellow representatives to submit draft resolutions.

194. Therefore, the Netherlands delegation will vote for giving priority to draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2, the procedural draft resolution introduced by Australia and other delegations.

195. In 1950 the Netherlands delegation cast its affirmative vote in the General Assembly for the proposition that the People's Republic of China should occupy the seat of China. This year my delegation hopes to see the realization of that objective.

*The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.*