

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



1161st  
PLENARY MEETING

Monday, 29 October 1962,  
at 3 p. m.

NEW YORK

## CONTENTS

### Agenda item 92:

*Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations (continued)* ..... 621

**President: Mr. Muhammad ZAFRULLA KHAN**  
(Pakistan).

## AGENDA ITEM 92

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

1. Mr. DADZIE (Ghana): The important question of the proper representation of China, which appears on the General Assembly's agenda this year in the form of an item entitled "The restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations", first came under the discussion in this Organization over a dozen years ago. During this period the question has not been resolved; on the contrary, it has grown as much in obduracy as it has in urgency.

2. The position of the Government of Ghana with respect to the question is well known and has not changed. Indeed, in a statement to the General Assembly on 5 October 1962 my delegation reaffirmed its position in the following terms:

"... we believe that the People's Republic of China, with its vast human, economic and scientific and technological resources, can make an effective contribution to the work of this Organization. Sentiment, vehemence and irrelevant oratory must no longer be allowed to obscure the issues. The character and composition of the Government of the People's Republic has nothing to do with the issue involved; it is in effective authority over China and is in a position to employ its resources and direct its people in fulfilment of the obligations laid down in the United Nations Charter. It is therefore entitled to be represented in this Organization, just like any other Member State, unless it is expelled in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter." [1143rd meeting, para 178.]

3. From the statements that have been made by some delegations during the current debate, it would appear that there is still a tendency to link together the question of the recognition of the Government and that of its representation in this Organization. International law, as well as established practice, has always regarded the recognition of the Government as an essentially political decision—whatever the principles on which the recognizing State bases itself—which each government makes, or declines to make, as it deems appropriate in the exercise of its

sovereignty. It is thus an individual and unilateral act which falls exclusively within the competence of the government whose decision it is.

4. A decision with respect to the representation of a Government in the United Nations, on the other hand, is a collective act of the Organization and is independent of the recognition of that Government in a *de facto* or *de jure* sense by Members of the Organization. It therefore follows that Members are at liberty to accept the representation of a Government with which they neither have diplomatic relations nor recognize, and that such acceptance by no means entails the conferment, expressed or implied, of recognition.

5. This point was developed with great authority and conviction in a memorandum presented to the Security Council in March 1950 by the then Secretary-General, and my delegation commends to the Assembly the following quotation from that memorandum:

"Where a revolutionary government presents itself as representing a State, in rivalry to an existing government, the question at issue should be which of these two governments in fact is in a position to employ the resources and direct the people of the State in fulfilment of the obligations of membership. In essence, this means an inquiry as to whether the new government exercises effective authority within the territory of the State and is habitually obeyed by the bulk of the population.

"If so, it would seem to appropriate for the United Nations organs, through their collective action, to accord it the right to represent the State in the Organization, even though individual Members of the Organization refuse, and may continue to refuse, to accord it recognition as the lawful government for reasons which are valid under their national policies."<sup>1/</sup>

6. Now, the Government from which the delegation here purports to derive its authority has ceased to exercise jurisdiction over any portion of the Chinese mainland. On the other hand, can there be any doubt that it is the Government of the People's Republic of China that exercises—and has done so for thirteen years—effective authority over the entirety of the mainland and some offshore islands, or that it has commanded for thirteen years the habitual obedience of the overwhelming majority of the Chinese people, amounting to some 690 millions? If, as is obvious, there can be no doubt on this score, then the inescapable conclusion follows that it is that Government which should occupy the Chinese seat in the organs of the United Nations.

7. To argue otherwise would be to deny the whole principle of universality, on which this Organization

<sup>1/</sup> Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, Supplement for 1 January to 31 May 1950, document S/1466, pp. 22 and 23.

is based, and which rests on the prerequisite that all participants in the work of the United Nations should be truly representative of the Governments in power in their countries. For the United Nations is not an association limited to Governments of the same political persuasion; it must include Governments of different and even opposing ideologies. The conduct of some Governments may, of course, be open to condemnation by Members of the United Nations, but if the Organization is to be able to achieve the objectives laid down in the Charter, then its efficacy would be all the greater if all such Governments were represented within it.

8. The rights of the People's Republic of China in the Organization flow from Articles 3 and 23 of the Charter; China was a founder member of the United Nations and it is one of the five permanent members of the Security Council. To deny it these rights would be to perpetuate an illogical, artificial, and dangerous situation. These rights are valid whether or not the Government of the People's Republic is willing and able to carry out its obligations under the Charter, for those considerations are irrelevant to the issue since they relate only to the admission of new members under Article 4. Even if they were relevant, the incontrovertible facts are that that Government is certainly able to discharge the Charter's obligations if it is willing, and that the matter of willingness is one for its own choice, which it can make at any time; by comparison, it is clear that, however willing the rival government of Taiwan may be, it certainly has lost the ability to assume or to discharge these obligations with respect to China and the Chinese people.

9. My delegation, therefore, holds the considered view that whether or not the People's Republic is peace-loving or willing to discharge the obligations laid down in the Charter, it is entitled as of right to be represented in the United Nations on the same basis as every other Member State unless and until it is—again on the same basis as any other Member State—expelled in accordance with Article 6 of the Charter. In this connexion my delegation cannot pass over in silence the inconsistency of those delegations who, on the one hand, argue for the exclusion of the People's Republic of China on the ground that its conduct is in violation of the principles contained in the Charter, a Charter to which it is not yet bound. These delegations, on the other hand, argue for the continued membership of certain other States, like South Africa and Portugal, whose continued violation of Charter principles have brought them within reach of expulsion.

10. What my delegation finds particularly disquieting, in the attitudes of some delegations on this issue, is that these attitudes are determined by their disapproval of the political and social system prevailing in the People's Republic. In my delegation's view this cannot be a valid reason for rejecting the claim of the People's Republic to proper representation in the United Nations; the political and social system of that country is its own internal affair and do not affect its character or personality in terms either of international law or of the Charter. Furthermore, not only are there several Members of this Organization whose political and social structure have undergone complete transformation during their membership, but there are at the same time several countries with the same kind of system as the People's Republic,

whose representation here has never been challenged. In consequence, this state of affairs where the People's Republic is denied proper representation constitutes a double discrimination and is, in effect, an interference in its internal affairs.

11. There are several other compelling reasons for correcting this state of affairs before it is too late. It is evident, for instance, that no significant disarmament, nor even the cessation of nuclear weapons testing, is possible without the participation of the People's Republic. It is believed that the People's Republic has the largest army on earth and now has the potential for the manufacture of nuclear weapons; it is also recognized that it will not participate in discussions or feel bound by agreements reached on such questions unless it is first represented in the United Nations. Reference has previously been made to the United States—United Kingdom draft nuclear test ban treaty presented in Geneva on 27 August 1962,<sup>2/</sup> under certain provisions of this draft treaty, and it is to be expected that any other treaty which may be adopted will contain similar provisions. States parties would be free to consider themselves released from their obligations if other States, not parties to the treaty, conducted nuclear explosions. The effect of this is that, at a time when, after so many years of waiting, agreement is within reach on the cessation of nuclear testing, as a prelude to general and complete disarmament, all our hopes could be utterly shattered if the People's Republic were to start testing nuclear weapons.

12. It is clear also that there can be no realistic discussion of such important Far Eastern issues as those concerning Korea and Viet-Nam. Even such other questions—which my delegation considers vital—such as the revision of the Charter and the expansion of the membership of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council have, regrettable though the fact may be, become dependent on the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China. At the same time it is debarred from taking part in the work of the specialised agencies which, as is well known, are making important contributions to the eradication of hunger, disease, poverty and illiteracy. Taking into consideration the vast natural and technological resources of the People's Republic, it is equally obvious that the development of international trade and economic relations cannot but suffer from its continued non-participation in the activities of the United Nations.

13. The absence of the Government of the People's Republic from this organization is all the more striking in relation to its participation in, and contribution to, various international conferences of high importance. Need I recall that the recent successful fourteen-nation negotiations on Laos, which removed a source of serious tension in the part of the world, would have been impossible but for the co-operation of the People's Republic? Need I refer to its contribution to the achievement of a peaceful solution of the Indo-China problem in 1954, or indeed to its constructive participation in the historic Bandung Conference of Asian and African nations the following year. Again, between August 1955 and December 1957, and in September 1958, direct talks took place in Warsaw between the representatives of the United States

<sup>2/</sup> Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for January 1961 to December 1962, document DC/205, annex 7, sect. 4.

and the People's Republic concerning, among other things, Formosa.

14. At all these conferences and negotiations representatives of many Governments which deny the legitimate rights of the Government of the People's Republic participated along with the representatives of that Government. Does it not reflect a regrettable contradiction, to enter into international agreements with a Government whose capacity to discharge its obligations is denied by refusing it representation in this universal world Organization?

15. My delegation is nevertheless aware of the problems that exist between the People's Republic of China and some of its neighbours. These problems have in fact caused my Government much anxiety in view of its friendly relations with these countries and especially because fighting has erupted between the People's Republic and one of those neighbours. Appreciative of their repeatedly declared willingness to settle their problems through negotiation, my Government takes this opportunity to reiterate its appeal to them, to intensify their efforts at the search for a solution through peaceful means, as enjoined by the Charter, reaffirmed in the final communiqué of the Bandung Conference and embodied in the Pancha Shila.

16. These difficulties, however, should not be permitted to obscure our judgement on the issues before us. In terms of the procedure of this Assembly, it boils down to a question of credentials which must be settled on the basis of a simple majority.

17. In conclusion, my delegation adheres to the view that the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic in the United Nations is a necessary step, the only step dictated by objectivity and realism towards the improvement of the international situation and the solution of many international problems. It would strengthen the cause of peace and international co-operation within the framework of the Charter.

18. These are the considerations which will determine my delegation's attitude to the draft resolution [A/L.395] and other proposals which may be put to the Assembly on this item.

19. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia) (translated from French): The problem of the representation of China in the United Nations has been left unsolved for too long. China is already a Member of the United Nations and holds one of the permanent seats in the Security Council. The question is which of the two Governments—that of Peking, or that of Formosa—has the right to sit in the Security Council, the General Assembly and the other bodies of the United Nations.

20. It was in the autumn of 1949, at the fourth session, that the question of the representation of China was first raised in the United Nations. In 1950, at the fifth session, the General Assembly rejected by 33 votes to 16 an Indian draft resolution<sup>3/</sup> proposing that the seat occupied by Formosa be given to Peking. In the following year, at the sixth session, the Assembly, which had before it a proposal for the inclusion on the agenda of the question of China's representation, decided to postpone discussion of this question for one year.<sup>4/</sup>

<sup>3/</sup> See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Plenary Meetings, 277th meeting, para. 8.

<sup>4/</sup> Ibid. Sixth Session, Annexes, agenda item 7, document A/1950 and Corr.2 para. 6.

21. This was the start of what have been called the delaying tactics, whereby countries opposing the People's Republic of China succeeded for ten years—from 1950 to 1960—in postponing discussion of the question from one year to the next. These delaying tactics, which originally had many advocates, have since then gradually been losing ground. In 1960, the resolution for postponement [1493 (XV)] was adopted by only 42 votes to 34—an infinitesimal majority of eight votes. Finally, in 1961, the question of the representation of China was included on the agenda of the General Assembly. After a heated debate, the proposal for the admission of the People's Republic of China was rejected by 48 votes to 37—this time again with a small majority of 11 votes.

22. This is therefore the second time since 1950 that the General Assembly has debated the substance of the question of China's representation. The Cambodian delegation welcomes this debate, which will, we hope, make it possible to solve this question, of capital importance for the Organization's future.

23. The position of Cambodia in regard to the representation of China is well known. Through its various delegations to the United Nations, and, in particular, through its revered Chief of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodia has continually and forcefully spoken in favour of the admission of the People's Republic of China. With the permission of the Assembly, I shall read some passages from the message which Prince Norodom Sihanouk, on behalf of the Cambodian people, sent to the General Assembly for its seventeenth session.

24. On the question of the admission of China, Prince Norodom Sihanouk says:

"The persistent exclusion of China seems more abnormal with every year that passes. A proliferation of small nations is entrusted with vital responsibilities in the consideration of world problems and the finding of solutions for them, and this right and these responsibilities are still denied to a nation with over 700 million inhabitants—more than one-fifth of all mankind! This is an anomaly, an injustice and a danger which do no credit to our Assembly and which, if they continue, will end by discrediting it absolutely."

25. Can the United Nations claim to be universal if one fifth of the world's population is not represented in the Organization by the Government which is in effective control of China? We believe that the United Nations should be an organization of a truly universal nature. The United Nations should faithfully represent the world as it is, and not—as some Member States seem to want—as it should be. In other words, the creation of a universal organ entrusted with the maintenance of law and order is a matter of practical politics. All nations capable of fulfilling the obligations of the Charter and assuming their responsibilities in this connexion should be entitled to membership. This ability to assume the responsibilities involved in the status of Member State is the only qualification specified for admission to the United Nations.

26. If we examine the substance of the present controversy, we shall see that the difficulty in creating a universal organ of law and order derives not so much from any fundamental disagreement between nations in the two blocs about the form which this organ should take, as from the fact that it is doubtful whether nations are ready and willing to accept

the responsibilities incumbent upon the members of an international institution which maintains peace by denying to all nations the oldest attribute of national sovereignty—the right to wage war. It is quite useless to institute a system without knowing whether or not it will work; and we know that political organizations do not work, or do not work well, unless they are supported by mutual good will and trust. With this in mind, those who signed the Charter considered that the Axis Powers were not qualified for immediate membership of an international organization designed to keep the peace. Yet the founders of the United Nations did not betray their ideal of universality; for they never irrevocably closed the door on States which had been excluded originally, but left them with the hope and the chance of taking their place among the Member States.

27. Indeed, the States which had remained neutral during the Second World War were admitted one after another, and former Axis Powers were also, finally admitted—Italy and Austria in 1955, and Japan in 1956. Since that time, about fifty new States have been admitted to the United Nations, and nobody ever raised the question whether they were peace-loving States, able and willing to carry out the obligations contained in the Charter.

28. The universality indispensable for the Organization, although not clearly specified in 1945, was a proposition conceded by all. As early as 1950, the former United States Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, who had actively participated in the work of the United States delegation at San Francisco, had publicly stated (admittedly prior to his appointment as head of the State Department):

"A growing weakness of the United Nations is its lack of universality.

"I have now come to believe that the United Nations will best serve the cause of peace if its Assembly is representative of what the world actually is, and not merely representative of the parts which we like."<sup>5/</sup>

This opinion is the logical outcome of the definition of the four main purposes of the United Nations as they are stated in Article 1 of the Charter.

29. Because of the Organization's lack of universality, there is a tendency to try to solve international problems at conferences held outside the United Nations. Prince Norodom Sihanouk said on this subject:

"We have seen, and shall increasingly see, that the most crucial problems facing our world and our civilization will inevitably come to be considered outside the United Nations, at small conferences which may produce a solution. An example is the problem of Laos—a problem which, we should recall, threatened to bring fire and sword to South East Asia and had to be solved outside the United Nations because Viet-Nam and, in particular, China were not Members. It was only the Geneva Conference which made it possible to find a satisfactory and realistic solution ending the conflict and enabling Laos to pursue a policy of neutrality."

30. I would add that at the Geneva Conference on Laos,<sup>6/</sup> as at the Geneva Conference on Indo-China,<sup>7/</sup> our Western and in particular our American friends sat with the representative of the People's Republic of China at the same table. At this Conference a sincere effort was made on both sides and, as a result, peace was restored in these troubled regions of South-East Asia. In view of this fruitful experience, my country hopes that the Western world will understand that a China which is present in the United Nations, and thus has international obligations arising from the recognition of its rights, is infinitely preferable to a China excluded from major decisions, injured in its national pride and answerable to nobody because of ostracism by its adversaries.

31. Another important aspect of the question of China's representation is its repercussions on the world's crucial problems foremost among which are disarmament, the suspension of atomic testing and the spread of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. As was said by our Chief of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk:

"In addition, who can think that the problem of disarmament can be solved without the participation of China? How can one imagine that this great nation with an impressive army, which will very shortly become a nuclear Power, could accept resolutions adopted at conferences from which it was barred?"

32. Even if the great Powers were to reach agreement on the problems of disarmament, one may wonder what would be the value of this agreement if China were left out of it and were free to use its army and engage in atomic tests—were, in other words, uncommitted by any international obligations.

33. With regard to the theory of peace-loving States, which has been advanced by some opponents of the People's Republic of China, Prince Norodom Sihanouk stated:

"Some countries justify their opposition to China's admission to the United Nations on the grounds of its aggressiveness. Cambodia, a close neighbour of China, has never known any such aggressiveness; it has, on the other hand, for many years been suffering from the aggressiveness of countries which are full Members of the United Nations. We would add that it is China which has invariably and disinterestedly given us its support against threats, armed incursions and attempts at annexation at the hands of our neighbours. By doing so, China has helped considerably to safeguard peace in Asia and the freedom of the peoples of small countries which are the victims of imperialism and ideological hatred.

"Frontier difficulties between China and India are also mentioned; but our country, which faces similar problems, still advocates that the two States of Viet-Nam be admitted to the United Nations, even before they have been reunified. India and China are our two best friends, and we would point out to the Assembly that the Indian Government each year, very commendably, maintains its support for the admission of China. It is therefore surprising

<sup>5/</sup> John Foster Dulles, *War or Peace*, 1st ed. (New York, The Macmillan Co., 1950), pp. 188 and 190.

<sup>6/</sup> Conference on the Settlement of the Laotian Question, held from 16 May 1961 to 23 July 1962.

<sup>7/</sup> Geneva Conference on the Problem of restoring peace in Indo-China, held from 16 June to 21 July 1954.



that some countries are more solicitous for the interests of India than are the Indians themselves."

"Those who use the argument that China is aggressive base their reasoning on Article 4 of the Charter. How should Article 4 be interpreted? Paragraph 1 of this Article States:

"Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and . . . are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

The whole controversy revolves around the phrase "peace-loving States". As I have already said, my delegation considers that the founders of the United Nations, in making use of that expression, wished provisionally to exclude all States which had fought against the Allies during the Second World War. In other words, we reject the idea of selection, which in our opinion is a restrictive interpretation of the spirit and letter of the Charter. This interpretation of this idea of selection are continually losing ground, while the number of Member States favouring the admission of the People's Republic of China increases every year.

There are clear and ever-growing indications that even certain American circles are admitting, more and more openly, that the People's Republic of China cannot and should not be kept indefinitely outside the United Nations. The argument used by the Western Powers a few years ago against the discussion of the question of the representation of China and now against the admission of the People's Republic of China, to the effect that China's conduct in both domestic and foreign affairs is contrary to the spirit and letter of the Charter, is losing more and more ground. More and more Member States consider that that argument does not justify the continued isolation of the People's Republic of China and its absence from the family of nations.

The same circles, however, while bowing to the inevitable, are preparing a position to which to withdraw. They are enunciating the thesis of "two Chinas", in the event of the People's Republic of China being admitted to the United Nations. But that thesis has been categorically rejected by the People's Republic of China, for very sound legal reasons. On this subject Prince Norodom Sihanouk said, in his message:

"Certain Powers have finally been able to agree to the admission of the People's Republic of China, provided that the so-called China of Chiang Kai-shek retains its seat in the United Nations. Such a solution would be in accordance neither with logic, nor with law, nor with justice. There are two Germanys, two Viet-Nams, and two Koreas; but no one could maintain, in good faith, that there are two Chinas. Marshal Chiang Kai-shek 'reigned' over China for many years, but there is no doubt that his régime has been swept away and repudiated by the entire Chinese people. It cannot be denied that today President Mao Tse-tung and the Peking Government derive their power exclusively from the popular will. Nor can it be denied that the Chiang Kai-shek 'Government' which has taken refuge in Taiwan would never have been able to hold that island without powerful foreign military protection—a protection which deprives this régime, which represents only itself, of any appearance of legality.

"There is another argument which we have heard in support of the thesis of two Chinas. This is the assertion that Taiwan is not a Chinese island and that, if the Peking Government should represent China in the United Nations, the Government of Chiang Kai-shek should represent the State of Formosa.

"This is a preposterous argument. If Formosa is not a Chinese island, how can we justify the presence in the United Nations, since 1949, of the representatives of a Government which speaks in the name of the whole of China? Are we to conclude that the United Nations has sanctioned the seizure by a foreign army (that of Chiang Kai-shek) of an independent territory? The Powers which wish at all costs to save the Chiang Kai-shek régime cannot assert the non-attachment of Formosa to China while at the same time recognizing the right of a Chinese citizen to administer it as part of China. Obviously the Island of Taiwan is Chinese, and as such should be administered by the only lawful Government of China, that of the People's Republic of China.

"The transfer of the Island of Formosa to the People's Republic of China is inevitable, and is an urgent requirement. In the era of intercontinental missiles, atomic submarines and other inventions, the United States can hardly claim that it is necessary to maintain a 'strategic base' there. The United States and their allies of the free world have an opportunity to demonstrate their desire for peace, without relinquishing their interests or endangering their security, by restoring to the People's Republic of China its legitimate rights in the United Nations and by returning Formosa to China."

38. There is another aspect of the question which deserves examination. This aspect particularly concerns the new States Members of the United Nations. It relates to the increase in the membership of United Nations bodies, especially the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.

39. In 1945, when the United Nations was established, it had in all fifty-one Members. Today it has 110, or more than twice as many; and it is natural that the membership of its bodies should be increased correspondingly. This would necessitate an amendment of the Charter; and it is clear that under the provisions of the Charter's Article 108 no amendment is possible without the consent of the People's Republic of China, which is a permanent member of the Security Council. This raises the vexing question of the veto, which creates difficulties for the new Member States. Some Powers have suggested that the new Member States should try to interest certain permanent members of the Security Council in their legitimate claims. Such an attitude is absolutely illogical, for at the time when the Charter was drafted the five permanent members of the Security Council clearly intended to play a dominant role in comparison with the other members, by reserving for themselves the right of veto.

40. I shall conclude my remarks by recalling the following passage from the message of Prince Norodom Sihanouk:

"During the past year the People's Republic of China had very effectively contributed to the maintenance of peace in South-East Asia and to the re-establishment of the sacred right of the Laotian people to independence, full sovereignty and inter-

nationally recognized neutrality. Chinese and American diplomats worked side by side in drawing up this agreement of Laos, and the results are very encouraging. Today, however, the United States refuses to sit at the same conference table to discuss the great questions relating to the building of a peaceful world. This ostracism has dispelled the hopes created all over the world by the latest Geneva Conference.

"If this year the United Nations again refuses to admit the People's Republic of China and immediately to exclude the Taipei régime, we are convinced that such an attitude will be condemned by history and recognized as the cause of an unprecedented international failure."

41. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): My delegation's position on this item was fully explained in my statement last year [1077th meeting]. Our position continues to be the same: that is, we consider that the establishment and uninterrupted existence of the People's Republic of China over the last fifteen years is a reality that cannot be ignored by the United Nations. The Peking Government has been in effective control of the mainland of China and would be the only one entitled to the representation of its 700 million people in the United Nations. On the question of disarmament and related subjects, and on all wider international issues, the active participation of a Government representing almost one-fourth or one-fifth of the population of the earth is a necessity which cannot long be disregarded.

42. Two essential principles that have to be followed in representation in the United Nations are, first, that of the universality of membership, and, secondly, that of the common purpose for peace and the peaceful settlement of disputes. In the sense of the universality of membership, the spirit of the United Nations is one of all-inclusiveness; it is not one of shutting out. All nations and all peoples should be represented. The people of the mainland of China should, therefore, have their place in the United Nations.

43. From the aspect of the common purpose, there has been diversity of opinion whether the Government of the People's Republic of China share such a common purpose for peace. Those who deny its peaceful aims refer, in support of their contention, to its past record. In our view, the past record alone of any people or régime would not be a sufficient reason for its exclusion from the United Nations in a developing world. We all change. We do not know that what has happened before will be repeated afterward.

44. What is important is a country's attitude in the present, towards the principles of the United Nations and more than that, the development of its policy within the United Nations in the future. In this respect, in view of the existing divergencies of opinion expressed in the United Nations, my delegation last year indicated a need for a clear and categorical statement by the Peking Government of its stand towards the United Nations and the Charter and towards world peace, giving due regard, of course, to that Government's actual conduct in world affairs. In saying this we fully realize that this is not a case of the admission of a new member, and that no question of a formal declaration therefore arises. However that may be, it is indeed regrettable that at the very time when this subject is being discussed Chinese

troops are advancing in the territory of India in an unfortunate appearance of warlike operations.

45. In describing the military advance of the People's Republic of China into India as one of naked aggression, the representative of India, Mr. Chakravarty, [1159th meeting], in an able address, pointed out the need for the Peking Government to be represented in the United Nations so that, by the influence of this world Organization and the Charter, it would follow a policy of peace and peaceful settlement of disputes. There were others who expressed opposite views. The question would therefore appear to arise of how far the United Nations would be strong enough effectively to influence the policies of the People's Republic of China, if it were represented in it, or, conversely, how far the participation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations might prove to be a constructive or an adverse influence in the United Nations, with consequences the extent of which cannot be now foreseen.

46. Our basic outlook and our belief is that, in this case also, the spirit of the United Nations will have to prevail and will prevail, for it is a spirit in keeping with the trend of the cosmic forces, which are for progress towards a new world of order and peace and not for regression towards the old world of anarchy and war.

47. Through the advances of science the world has moved further forward from the political and social concepts of one hundred years ago. However progressive those concepts may have been considered at the time, they now become outdated and regressive unless they are adapted to the new conditions of this nuclear age and to the spirit of our time. The notion of achievement by war is now unrealistic because of the total destructiveness of nuclear weapons, and all political thinking based on it is necessarily outdated and unsound. Moral principles go unchanged through the ages, for they derive their force from the very laws of the universe. Social dogmas and political doctrines cannot remain rigid in a changing world. They have to adapt themselves to the new circumstances of life. We therefore confidently trust that the People's Republic of China will come to realize the need of earnest and peaceful co-operation with the rest of the world for the common good of humanity in this age of interdependence, and that its eventual participation in the United Nations would prove a constructive and not a destructive influence.

48. The problems that arise in connexion with the representation of the People's Republic of China further emphasize the need for strengthening the United Nations, a matter on which I dwelt extensively in my statement in the general debate [1155th meeting]. The discussion on whether this item is an important question under Article 18 of the Charter or not is in reference to the nature of the General Assembly majority required for a decision on the subject. That the item is one of great importance from the aspect of substance cannot be denied. That procedurally, considered as a question of mere credentials, it would require only a simple majority is also indisputable. Whether greater weight should be given to the substantive aspect of the problem, which would entitle it to a two-thirds majority, or to the procedural aspect based on the rules of general practice in matters of credentials, is a question for the decision of the General Assembly, which is master

of its own procedure and can adapt it to the particular requirements of each case.

49. After consideration and discussion of the subject the General Assembly at the sixteenth session decided that the procedure to be adopted was that applied to important questions. The issue having thus been decided upon last year it would hardly seem profitable or useful to discuss it further, particularly as no change appears to have taken place in the meantime that might have rendered more likely a different decision this year and would have justified a further debate.

50. The whole issue of the representation of China is made difficult and complicated by the fact that not merely has this country gone through a revolutionary change in its régime but its territory has since been divided in two, the mainland and the bulk of the population, under the effective control of the Revolutionary Government of the People's Republic of China, while a smaller part, consisting mainly of the island of Taiwan with a population of about 11 million, is under the effective control of the pre-existing Government of the Republic of China. This division, which has been in existence for the last fifteen years, has brought about a *de facto* situation which cannot be overlooked. A further complication is that neither of these Governments would consider the separation of Taiwan from the mainland. Neither of them, therefore, recognizes the present *de facto* state of a divided territory or would be willing to act upon it.

51. The existing reality, therefore, of two separate entities cannot in the circumstances be reflected in the United Nations. Thus while, on the one hand, representation of the mainland of China by the Government of Taiwan is obviously unrealistic, on the other hand, representation by the Government of the People's Republic of China of the population of Taiwan also would be contrary to reality, as Taiwan all along has been under the control of another Government and continues to be.

52. Furthermore, if the United Nations were thus to treat Taiwan as part of the People's Republic of China by seating its representatives in the United Nations as representing the whole of China, including Taiwan, it would in effect render illegitimate the existing Government in Taiwan. The United Nations would thus be giving a clear indication and encouragement for the forcible ouster of the Government of Taiwan by the thus legitimized, only authority over Taiwan, that of the Peking Government. The result would be, we are afraid, the creation of a dangerous situation, one even involving war. In consequence, the United Nations, by acting in this manner, would in a way be acting contrary to reality and it would itself be creating an international crisis. However, the fact remains that the People's Republic of China, since it represents a great portion of the population of the earth, has to be represented in the United Nations.

53. As I said last year, our desire and our purpose in seeing the representatives of the mainland of China seated in the United Nations should also be seen realistically, in conjunction with the consequences of a move which, without appropriate previous preparation, might lead to a threat to the peace, which is a matter of major responsibility for the United Nations. Consequently, a pragmatic consideration of the problem shows the important need of previous preparation through negotiation.

54. In view of these complications and those involved in the composition of the Security Council, we suggested during the debate on this item in the sixteenth session the setting up of a special committee to study the question and to deal with it as a matter of urgency, with a view to reporting to the present session of the General Assembly, putting forward concrete proposals for solution.

55. A year has elapsed since then, and the matter is still unresolved. We therefore reiterate that suggestion, for the setting up of a committee to report to the eighteenth session of the General Assembly on the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China. As I said at the beginning of my statement, we believe that this is the only practical way to move forward towards achieving representation of the People's Republic of China, for which we stand.

56. Mr. VASQUEZ (Colombia) (translated from Spanish): The General Assembly is at present debating the USSR draft resolution [A/L.395] under which the General Assembly would resolve "to invite representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China to occupy China's place in the United Nations and all its organs" and "to remove"—which in this case means to expel—the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China, one of the founding Members of the Organization.

57. The Colombian delegation will vote against this draft resolution because of certain important international considerations, for reasons based on the world situation and because of the very meaning of the United Nations Charter, which as the supreme law of the community of nations, binds us all.

58. This is certainly not the first time that this question has been debated here. The debate on the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations takes place each year like a solemn ritual, and, while Members have explained their positions at great length in the debate, we cannot presume to say that the General Assembly is prepared to take this step, for the recognition of one body of representatives and the non-recognition of another presents one of the thorniest problems in international politics.

59. We do not quite see how there could be two recognized Governments for a single nation. While both might be represented in the General Assembly, the same could not apply to the Security Council. Moreover, if we elected the procedural course of expelling the Chinese Government represented in this hall, as proposed in the draft resolution before us, we would be acting both as judge of and participant in the internal events of a nation, deciding its affairs and setting a new precedent, namely, that it is not the peoples themselves who exercise freely the right to elect their rulers, but foreign Governments which decide in favour of one or the other of the contending parties—and in this case the decision would be in favour of the totalitarian and absolutist trend.

60. Consequently, for reasons based on international law alone, Colombia considers that the draft resolution now before us should not be adopted. Furthermore, we believe that the world situation does not this year favour the Soviet proposal. The latter has coincided with the armed attack by the People's Republic of China on a Member State long renowned for its dedication to the cause of peace and for its service to the policy of peaceful coexistence—the homeland

of Gandhi and a country of high cultural achievement, whose Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, has denounced the belligerence of its powerful neighbour.

61. This testimony, given by no less a person than Mr. Nehru, should surely suffice as concrete evidence of the expansionist and totalitarian aims of the People's Republic of China. Moreover, was it not the Chinese Communist State that the United Nations condemned for its aggression in Korea?

62. The Soviet draft resolution comes before us at a time when the world has learned of the havoc wrought by the spread of atomic weapons to the Caribbean with the full support of the Communist Powers. In our opinion it is impossible to divorce the item now under discussion from matters of international concern and to ignore the fact that the People's Republic of China has done its utmost to bring to this hemisphere the pernicious effects of Communist propaganda, especially instruction in the training of guerillas. To admit this State into the United Nations would in our view be tantamount to giving unexpected and unjustified approval to propaganda efforts of Chinese communism in the Americas.

63. We must state, quite categorically, that the circumstances surrounding this debate are not auspicious for the motion to admit the People's Republic of China into the United Nations. But even if the reasons I have advanced so far are not thought fully convincing, there remain the arguments which my delegation has long advanced from this international rostrum. We consider it essential that the conditions laid down in Article 4 of the United Nations Charter, none of which are met by the present communist Government of Peking, should be scrupulously observed. These conditions are that membership in the United Nations is open to States "which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgement of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations".

64. We cannot be certain of any desire for peace on the part of the People's Republic of China, which on the contrary, has become known for its determined and stubborn policy of territorial expansion and for its assistance to armed movements which have endangered international security in the Far East. Nor do we have any documentary evidence which might convince us of the peaceful intentions of that State.

65. Article 4 of the Charter lays down very limited requirements for admission, but in our view they are so imperative that to side-step them would be equivalent to their open violation. That is our general position.

66. Colombia's greatest hope is to see achieved the universality of this Organization, founded to avert the scourge of war, to maintain justice among nations and to ensure the defence of human rights in conditions of justice and the rapid advancement of all peoples. A major step towards universality has been made with the advent of new States, primarily in Africa, whose admission we supported with our votes and our faith in the common destiny of all peace-loving peoples, regardless of the various political and social systems represented here. The United Nations must be fully universal, and we have no doubt of the Organization's ability to achieve this objective.

67. The United Nations represents, in our view, a co-ordination of the general desire to ensure the

maintenance of international security. Member States accept certain rules of coexistence and express their willingness to comply with the procedures of peaceful settlement of international disputes. We cannot observe in the People's Republic of China this desire to co-operate in the interest of international security, this willingness to submit to a rule of law, this desire to live and let live. If it is, by its own definition, a revolutionary State that wishes to destroy a whole system of rights and obligations, if its great human resources, which we readily grant it, are organized by the communist régime to perform military functions, how can we say that it has fulfilled the conditions laid down in the United Nations Charter?

68. The admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations is much more than a mere matter of procedure or a mere protocol arrangement for the seating of a delegation in this hall. It is, by its very nature, a grave juridical and political issue which involves very serious questions for the United Nations.

69. Colombia does not believe that the time has come to admit the People's Republic of China into the United Nations. It may be that in the future new aspects of this problem may emerge and new solutions may be found. For the present, however, the belligerent policies of this totalitarian country, its attitude in Asia and its pernicious influence in the Americas do not entitle it to the distinction which we confer upon States that are dedicated to peace, respectful of international law and devoted to the ideal of justice for which the United Nations stands.

*Mr. Auguste (Haiti), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

70. Mr. QUINONES (Guatemala) (translated from Spanish): In considering the question of the admission of the Mao Tse-tung régime to the United Nations, the Guatemalan delegation, true to the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter, leaves aside the interests of the great Powers and is governed solely by the desire to see the principles of international law prevail over the *de facto* consequences of force. In keeping with this position, we think it our duty to analyse dispassionately the provisions of our Charter which have a bearing on this question.

71. We note, first of all, that those who support the admission of the Mao Tse-tung régime and the consequent expulsion of the Government of the Republic of China have stressed the enormous importance this step would have for the world at large and for themselves in particular. This does not prevent them from asserting, however, in relation to Article 18 of the Charter, that the question is not an important one, that it is purely a matter of credentials and that it can, therefore, be settled by a simple majority decision.

72. This paradoxical conclusion is not in accord with the terms of Article 18, which lists as important questions "the election of the non-permanent members of the Security Council" and "the suspension of the rights and privileges of membership". What do the supporters of this move seek if not the suspension of the rights and privileges of the Republic of China as a permanent member of the Security Council? If the election of a temporary member of the Security Council is an important question, how can we term otherwise a decision which, in the unhappy event that it is favourable to Mao Tse-tung, would mean the replacement of a permanent member?



73. It is a general principle that what is required for the least must also be required for the most. Clearly, therefore, the consideration of this question's importance is not, as some representatives have asserted, a subterfuge, but rather the logical application of a clear and categorical provision of the Charter.

74. As far as the substance of the matter is concerned, speakers have vehemently invoked reality, but a one-sided and distorted reality. For the sponsors the only reality is that the Mao Tse-tung régime controls several hundreds of millions of human beings and that it therefore is the sole representative of China. But the true reality is different. The followers of Mao Tse-tung, aided by another great Power and acting entirely under its control, rose in insurrection against their legitimate Government, yet failed to crush it. They now seek to replace that Government here on no basis other than force. This we cannot accept. The legitimate Government is represented here among us, and however often it may be called a "myth" and an "invention", the fact is that it exists, it is here, its reality is irrefutable. Thus the argument of force, even under the more pleasant name of "reality", turns in the end against those who adduce it.

75. The State which signed the Charter as a founding Member of the United Nations is the Republic of China. The State which is a member of the Security Council is the Republic of China. This State has not ceased to exist; it is fully extant, it has a legitimate Government, it has a territory, it has a population, and most important, it has juridical legitimacy. Thus it is truly a reversal of logic which the illustrious defenders of Mao Tse-tung have contrived here in stating their argument that the régime of the People's Republic of China, that is, the régime of Mao Tse-tung, should have its proper place in the United Nations restored to it. How can it have its place restored when it never had a place at all? The truth is that what is now sought is to have that régime usurp the place legitimately occupied by the Government of the Republic of China, and that to this end they had to resort to certain offensive inventions, for instance that the Government of the Republic of China is a myth and an impostor.

76. But how can something that really exists be a myth? And how can we call an impostor someone who upholds legitimacy and asks only that he not be played false. From these inventions it is clear that the spurious reasons had to be resorted to because genuine ones did not exist. It is only when the eloquence of truth is lacking that one need have recourse to invention, and only when the eloquence of reason is absent that one need resort to insult.

77. Those who are sponsoring Mr. Mao and his régime angrily reject the idea that there are two Chinas. Indeed, there is only one legitimate régime, the one now in Taiwan, and that régime alone is and will remain a Member of the United Nations. The other régime is merely a force which is attempting to subvert the legitimate Government. The fact that this subversive movement has not yet been crushed does not mean that its legal status has changed. It merely means that it has been strong until now. However, we are here to raise the standard of legitimacy and not to see it bow to force; if ever we come to that pass, this hall will lose its dignity and the United Nations its reason for being.

78. Another argument which has been put forward with a vigour and perseverance worthy of a better cause is that unless we accept the régime based on force in preference to that based on legitimacy, it will be impossible to solve many problems of vital importance to the United Nations.

79. The question is, however: will yielding to force enable us to solve those problems? My answer to that question is: most assuredly not. If we accept the mere display of strength as a patent of legitimacy, what principles can we then oppose to it? The question before us is not to determine which of the two régimes is the stronger but to determine which is legitimate. The legitimate one, the one which represents the Republic of China, is the Government established in Taiwan.

80. An attempt has been made in defiance of the facts, to deck out the Mao Tse-tung régime in the whitest garments of peace. Why, then, is it being quietly suggested that the way to restrain that régime's aggressive impulses is to reward it with the seat which belongs to the legitimate Government of China? And is the invasion of India to be cited by those who argue that the Mao régime should be admitted to the United Nations because of its peaceful nature and in the interests of legality and justice? If we condone and encourage this sort of thing, we will have to condone other things of a like or worse nature in the United Nations itself. We are not so optimistic—indeed naïve—as to believe that the entry of the Mao régime into the Organization would cause it to change its aggressive character. On the contrary, it would regard its triumph as one of might over right, and its propaganda would blazon forth that triumph, thus causing all mankind the most terrible disillusionment.

81. My delegation feels that the admission of a movement based on force, however powerful it may be, and the accompanying expulsion of a legitimate Government would serve to negate our Charter and to undermine the legal and spiritual foundations of our Organization.

82. Mr. VOLIO JIMENEZ (Costa Rica) (translated from Spanish): I do not think I will need many words to set forth Costa Rica's views as we debate once again the question of admitting the People's Republic of China to the United Nations. Our position is well known, and nothing has occurred to make us change it.

83. Two main arguments have been advanced here in favour of this proposal: first, that the admission of Communist China would enable the United Nations to control that country's notoriously aggressive attitude, and second, that it is contrary to the principle of United Nations universality to exclude a country which is one of the largest in the world and the most populous.

84. My delegation believes that these very arguments eloquently reveal the weakness of the case put forward for the Peking régime and at the same time, strengthen the position of those of us who oppose it.

85. How, without denying the very nature of the United Nations, can we admit a country whose foreign policy is based on force and on disregard for international law—admit it simply as a means of controlling that policy? The United Nations is not an institution for reforming the behaviour of Member States but a place where those States place their best qualities, their entire cultural heritage, in the service of

mankind in order to lead it to its highest destiny. A State which shamelessly makes war the principal instrument of its expansionist designs and attacks a Member of the United Nations at the very moment when we are discussing this question cannot be admitted, without contravening the purposes of the Organization, simply in order to please those who believe that Red China's international behaviour can be reformed through its admission to the United Nations.

86. My country is equally unable to accept the argument based on the territorial extent and population of the country ruled by the Chinese Communists. That is not what qualifies a State for admission to the United Nations; what is required is, rather, unmistakable proof of an attitude of respect for the Charter and of a way of life that is in keeping with it. During the seventeen years of this Organization's existence, my country has clearly conducted its foreign affairs in accordance with the principles of the Charter. If Costa Rica and other small nations have acted in this way, it is all the more necessary for the large countries to present similar credentials if they aspire to membership in the most important international organization.

87. My delegation wishes to stress the very significant fact that this attempt to admit Communist China to our Organization, like the previous ones, was not preceded by an actual application from the country concerned or—which is more important—by assurances that it will fulfil the obligations incumbent upon every State Member of the United Nations. There have been no express assurances that, if admitted, that country will strive to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. There has been no reaffirmation of faith in fundamental human rights and the dignity and worth of the human person. We have heard no message of tolerance and of States living together in peace. We have heard no statement of respect for the obligations deriving from the sources of international law. Instead, the admission of Red China is being sought on the basis of its power and in spite of its repeated disregard for all those supreme goals of mankind. There are other reasons for opposing the admission of Communist China; they have been set forth in detail in this and earlier debates. However, my delegation wished only to comment on the two arguments which have been put forward most emphatically on this occasion by those who favour Communist China's admission.

88. We are certain that the General Assembly will, as in the past, reject this draft resolution [A/L.395], thus reaffirming that the admission of a State to the United Nations is a very serious act and that membership can be granted only to fully qualified countries which are clearly able to fulfil the Purposes and Principles of the Charter.

89. In this instance, it is obvious that the Peking régime, if one is to judge from its foreign policy, is not capable of respecting those Purposes and Principles, and Costa Rica will therefore vote against the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

90. Mr. SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela) (translated from Spanish): The General Assembly is now, for the second time, considering the problem of the representation of China in the United Nations in terms of its substance, in terms of the actual issues involved. My delegation clearly expressed its views on this

question last year and declared that it was opposed to the expulsion of the Government of the Republic of China and to the latter's replacement by the Government of the People's Republic of China. The reasons we gave for our position at that time are, in our view, still valid—especially so this year—and I should like to summarize them briefly before this Assembly.

91. The problem before us derives from the fact that there are at present two Chinese Governments: the Government of the Republic of China, which is on the island of Formosa and has full jurisdiction over the latter's 12 million inhabitants, and the Government of the People's Republic of China, which is established in the mainland. This has caused the problem to be approached from two directions. The first approach, which poses the issue in terms of the admission of Communist China to the United Nations, has given rise to a debate regarding the qualifications of the Government of the People's Republic of China for membership in this Organization. The second approach is to treat the problem as simply that of substituting one set of credentials for another; it is reflected in the draft resolution submitted to this Assembly by the Soviet Union [A/L.395]. I shall examine separately each of these approaches to the problem.

92. If we examine the question in terms of the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, as many previous speakers have done, then it is a matter of determining whether the Government of the People's Republic of China is in fact qualified for membership. The principal argument advanced in favour of that Government's admission is that, since the United Nations is an organization which aspires to universality, it is absurd for a State with more than 600 million inhabitants and a huge expanse of territory to be kept out.

93. It has also been said that it is unjust to bar a State from this Organization because it is Communist and that a State's social or political system should have no bearing whatever on the question of its admission to membership.

94. My answer to these arguments is the following: the matter is settled by Articles 4 and 6 of the Charter. Article 4 indicates the conditions which a State must fulfil in order to become a Member of this Organization, and Article 6 says that a State which fails to carry out its obligations under the Charter may be expelled from the Organization. What does this mean? It means that the universality to which the United Nations aspires is not an unqualified, but a qualified, universality. Any State which fails to meet the requirements laid down in the Charter cannot become a Member of the Organization, and any Member State which fails to carry out its obligations can be expelled. This means that although the Charter aims at universality it does not tell us that all States, regardless of their conduct, may be Members of the Organization, but that they must conduct themselves in a certain manner and respect certain principles that are embodied in the Charter in order to qualify for membership.

95. What are the facts with regard to the People's Republic of China? We have seen that its condemnation as an aggressor in Korea is still in force, and that it continues to intervene in Viet-Nam, Laos and Tibet. That was how matter stood last year; this year, we have witnessed its open intervention and armed attack on India. Can such a country be called peace-loving?

Is this a country or a Government which meets the requirements of Article 4? I think that what is happening at this moment in India provides the answer to those questions.

96. If the Charter said that a State of a given population or size must necessarily be a Member of this Organization, that would be another matter. But that is not what the Charter says. The Charter requires respect for the principles embodied in it, among which is the principle that a State must be peace-loving. We therefore feel that the considerations which last year prompted us to vote against the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations are even more valid this year in view of the attack on India.

97. I should also like to point out that there is no question here of disqualifying Communist China because its Government is Communist, for we have Communist Governments in the United Nations and they are fully entitled to membership. What is inadmissible is that we should grant membership to a Government which is obviously unwilling to respect the principles of the Charter. We oppose its admission not because it is a Communist Government but because it does not respect the principles of the Charter.

98. I shall now turn to the other view of this problem, i. e., that it is a simple question of credentials. That is the approach adopted in the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union, which holds that China is already in the United Nations and that it is therefore a question of which Government is to represent that country.

99. In this connexion, I should like to point out that the Government of Nationalist China still has full jurisdiction over a part of China's territory, that it is recognized by a greater number of Governments than is Communist China, that it is fulfilling all its obligations under the Charter, and that it has represented China ever since the founding of the United Nations. Thus, it is not a Government which has been completely removed from Chinese territory and which has no jurisdiction over it.

100. Our views—looking at the problem from this second standpoint—were expressed by my delegation on a previous occasion [1077th meeting, paras. 107-109], and they remain the same this year. I shall take the liberty of quoting what we then said on this subject:

"[To examine the problem as a question of the direct replacement of the Government of the Republic of China by the Government of the People's Republic of China as representing that country in the United Nations] would be tantamount to recognizing that the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations necessarily entails the exclusion, either in advance or at the same time, of the Republic of China.

"However, we do not consider that the admission of the Government of the People's Republic of China to membership in the United Nations can be treated merely as a question of credentials, in the sense that for the purpose of admitting the People's Republic of China to the United Nations it would suffice to recognize the validity of the credentials of that Government's representatives and automatically declare invalid the credentials of the representa-

tives of the Republic of China. In other words, we do not think that it is possible to admit the People's Republic of China to membership in the United Nations in disregard of the provisions of Article 4 of the Charter simply by taking the position that its Government has to all intents and purposes replaced the Government of the Republic of China as the Government of China. That could be done if the same thing had happened in China which has happened in some States Members of the United Nations, where a Government born of a revolution has completely replaced its predecessor throughout the national territory. In such cases it is true that the United Nations is in no way concerned with the conduct, intentions or qualities of the new Government and cannot require the readmission to membership of the State in question but can only accept the new Government as the representative of that State. To do otherwise would be to intervene in the domestic affairs of a State, and this is clearly prohibited by the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.

"In the case of China, however, the situation is very different: there are at present two distinct Governments, each exercising full authority over the part of Chinese territory which it occupies. The Government of the People's Republic of China exercises full authority over the territory of mainland China; that of the Republic of China, in turn, exercises full authority over the territory of the islands of Formosa and the Pescadores, which are entirely under its jurisdiction. This Government, moreover, maintains normal diplomatic relations with a large number of countries, a number greater than that of the countries which maintain diplomatic relations with the Government of the People's Republic of China. Consequently, the United Nations cannot arbitrarily divest the Government of the Republic of China of its authority and thus deliver approximately 12 million people to another Government which, for all that it may be exercising authority over the whole of the rest of China, is not exercising it in any way and never has exercised it over the islands of Formosa and the Pescadores. It would not be in conformity with the principles of the Charter thus to disregard the right of the inhabitants of those islands freely to determine their destiny. Nor would it be humane to deliver them, defenceless as they are, to possible reprisals by a régime which heretofore has not precisely distinguished itself by its respect for human rights."

101. For the reasons I have indicated, my delegation does not consider it appropriate, under the existing circumstances, that the People's Republic of China should be admitted to the United Nations. Furthermore, it feels that there are no valid political or juridical reasons for expelling the Republic of China from the Organization.

102. My delegation will therefore vote against the draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [A/L.395].

103. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic): For the thirteenth time, the General Assembly is dealing with the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. With the aid of pressure exerted on its vassal States, the United States of America has for the past twelve years flouted the accepted stan-

dards of international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter. The United States does not wish to allow the People's Republic of China into the United Nations, because restoring the rights of the People's Republic of China would mean withdrawing from its territory—from the island of Taiwan.

104. The aggressive forces of the United States of America are using Taiwan, with the Chiang Kai-shek clique subservient to them, as their strong point in the Far East for the stifling of the national liberation movements of Asian countries and for a possible invasion of the People's Republic of China. It is also profitable for aggressive circles in the United States to keep the Chiang Kai-shek puppet in the United Nations because it ensures one more vote for the United States in all the Organization's bodies.

105. The United States Government does not want to say good-bye to Taiwan, because that would mean finally writing off all those thousands of millions of dollars spent by the United States on maintaining counter-revolutionary forces in China prior to the victory of the Chinese revolution, arming the followers of Chiang Kai-shek after the establishment of the People's Republic of China, and creating United States military bases on Taiwan.

106. According to extremely incomplete data given by the American journal U. S. News & World Report of 23 April 1962, so-called "United States aid" to the Kuomintang group since the end of the Second World War amounts to about \$4,000 million. The United States Government still cherishes the hope of restoring the old order in China and turning continental China into its own private domain.

107. The island of Taiwan and its population of eleven millions have been delivered up by the Chiang Kai-shek group as plunder for United States monopolies. In January 1962 the Taiwan newspaper Lien Ho Pao stated that the electronic, petroleum, shipbuilding, metallurgical, engineering and cement-manufacturing industries were all controlled by United States capital. In the electrical engineering industry, 74 per cent of the total capital belongs to United States citizens, while the figure for the oil industry is 87.5 per cent. United States investors are exempted from taxation for 3-5 years. The existing Chiang Kai-shek puppet régime is thus nothing but a form of colonial domination of this island by the United States of America.

108. For twelve years the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, together with the socialist countries and those States whose Governments are guided by common sense and take the real international situation into account in their policies, has consistently advocated the restoration of the illegally withheld rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

109. Our Republic holds, and has always held, that the right to represent the great nation of China in the United Nations and its organs is vested solely in the Government of the People's Republic of China, as the only lawful successor to the rights and obligations assumed by pre-revolutionary China, as a member of the United Nations, when the Organization was established.

110. More and more new States are being given the opportunity to participate in the activities of the United Nations, the membership of which has now risen to 110. Unfortunately, however, the People's Republic of China remains outside the Organization. So long as such an abnormal state of affairs persists, the

United Nations cannot claim to reflect an accurate picture of the present-day world.

111. It is difficult to understand the mentality of delegation which vote, year after year, for the retention of the Chiang Kai-shek puppet in the United Nations and the refusal to the People's Republic of China of the right to take its place in the Organization.

112. One such delegation is that of Cameroon, whose representative, Mr. Betayene, suggested at the plenary meeting of 3 October 1962 that the question of the admission of China was not really a problem at all [1140th meeting, para. 153].

113. In reality, the question is that, not of admitting the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, but of restoring the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, since China has been a member of the Organization since 1945.

114. Moreover, restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is a highly topical problem, the solution of which brooks no delay, since without the presence of representatives of the great Chinese nation it is completely unrealistic to try to solve such burning problems as general and complete disarmament, the banning of nuclear arms, the creation of an atom-free zone in Asia, and so on. Is it really the contention of the Cameroonian representative and those who think like him that world problems can be effectively solved without the People's Republic of China? If they do believe that, they are profoundly mistaken.

115. We are astounded by the cynicism of the so-called "arguments" with which, at the meeting of 26 October 1962, the representative of Australia attempted to persuade the Members of the United Nations, including countries which have recognized the People's Republic of China, not to support the proposal for the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. It is clear that the representative of Australia, like the representatives of New Zealand, Paraguay, El Salvador, Venezuela (just now) and other countries, is entirely under the influence—as the Indonesian representative, Mrs. Supeni, put it—of "ideological considerations".

116. Being opposed to socialism in general, the Australian representative and those who think like him are trying to discredit the People's Republic of China, which is building socialism, and for that purpose even employ slander. They thereby openly flout the principle of the equal representation, in the United Nations, of States with different social and economic systems.

117. Year in and year out, the representatives of the United States of America, heading a bloc of countries whose policy it is to intensify the "cold war" and to undermine peaceful co-operation between States and the authority of the United Nations as an instrument for the general peace and security of nations, trot out the same old fabrications with the aim of preventing the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations. The United States representative, Mr. Stevenson, repeated the same old fabrications this year, in his statement of 22 October [1156th meeting].

118. The overwhelming majority of mankind now favours the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. In 1952, 70 per cent of the delegations present and



voting cast their votes against the admission of the People's Republic of China to the Organization, but in 1961 only 46 per cent of them did so. There are ample grounds for believing that a number of new delegations will, at the present session, advocate the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

119. In addition to the socialist countries, many non-aligned countries—such as Indonesia, Burma, the United Arab Republic, India, Cambodia, Ceylon, Sudan, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Ghana, Somalia, Iraq, Syria, Algeria and others—have spoken out in support of the great Chinese nation during the general debate at the General Assembly's present session.

120. In the course of the general debate, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, Mr. Jawad, said on 12 October 1962:

"The People's Republic of China is still barred from taking its rightful place in the United Nations. This anomalous situation cannot be tolerated much longer. It is utterly inconceivable that the most populous nation in the world, a country with a rich and ancient culture representing a great force in our world today, should be denied its lawful rights to represent the Chinese people in this Organization." [A/PV.1152, para. 21.]

121. Mr. Jawad reaffirmed this opinion in his statement of today.

122. On 27 October 1962, during the general debate, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cambodia, Mr. Huot Sambath, described the policy of withholding the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations as "unfair, ridiculous and unwise" [A/PV.1134, para. 86].

123. These views were reaffirmed here today by Mr. Huot Sambath, who spoke shortly before me at this meeting.

124. In the opinion of the Byelorussian delegation, the question of restoring the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations reflects, as in a mirror, two divergent trends in international relations: the trend towards peace, co-operation, friendship and justice among peoples, which is characteristic of the countries of the socialist camp and of the sovereign neutral States, and the trend towards the intensification of international tension and disregard for the letter and spirit of the principles of the United Nations Charter, which is characteristic of the United States of America and its partners. In the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the Organization, the United States and its allies in aggressive blocs, instead of endorsing the principle of universality and of equal participation in the work of the United Nations by States with different social systems, uphold lawlessness and arbitrary action, with the sole aim of preventing the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, simply because the People's Republic of China is a socialist State.

125. Every time the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China is discussed, a pitiless light is cast on United States foreign policy, which is directed against any attempts by peoples to achieve real freedom and independence, real democracy and progress, real peace and co-operation. The attitude of the United States to the People's

Republic of China reflects the struggle of the former's ruling circles for economic, political and ideological domination of the world. It is not by chance that demands have been made in the United States for the "public unmasking of those who sold out China to the Communists" (I quote from the French weekly *L'Express* of 29 March 1962). How absurd these demands seem to us! China was "sold out" to the Communists by history and by the makers of history—the popular masses, who have thrown off the fetters of slavery and oppression. We recommend the gentlemen making these demands to read the programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—the most inspired document of our time—in which they will find the answers to their questions and the reasons for the failure of their policy.

126. The United States aggressors are preparing Chiang Kai-shek's counter-revolutionary bands for an "assault on the mainland". This is confirmed by the many acts of provocation against the People's Republic of China, which have become an integral part of United States foreign policy. Thus, according to the Chinese newspaper *Jen-Min Ji Pao* of 27 April 1962, between 7 September 1958 and April 1962 alone United States warships violated Chinese territorial waters 144 times, while United States aircraft violated Chinese air space 161 times. The patience shown by the Government of the People's Republic of China in the face of this chain of systematic provocation bears witness once more to the desire of the People's Republic of China for the preservation of peace in the Far East.

127. It is my duty to say in conclusion that by allowing itself to be led by the aggressive NATO bloc headed by the United States, and by continuing to flout the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, the Organization is doing vast damage to its authority and to its effectiveness as an instrument of peace and security and as a universal body for the promotion of good neighbourly relations between States. At the fifteenth session of the General Assembly, the Head of the Soviet Government, Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev, declared that the United Nations "needs to have such a great nation and such a powerful country as the People's Republic of China represented in it and taking an active part in its work" (881st meeting, para 96).

128. The Byelorussian delegation fully supports the draft resolution "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations" [A/L.395] submitted by the Soviet Union delegation, and calls upon all who are true to the United Nations Charter, its principles, and the ideas of peaceful coexistence and co-operation between nations to vote for this draft. We would like delegates to remember that not a single important problem in Asia, or in the world as a whole, can be solved without the direct and active participation of the People's Republic of China.

129. It is clear duty and urgent task of the United Nations to restore legality and justice, to drive out of its ranks the Chiang Kai-shek puppet from the United States marionette show, and to return their rightful place in the United Nations to the representatives of the Chinese people—the representatives of the Central Government of the People's Republic of China.

*Mr. Muhammad Zafrulla Khan (Pakistan), resumed the Chair.*

130. Mr. UZAMUGURA (Rwanda) (translated from French): From the moment at which a country becomes a Member of this great family of the United Nations and signs the Charter, it embraces the fundamental principles of the Organization. The maintenance of peace and security—which is essential if man is to realize his spiritual and material aspirations and if the more prosperous nations are to combine to combat poverty in all its forms, and especially under-development, that unwanted monopoly of the so-called "young" countries—is the responsibility of all Member States, both those which have long been independent and those which have recently been admitted to the United Nations. For that reason my delegation feels compelled to speak on the critical question which is now before us.

131. This question is entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations"; but the admission of a country to our Organization is not a right but a privilege, and none of us should forget that fact. Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Charter in fact specifies that:

"Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter, and, in the judgement of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

Thus the Charter says that membership in the United Nations "is open to" peace-loving States, not that they shall *ipso facto* become Members. The title of the question before us is therefore, in my opinion, ill-chosen. There is no question of "restoring" the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China by admitting it to the United Nations; the point is whether the privilege of admission can and should be granted to it.

132. The conditions that must be fulfilled by a country if it wishes to be admitted are also unequivocally stipulated in the paragraph I have quoted. First, the State must be peace-loving; secondly, it must be able and willing to carry out the obligations contained in the Charter.

133. Does the People's Republic of China fulfil these conditions? That is the first question we must ask. Unfortunately, the reply is in the negative. It uses force against its neighbours, and at this very moment it is attacking one of its best friends—India. We all know what has befallen the people in Tibet; they have been torn from their holy places, their customs and traditions have been outraged and they have been condemned to exile. We all know the attempts at subversion made in Laos and Viet-Nam by the People's Republic of China. Its threat to intervene against the United Nations forces in Korea is a matter of common knowledge. Its policy of corrupting foreign Governments by training agents to introduce a reign of terror, and to spread suspicion and anarchy, in their own countries is no secret. Lastly, do the present relations between India and continental China testify in the latter's favour?

134. The Assembly undoubtedly remembers the non-aggression pact signed between these two countries in 1954.<sup>8/</sup> It embodied five principles on which a new era of friendship in Asia was to be based. These five principles are: peaceful coexistence, mutual

respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in internal affairs, and equality and mutual benefit. Thus the two signatories undertook not to resort to force on any pretext whatsoever. But we see every day how this agreement is being respected by the People's Republic of China.

135. It is thus clear that this country is neither peace-loving nor able and willing to carry out the obligations of the Charter, the first and foremost of which is negotiation—in other words, the exclusion of force in the settlement of international conflicts.

136. The draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [A/L.395] asks us not only to admit to the United Nations a country which does not fulfil the required conditions, but also to exclude, for that purpose, a Government which for its part completely fulfils them and which, moreover, was one of the signatories of the Charter at the San Francisco Conference in 1945.

137. Are we, then, to violate our own Charter and sanction the use of force? Must our Organization, which is the guarantor of the security of small States, admit as a Member a country which threatens that security? Some speakers have propounded the idea that none of the great problems can be solved without the presence of the People's Republic of China. My delegation, on the contrary, does not believe that the presence of that country would in any way facilitate the work we have to do. Indeed, Mao Tse-tung has said:

"The highest form of revolution consists in the seizure of political power by force and the solution of problems by war."

He, the Head of Government of the People's Republic of China, has also said:

"On the ruins of dead imperialism the victorious people will rapidly create a civilization a thousand times superior to the capitalist system and will prepare a magnificent future for itself."

If that is not a defence of war, I do not know what it is. To ask a country which sees such benefits in war to contribute to the search for peace seems to me like setting the fox to keep the geese.

138. Lastly, there are those who say that admission to the United Nations would have a moderating influence on the People's Republic of China. We are entitled to wonder how such an influence could be exerted effectively by an Organization which would oppose that Republic's expansionist ambitions and whose mission consists in guaranteeing the peace and security of all States, small and large.

139. To sum up, my delegation considers that there is no reason for restoring to the People's Republic of China rights which it has never possessed or for granting it a privilege, seeing that it does not fulfil the required conditions. In my view we should begin by ascertaining whether the People's Republic of China fulfils the conditions laid down by the Charter. When it does fulfil them, my delegation will be the first to welcome its admission to the United Nations. For the time being, however, we cannot support the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union.

140. The PRESIDENT: Before I call on the next speaker, I should like to mention that it would help me in planning further meetings, particularly having

<sup>8/</sup> Agreement between the Republic of India and the People's Republic of China on trade and intercourse between the Tibet Region of China and India, signed at Peking on 29 April 1954.

regard to the needs of the First Committee, if I knew a little more clearly than I do at present how many Members are likely to participate, after the general debate on this item is finished, in the explanations of vote on the resolution, and how many would wish to speak on the resolution. If those who have made up their minds in regard to speaking--and I have three names already--were to indicate their wishes, before the adjournment of the meeting, to the Secretariat officials, that would help me to plan further meetings on that basis. Of course, that does not shut out any Members who make up their minds later to speak on the item. However, I should like to have some indication as to how many are at present thinking of speaking on the resolution.

141. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (translated from Russian): Let us imagine, just for a minute, that we are attending a session of the General Assembly with representatives of the great Chinese people, and that the red flag of the People's Republic of China, with its stars, is flying from one of the flagstaffs at the entrance to the United Nations building.

142. How insubstantial and even artificial will seem to those supporting the United States, the latter's arguments, motives and reasoning which it has used in the past, and is unfortunately again using at this session, in order to delay the solution of the urgent question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations!

143. The United States, in its malicious obstinacy, does not wish to resign itself to the fact that what happened in China in 1949 was, not a formal change of Government or a change in the name of the State, but a fundamental change in the country's social system and international position. The year 1949 marks the beginning of China's true independence; it saw the end of domination by colonizers and imperialists in Chinese territory.

144. By the occupation of Taiwan, the United States is trying to maintain the fiction that in Taiwan there is a Government representing the entire Chinese people--in other words, that in China the only de jure Government is still that of Chiang Kai-shek and that Taiwan is the embodiment of the Chinese State. It is difficult to imagine a greater political absurdity or a greater violation of the United Nations Charter. And, paradoxical though it may seem, the originator of these political manoeuvres is the Government of a great Power, which the United Nations Charter entrusted with the responsibility of establishing conditions under which there can be respect for justice and for the obligations arising from the Charter.

145. When the representative of China signed the United Nations Charter at San Francisco, his Government ruled over most of the country, with the exception of the island of Taiwan, which you will recall was under Japanese occupation; and of Manchuria and certain other territories, China's title to which was never in doubt in the United Nations.

146. Is there such a Chinese State now? Yes, there is. There is now an immeasurably stronger State--the People's Republic of China--with a Government having the full confidence of the people and authority over the entire territory of China with the exception of Taiwan, which is occupied by the United States. Yet the People's Republic of China still has every

right to this island. When China signed the United Nations Charter, as I have already emphasized, Taiwan was under Japanese occupation. History has shown that China remains a great and united Chinese power, irrespective of who is occupying Taiwan. This island is now under United States occupation, but this is no reason why the Government in power in China should not be the sole representative of the Chinese people.

147. The powerful tree which is the Chinese State once had the misfortune be decked with the foliage of the Chiang Kai-shek regime. As you know, however, the wind of the people's revolution swept the old leaves to the island of Taiwan. Some representatives here want to persuade us that the old, rotten leaves of Taiwan still adorn this tree of China and still represent the whole of China.

148. We are convinced that it is only from the mouths of the true representatives of the Chinese people in the General Assembly Hall that the wisdom of that people will flow, as from an inexhaustible spring, and that its true life will be expressed. Is this a matter for fear? I think not.

149. The representatives of the United States and of the countries following its lead in this question continually repeat that the voice of the People's Republic of China would strike, as they have claimed, a discordant note in the concert of States Members of the United Nations. They even assure the General Assembly that to restore the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is tantamount to admitting "a new and still greater evil" into the Organization. This attitude on the part of the representatives of the United States and other Western countries is hardly surprising since, as in many other cases, it reflects their almost pathological aversion for or even hatred of the socialist system established in the People's Republic of China. Yet the whole point of the United Nations is precisely that countries with different social and economic systems are represented in it. The United Nations must encourage the peaceful settlement of disputes between these countries, promote their peaceful coexistence and, finally, create conditions for emulation between countries with different social and political systems, thus contributing to the strengthening of peace and the elimination of war from the lives of men.

150. For reasons which are well known, this is not the first time that the General Assembly is discussing the important and pressing question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, and of the removal from this Organization and all its organs of persons not empowered by the Chinese people to represent its interests in this international forum or, for that matter, anywhere else.

151. For the past thirteen years the Chinese people has been denied its rights in the United Nations. For thirteen years the Soviet Union and all other peace-loving countries have been fighting against the hostile policy pursued towards the People's Republic of China, both in the United Nations and throughout the world, by United States ruling circles.

152. Those who advocate the restoration of China's rights in the United Nations are doing their duty not only towards the great Chinese people but also towards the United Nation, fully realizing that such an outcome will strengthen the Organization, enhance its authority and make it still more representative and universal.

153. The arguments used here by the United States to oppose the recognition of the rights of the People's Republic of China are not new. The United States is continually threatening the Assembly with the prospect of an outbreak of war in the Far East as soon as the gentlemen from Taiwan, who do not represent anybody, leave the United Nations. It says that the expulsion of the Chiang Kai-shek representatives from the United Nations would signify "tacit consent" to an attack on Taiwan by the People's Republic of China, which would be fraught with dangerous consequences for peace. Unfortunately last year, under pressure from the United States, the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of China in the United Nations was not settled. A year has passed. Events during the year show, however, that the delay in the solution of the question of restoring the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, which can be tolerated no longer, is interpreted and understood by the Chiang Kai-shek clique as an incentive for military forays against the People's Republic of China. In fact it is well known, because much is said and written about this, that suspicious plots are being hatched in Taiwan with a view to "the Chiang Kai-shek tiger pouncing on mainland China". An American newspaper recently carried an article by a correspondent who said, among other things, that warlike appeals for a return to the mainland had actually be found on the labels of beer bottles and on bus tickets in Taiwan.

154. This summer there were, in Taiwan, large-scale preparations for adventure. Troops at the south of the island were moved nearer to the Taiwan Strait, landing craft were made ready and plans were evolved for the administration of the areas coveted by the Chiang Kai-shek clique. Obviously Chiang Kai-shek and his clique are not doing all this alone. The warriors of Taiwan have been talking openly about military campaigns, obviously relying of support from United States ruling circles.

155. What does this show? It shows that, because no solution has been found in the United Nations, the Chiang Kai-shek clique can continue to play its dangerous game in the Far East and, with direct support from the United States, prepare a breeding ground for a world war. But the Government of the People's Republic of China is exercising considerable self-restraint, despite the fact that the United States has set up a military base in Taiwan, keeps its fleet off the coast of Taiwan and sends planes from Taiwan, on espionage missions, into China's air space. Given this real danger, would the Government of the People's Republic of China not be justified in taking steps to prevent the establishment of a base for aggression on the island of Taiwan, which is about 150 kilometres from the mainland?

156. Our discussion of this urgent question in the General Assembly is drawing to an end. We have noticed that some representatives, apparently understanding that the People's Republic of China cannot be kept out of the United Nations, are beginning deliberately or otherwise to spread the idea of "two Chinas". For example, we could detect this trend in the statements made at this session by the representative of the Central African Republic, the Upper Volta, Senegal and Japan and the speaker who immediately preceded me.

157. But there are not two Chinas. There is one China—the People's Republic of China—and the island

of Taiwan is part of great China. This is therefore a question, not of admitting a new Member to the United Nations, but of recognizing the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the Organization. Undoubtedly, so far as the urgency of solving it goes, this is an important question. A number of delegations from various countries admitted as much in their statements, but with the reservation that a decision must be taken by a two-thirds majority.

158. Everybody realizes, however, that what is dividing the Members of the United Nations is not whether the question of a change in the representation of China should be decided by a simple majority or by a two thirds majority. The crux of the matter is whether the Chinese people is to be represented in the United Nations, or whether the Organization is to condone the selfish and dangerous manoeuvres of the United States, which are designed to deprive the People's Republic of China of the right to take its lawful place among us.

159. What conclusions are to be drawn from this fact? There can be only one conclusion: the States which demand that a change in the representation of China should be decided by a two thirds majority are motivated by their opposition to the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, since nowhere in the Charter is it stated that the question of the competence of a delegation to represent a country must be decided by a two thirds majority. No provision in the Charter sanctions a situation whereby, against the wishes of the majority of the Members, there is in the United Nations a delegation which represents nobody—I refer to the Chiang Kai-shek representatives. Those, therefore, who are insisting on a two-thirds majority are concerned not with the United Nations Charter but with how to postpone indefinitely the appearance in this hall of the real representatives of the Chinese people. Those who are really in favour of restoring China's lawful rights naturally support the statutory procedure for the settlement of this question—a decision by a simple majority.

160. The refusal by the United States to recognize China's lawful rights in the United Nations, which has no basis in international law, is yet another manifestation of a conservative policy which relies on putting back the clock of history. It is quite wrong for the United States to make the solution of this question a matter of "prestige". When what is ultimately at stake is the fate of the world, there can be no prestige "capitulations" or "victories", because any step which makes the prospect of war recede, strengthens peace and normalizes relations between States is a step of great statesmanship and wisdom, and history will remember those who, in our troubled times, proved equal to their responsibilities towards mankind. If the majority of Members of the United Nations really want to establish new principles for relations between States in our era, they will vote for the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

161. The Ukrainian delegation shares the view—and has itself often drawn attention to this—that without the participation of the People's Republic of China the consideration and solution of important international problems, such as general and complete disarmament, will be hampered and delayed.



32. But I should like to stress that, even if the United Nations were able to solve present and future international problems without the People's Republic of China, China's rights in the United Nations should still be restored because the Organization is continually moving towards universality by admitting States to membership irrespective of their social systems.

33. My delegation will therefore support the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union delegation [A/L.395], which urges that the Chiang Kai-shek representatives should be removed from all United Nations organs and that representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China should be invited to occupy China's place in the United Nations.

34. Mr. GARCIA INCHAUSTEGUI (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): At this seventeenth session of the General Assembly, we again have before us the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

35. The People's Republic of China is a founder State of our Organization and a permanent member of the Security Council.

36. In the People's Republic of China, as in our homeland—and as has happened in other parts of the world—there has been a victorious people's revolution. The gallant Chinese people fought for their right of self-determination, at the risk of their lives, in the face of foreign domination and of the indigenous agents of that domination. Arms in hand, and even without arms, they ejected the exploiters and set their country on the path of socialist construction. That heroic people has suffered, as other peoples have suffered and still suffer, the constant harassment of imperialism, and the reasons have been the same as those for which imperialism harasses all who successfully rebel against its domination and influence. Despite that harassment, the Chinese people has toiled and is toiling successfully to build the new socialist society.

37. However, United States imperialism has not been satisfied with direct harassment of China in violation of all the principles of our Charter; it has not been satisfied with sending its fleet to that country, too, or with unlawfully seizing a part of Chinese territory, the island of Formosa, and converting it into an aggressive base against China. United States imperialism has gone further; it has used this international organization for its schemes and, in contravention of the principles of the Charter, has prevented the lawful representatives of China from joining us. This illegal action has impaired the representative character and international authority of the United Nations, limiting the effectiveness of the agreements reached here and making us less representative by seating along us a number of gentlemen who represent no one.

38. China's social system—like other social systems in other parts of the world—is distasteful to the United States Government. It is, of course, quite natural and logical that any system in which the monopolies have a place should be faced with the aggression and hemming of the United States Government.

39. The United Nations—as we have observed on so many occasions in the Security Council—grew out of the joint struggle of countries with different social systems against Nazi-Fascism, and it is high time the United States realized that its unwillingness to accept the facts of life, its unwillingness to accept

what peoples want and defend, cannot lead to anything good but only to greater tensions and greater difficulties in international relations. If the United States does not understand that, the other sovereign States seated here, including those which are allies and friends of the United States, should try to make it understand. There is no moral, legal or practical reason why a nation with an age-old culture and with more than 650 million inhabitants should be denied representation here because the United States does not like its social system.

170. Some have resorted to the device of presenting the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China as though it were a matter of admitting a new State. This is nothing but a manoeuvre to withhold rights which the Charter accords to every Member State and which the People's Republic of China has been demanding since 1949.

171. The United States has repeatedly branded the People's Republic of China an aggressor State, as though it was not in fact a peace-loving State. Yet those who apply such terms to China are the very ones who are keeping their fleet thousands of miles from their own territory in order to harass China, who are occupying Formosa, who are occupying South Korea, who are interfering in the domestic affairs of Viet-Nam and unleashing aggression against that gallant people, and who are, at this very moment, attacking Cuba. This unilateral condemnation is out of place, especially when the State which utters it has a long record of aggression behind it.

172. We have heard many speakers, including representatives of countries like Cambodia and Nepal which are neighbours of China, state that they favour recognition of the rights of the People's Republic of China.

173. Cuba maintains cordial diplomatic and commercial relations with its sister country in Asia and is grateful for the assistance and support which the Chinese people and their Government have given to our people and their Government. We regard the People's Republic of China as a peace-loving country, and we ask that the States Members of this Organization to vote for the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union [A/L.395], which recognizes the lawful rights of the only Chinese State—the People's Republic of China, whose capital is at Peking.

174. Mr. MENSHIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation, after hearing the statements of more than forty countries on the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, and in the light of the international situation which has arisen during the past week, deems it essential to speak in exercise of its right of reply.

175. The unprecedented aggressive actions of the United States, which plunged the world into a state of acute crisis, are opening many people's eyes to facts which previously they did not face or did not want to face. The world has just glanced deep into the chasm of thermo-nuclear war. It is still standing on the edge of this abyss. In such an exceptionally grave situation, the utmost realism and soberness and the will, not only to face facts but to use them in the interests of the maintenance of peace, are demanded of everyone and especially of statesmen, political

leaders and representative of States Members of the United Nations.

176. The actions taken by the Soviet Government and described in the messages from Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev to President Kennedy have offered a reasonable way out of a dangerous situation fraught with the most serious consequences for peace. We shall hope that the assurances given by the United States of America concerning non-aggression against Cuba and the lifting of the blockade will be implemented and that the United States of America will cease from intervention, in any form, in the domestic affairs of Cuba.

177. The Cuban crisis created by the United States of America teaches us realism. International events must be viewed from the angle of the facts. If the question of the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is approached realistically, one cannot fail to see that at present the great country of China, one of the founders of this Organization, is being deprived of the right to vote, contrary to the provisions of the Charter and to the elementary requirements of justice. Even those who oppose the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations cannot deny this irrefutable fact. Such a situation is entirely abnormal and should be remedied immediately.

178. The Soviet Union has frequently stressed the fact that the participation of the People's Republic of China is essential for the settlement of the most important international questions, including the problem of disarmament, the reorganization of the United Nations, and many other matters.

179. We are gratified to note that most of the speakers have displayed understanding of this fact. It has had to be weighed both by certain allies of the United States of America which maintain diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China and by the United States of America itself, in connexion with the settlement of critical international problems, especially in Asia.

180. Why then, when participation by representatives of the People's Republic of China in the work of the United Nations is discussed, do the United States of America and its supporters deny to the Government of the People's Republic of China the enjoyment of its lawful rights? Why in the Security Council, now considering a question on the solution of which the fate of the world depends, do gentlemen not representing anybody or anything sit in the place of the representatives of the Chinese people? Is such a situation reconcilable with international reality, the interests of peace and the interests of the United Nations? Of course not.

181. Some of those who oppose the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations have so lost touch with reality that they have asserted, in the debate, that the Chiang Kai-shek clique, driven out by the Chinese people thirteen years ago and maintained all these years on the island of Taiwan under the protection of the United States fleet, was entitled to represent China in the United Nations.

182. There is no doubt, however, that the Chiang Kai-shek people are able to stay on Taiwan, which has been transformed into an aggressive military base, only because the United States of America gives them military support. Nor is it a secret to

anybody that in the current year United States military aid to the Chiang Kai-shek forces has increased suddenly and sharply and military preparations on Taiwan have been intensified. United States weapons and military supplies are being sent to Taiwan in an unending stream. The Chiang Kai-shek people have received from the United States of America new missiles and jet aircraft, as well as landing-craft for the transportation of tanks and troops to the mainland.

183. These activities of the Government of the United States of America are being carried out against the lawful Government of China on territory forcibly torn from the People's Republic of China. The United States Government apparently regards it as entirely normal and lawful to transform Taiwan into a military base, which the leaders of the Chiang Kai-shek group, as they have stressed dozens of times in their official statements, intend to use for an invasion of the mainland and for an armed struggle against the Chinese people.

184. The United States of America not only has not announced the imposition of a blockade on deliveries of weapons to Taiwan, but has sent its fleet to this island with a view to protecting the Chiang Kai-shek mercenaries and helping them to carry out their aggressive plans.

185. The United States of America apparently considers itself entitled to play the master in any country and throughout the world in general, as it pleases. The General Assembly should not encourage it in this mistaken and dangerous opinion.

186. The Members of the United Nations must display true, statesmanlike wisdom and ability to face facts, by refusing to follow the United States of America on the question of the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

187. In this connexion it should be noted that in his statement, Mr. Stevenson, the United States representative, tried to frighten those Members of the United Nations which regarded the immediate restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the Organization as essential. He deliberately reproaches and censures all those who dare to differ with the Government of the United States of America on the specific question before the United Nations. Mr. Stevenson's appeal, of course, accords with the general policy of the United States Government, but—and this is very important—it is entirely at variance with the Charter of the United Nations and the ideals of international co-operation.

188. Mr. Stevenson's speech proved the correctness of the Soviet Union's disclosures concerning the true position of United States policy with respect to China. The statements of the United States Government against the immediate restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations are motivated solely by the United States Government's dislike of the social system obtaining in the People's Republic of China.

189. Mr. Stevenson and certain other delegates who spoke in support of his views endeavoured to transform the discussion of the question under consideration by the General Assembly into a discussion of the legitimacy of the Government of the People's Republic of China. However, neither the United States representative nor the other representatives supporting him in this matter are in any degree competent to decide

whether the Government of the People's Republic of China is or is not legitimate. That question was long ago decided by the Chinese people.

190. Neither the Chinese people nor any other independent people will change its social and governmental system to please the Government of the United States of America. The very attempt to divert the General Assembly into a discussion of the legitimacy of the Government of the People's Republic of China constitutes gross interference in the domestic affairs of China and an outrageous violation of the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter.

191. The speakers who from this rostrum supported the attempt of the United States Government to prevent the immediate restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations based their statements, as was obvious, not on facts or common sense but on other considerations. In seeking to invent at least some sort of argument in support of their position, they inevitably began to contradict one another, quite apart from their attitude's being at flagrant variance with the facts. One of them asserted that the People's Republic of China would have to be readmitted to the United Nations, as though China were not a founding Member of this Organization. Other acknowledged that it was a question of representation, a question of who was authorized to speak in the United Nations on behalf of the Chinese people. While acknowledging this fact, however, some of those opposing the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations suddenly demanded that the question should be decided not by a simple majority, as prescribed in the Charter, but by a two-thirds vote, although they could not put forward any reasonable arguments to justify such a demand.

192. It is the duty of the United Nations to decide this clear question without further delay: to restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, and to reject the opposition of the United States of America and all the contradictory stratagems of those who support the United States in this matter.

193. The Soviet Government has submitted to the General Assembly a draft resolution providing for the removal of the Chiang Kai-shek men from the places belonging to the Chinese people and an invitation to the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China to occupy these places. This Soviet position enjoys broad support and understanding. It is supported by all those who are sincerely interested in the strengthening of international peace and security, in the observance of the United Nations Charter and in the establishment of elementary justice. It is supported by those who consider it unlawful and intolerable to deprive the Chinese people of the right to vote in the United Nations; it is supported by those who recognize the necessity of facing the facts of international life and the urgent need for participation by the People's

Republic of China in the settlement of highly important international problems, such as those connected with the activities of the United Nations itself.

194. Those delegation which face facts and are concerned about the prospects of peace will undoubtedly vote for the draft resolution [A/L.395] submitted by the USSR.

195. The PRESIDENT: I recognize the representative of India for the exercise of the right of reply.

196. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India): I regret to intervene once again in this debate, but it is necessary to put the record straight by answering two of the points raised by the representative of Albania this morning [1160th meeting].

197. In the first place, I want to make it clear that there has been no offensive by the Indian forces. The very fact that the Indian forces have retreated all along the line against heavy Chinese attacks goes to prove that we were neither preparing for an offensive nor are prepared for one. As is well known, the aggressor always has the initial advantages in an offensive of his own choice. The kind of armaments used by the Chinese forces, including the use of tanks, is clear evidence of the fact that a massive and premeditated offensive was mounted by the Chinese and not by us.

198. Secondly, the representative of Albania also referred to the recent proposals made by China. These proposals are extremely deceptive, since the principal point therein is that the forces on both sides should withdraw twenty kilometres from the present actual line of control. That means that the Chinese would withdraw twenty kilometres from the points that they have reached in our territory, thus retaining the fruits of their aggressive action. In return, we have been asked to retreat another twenty kilometres into our own territory, without putting up any resistance. Obviously such a proposal can never be acceptable to us. It must suit the Chinese, as it will enable them to continue to remain deep inside Indian territory and to consolidate their position while talks are being held.

199. If the Chinese really want a peaceful settlement, they should accept our reasonable proposal: that is, that they should restore the status quo as it obtained prior to their further aggression which started on 8 September 1962. We would then be prepared to talk with them.

200. The PRESIDENT: This concludes the general debate on this item, subject to the right of reply on behalf of China. In the next meeting, after China has replied, we shall proceed to the draft resolution [A/L.395]. I shall first call upon those who have inscribed or may inscribe their names for explanation of votes before the vote, and then, after the voting, those who have inscribed their names or may inscribe their names for explanation of votes after the voting.

*The meeting rose at 6.05 p. m.*