

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1074th
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 8 December 1961,
at 3.30 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda items 90 and 91:</i>	
<i>Question of the representation of China in the United Nations (continued)</i>	961
<i>Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations (continued)</i>	
<i>Agenda item 93:</i>	
<i>An international investigation into the conditions and circumstances resulting in the tragic death of Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld and of the members of the party accompanying him (continued)</i>	970

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEMS 90 AND 91

Question of the representation of China in the United Nations (continued)

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

1. Mr. BROOKS (Canada): For more than a decade the question of the representation of China in the United Nations has posed a dilemma for this Organization. It has provoked sharp differences of opinion in this Assembly. There is no simple solution. Had there been one, we would not still have the undecided question before us. It is because the question is so complex, and because opinions on its solution have differed so widely, that this Assembly has not previously thought it wise or timely to take a decision on the substance of the matter. Now, however, for the first time, we are concerned with the real issues. I should like to state the views of my delegation on these issues.

2. Let me say plainly at the outset that the Canadian delegation is ready to consider carefully any proposal to settle equitably the question of Chinese representation. I stress the word "equitably". There are those who claim that wrong has been done to one of the parties concerned. They are entitled to that opinion, but I cannot believe that any delegation in this Assembly would seriously seek to right what it considers to be one wrong by the creation of another.

3. It is the firm opinion of my delegation that there must be preserved for the people of Formosa the right to self-determination, that is, the right to decide their own future. The right of all peoples to a voice in their own destinies is one that is fundamental to the purposes of the United Nations. Subject to due respect for that right in this matter before us, the Canadian delegation will, I repeat, give the most earnest attention to any proposals which may be advanced.

4. Mao Tse-tung, the Chairman of the Communist Party of China, said some months ago in an interview with a foreign correspondent, "Taiwan is China's affair. We will insist on this." It is quite clear that what he meant was that the future of Taiwan was exclusively Peking's affair and no one else's.

5. My delegation cannot accept that claim. We believe, on the contrary, that the future of Formosa is the affair of the people of Formosa. Canadians would never understand or accept a solution by which this Organization sanctioned the forcible extinction of the political identity of Formosa. We have always been led to believe, and we do believe, that the United Nations function is to prevent the imposition by force on any people of a political régime unacceptable to them.

6. On another occasion, the head of the Government in Peking said:

"This question is relatively simple. If the so-called 'Taiwan clique' is to appear in the United Nations, under whatever form and in whatever name—be it the Chiang Kai-shek clique or some other clique—we will definitely refuse to take part in the United Nations and sit together with them."

7. So far as the delegation of Canada is concerned, that is an unacceptable condition. Believing that the people of Formosa have a clear and inalienable right to decide their own future, we cannot for a moment agree that there is any justice or reason in the claim made by the Government in Peking that it can impose, as a condition of its own representation, denial of the representation of the people of Formosa. I would remind delegations, as they have already been reminded a number of times, that the population of Formosa is greater than that of about two-thirds of the Members of this Organization.

8. The only conditions which apply to membership in the United Nations, and consequently to representation in it, are the conditions set out in the Charter. There are important provisions of the United Nations Charter which my delegation believes deserve special attention when the question of the representation of China is considered. Members are required to be peace-loving and to refrain from the threat or use of force in their international relations. We have no desire to exacerbate differences, but we feel bound to emphasize that the record must give cause for grave doubts about the acceptance of that principle in Peking.

9. Canada believes that, as far as possible, representation in the United Nations should be comprehensive, embracing all nations without distinction as to the form of government or social system adopted. This does not imply recognition of any particular Government or approval of its policies, nor does it exclude the Governments concerned from criticism which we consider valid.

10. Those who seek representation in this Organization, and who also seek to impose their own conditions for representation, cannot complain, therefore, if the shortcomings in their own record are held up to scrutiny.

11. Two draft resolutions are before us for consideration. The first [A/L.372] would require delegations to express an opinion on the importance of a change in Chinese representation within the meaning of Article 18 of the United Nations Charter.

12. Can there be any doubt about the importance of this question? It concerns the competing claims to representation in the United Nations General Assembly of hundreds of millions of people. It concerns ultimately the disposition of a permanent Security Council seat and, by extension, of seats in the Economic and Social Council and in all subsidiary organs of the United Nations which by custom are held by permanent members of the Security Council.

13. Such a decision cannot be taken lightly. It must be accorded its due importance. It is patently of immediate importance both to the people who are ruled from Peking and to the inhabitants of Formosa. In the final analysis, it will have a profound influence on the effective functioning of the United Nations itself.

14. Any question which had remained unresolved for the past twelve years and which has attracted so much international attention must not be settled by recourse to any narrow voting majority. A just and peaceful solution must be found which is generally satisfactory to Members of the Organization.

15. For these reasons, the Canadian delegation will cast its vote in favour of the draft resolution before us, declaring any proposal to change the representation of China to an important question.

16. It follows that it would be altogether unjust to decide the question on the basis proposed in the draft resolution [A/L.360] put before us by the delegation of the USSR. This draft resolution attempts to pre-judge the issue by speaking of the restoration of rights which most Members of this Organization have never yet agreed existed. Such a solution would not only be inequitable but also quite contrary to the interests of this Organization. The Canadian delegation will therefore vote against the Soviet draft resolution.

17. My delegation does not believe that a decision recognizing the importance of the question constitutes, as has been suggested in some quarters, a new form of moratorium. We would not regard the simple adoption of one resolution and the defeat of the other as a satisfactory outcome of this debate.

18. My delegation has entered this debate ready to consider carefully any proposals designed to settle equitably the question of Chinese representation. Unfortunately, neither of the draft resolutions before us offers scope for such a settlement.

19. What is needed most is some further time for full examination, by whatever means may be found generally acceptable, of all the elements of this complicated question, so that by the next session we can look forward to a solution that will embody the general judgement and serve the cause of justice and peace.

20. Mr. WIRJOPRANOTO (Indonesia): The question of the representation of China in the United Nations, and the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and all its organs, has been before this Assembly for the past twelve years. While debates on substance have yearly been deferred by means of a procedural manoeuvre, this question has cast its shadow across the United Nations for these many years. For twelve years it has preoccupied our minds and the minds of all thinking men. For twelve years it has been considered, examined and analysed in all its aspects in the world Press. Surely the time for lengthy discussion is long past. There is no excuse for further delay or procrastination. The time for decision has come.

21. The views of Indonesia on this matter are well known to the Assembly. Since early 1950, we have recognized the Government of the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate Government of China. We believe that, as such, it must take its rightful seat in this Organization. We consider this to be imperative, not only to do justice to the 700 million people of China, but, no less, to do justice to the United Nations, to the purposes and principles for which it was created, to the mission of peace, of international co-operation, of harmonizing the actions of nations, with which it is entrusted. In short, we consider the proper representation of China to be imperative for making the United Nations strong, universal and effective.

22. It is the representation of China that is at issue here. Let us be clear about this from the very start. We are not concerned with the expulsion of any Member State. We are not concerned with the admission of a new Member State. China is an original Member of the United Nations and one of the permanent members of the Security Council. Nor are we concerned with the question of the recognition of the Government of the People's Republic of China. That is a political decision that each sovereign nation must make for itself. So let there be no confusion. We are dealing neither with a question of the expulsion, nor the admission, nor the recognition of a Member State.

23. What is at stake, here and now, is a question of the representation of a Member State. It is a matter of credentials and, in that sense, a procedural question, pure and simple. It is basically the same procedural question that was first raised, as a subject of controversy, in the Security Council in January 1950. At that time, the representative of the United States made the following statement in explaining his Government's negative vote on a Soviet draft resolution to seat representatives accredited by the People's Republic of China:

"I should like to make it clear that the United States Government considers that the Soviet Union draft resolution presents to the Council a procedural question involving the credentials of a representative of a member."^{1/}

24. We do not, of course, deny for a moment the importance of this issue, then as now. The proper representation of the People's Republic of China is, as I have mentioned already, of great consequence for the United Nations. It is also of importance to many individual Member States, especially, I may

^{1/} See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, No. 2*, 460th meeting, p. 6.

say, to those of Asia. But this does not detract at all from the fundamental fact that this issue concerns the procedural question of the credentials of a Member State.

25. In this respect, I may recall the item concerning the question of the representation of the Republic of the Congo (Leopoldville), which was dealt with at the fifteenth session of the General Assembly. This, too, was a matter of consequence for the United Nations. It was a matter which most Member States, and in particular those of Africa and Asia, considered to be an important question. It was the subject of controversy and divided opinion. Yet, no one—not even the representatives of Australia, Colombia, Italy, Japan and the United States of America—suggested that the Assembly should depart from the normal procedure on issues involving the credentials of a Member State. A decision was adopted by majority vote.

26. Indeed, what we find most disturbing in the present debate is this attempt to introduce in our proceedings a strange sort of double standard, for the sake of maintaining an untenable situation and postponing the inevitable. In our considered opinion, it is just this recourse to a double standard that constitutes the real threat to the United Nations. If allowed, it would seriously undermine the prestige and effectiveness of this international Organization. Certainly, it would shake public confidence, and our confidence, in the United Nations.

27. For very good and sound reasons, it has been the consistent practice for a Member State to be represented in the United Nations by the Government enjoying the obedience of the bulk of the population and exercising effective control over the territory. Yet, in the case of the People's Republic of China—and in the case of this Member State alone—an attempt is made to circumvent this accepted rule by introducing completely irrelevant and subjective elements into the question of representation. When we consider soberly the items that are included on our agenda, the charges and counter-charges that are constantly made in this body, the bloodshed and indignities that are perpetrated in the name of colonialism, can anyone then truly doubt the havoc that such a precedent would create in the United Nations? Can anyone imagine the future of the United Nations if the question of representation were transformed into a morality play, with each Member State having the right to judge between the saint and the sinner?

28. Behind the cover of all sorts of subjective judgments, certain Powers are seeking, in effect, to place a Member State of the United Nations, the People's Republic of China, on probation. They desire to single out this vigorous and proud nation for such humiliating treatment. This is something, however, that no self-respecting Government and people can or will accept.

29. It has been argued that the Government of the People's Republic of China should not be represented in this international Organization because it came to power by force of arms. But, then, how many Member States seated here and now are represented by Governments that came to power in a national revolutionary struggle and by force of arms? I believe that, when we go back in history, that includes almost all not excepting my own. Are we then to adopt one criterion for the Government of the People's Republic of China and another for those of all other Member States?

30. It was further argued that the Government of the People's Republic of China should be excluded because it refuses to renounce the use of force. But, again, how many Member States seated here—and, in particular, the great Powers with their enormous arsenals of weapons—have renounced the use of force in defence of what they consider to be their national interests? Look at the Berlin crisis, for instance, where a great Power has declared its intention to use force, if necessary, to maintain all its rights. And have the authorities of Taiwan, who annually announce their intentions—or, I should rather say, their delusions—of returning to the mainland, renounced the use of force?

31. In the statement of the representative of the United States, we also find the rather curious interpretation that the demand to restore China's legitimate rights can have only one meaning, "that the United Nations should acquiesce in Communist China's design to conquer Taiwan and the 11 million people who live there" [1069th meeting, para. 347]. If we follow this reasoning to its logical conclusion, then when the representative of the United States further spoke of maintaining the "legitimate rights" of the authorities in Taiwan, he can only have meant that the United Nations should acquiesce in Taiwan's design to conquer the mainland of China and the 700 million people who live there. The absurdity of this kind of argument is, of course, obvious.

32. As is generally recognized, and even claimed by both parties to the controversy, Taiwan is a part of the territory of China. It is, in fact, a province of China and, as such, has no international status. The problem of Taiwan is a purely internal matter, to be resolved by the Government and people of China. At the same time, the United Nations, under its Charter, does have a responsibility to endeavour, as far as possible, to promote the peaceful reunification of the province of Taiwan with the mainland of China, in conformity with the provisions of the post-war agreements. That would be a big contribution to peace in Asia and the world as a whole. However, even to embark on such an effort to settle peacefully the problem of Taiwan demands, *a priori*, the full participation in this Organization of the representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

33. Finally, the matter of China's relations with other States was mentioned by the representative of the United States. We really do not understand what this has to do with the question of representation. After all, the majority of Member States represented here have differences—and even differences of the most serious nature—with one or another Member State. Indonesia is not excluded from this state of affairs. Nor is there anything new or startling about the fact that differences and sources of conflict exist among nations. We live in a quarrelling world; a world in which the forces for peace must contend with and seek to overcome the ignoble aggressive instincts of man; and that is, indeed, a *raison d'être* for the United Nations.

34. For our part, however, I can say that we enjoy very good relations with the Government of the People's Republic of China, based on the principles of equality, of mutual benefit, and of non-interference in the domestic policies of each other's country. My Government has concluded with the Government of the People's Republic of China a treaty of friendship,

an agreement on cultural co-operation and, perhaps most important, an agreement^{2/} that has finally resolved the heretofore vexing problem of dual citizenship.

35. Under this latter agreement, the previous practice whereby overseas Chinese in Indonesia enjoyed dual citizenship has been abolished on the basis of a free choice between adopting citizenship of the Republic of Indonesia or that of the People's Republic of China. A cornerstone of this agreement is the provision in article 11, urging citizens of the Republic of Indonesia residing in the territory of the People's Republic of China and the citizens of the People's Republic of China residing in the territory of the Republic of Indonesia to "respect the laws and customs of the country of their residence, and also not to take part in political activities in the country of their residence".^{3/}

36. In contrast to these friendly and co-operative relations, Indonesia's experience with the authorities in Taiwan has not been a happy one. Their hostile and even aggressive attitude toward the Government and the people of Indonesia has taken the form of harbouring and sheltering all sorts of adventurers on their territory, including the saboteurs of the aircraft of Air India which was carrying representatives of the People's Republic of China to the Asian-African Conference in Bandung in 1955. More recently, this aggressiveness was exemplified in the moral, material and financial assistance that Taiwan gave to the rebel elements which, a few years ago, seriously disturbed our national life.

37. I will say no more on this subject, however, since we have come here neither to praise nor to condemn, but to proceed with the task of settling this long-standing problem of representation. From what I have already said, it should indeed be clear that the introduction of extraneous matters, of moral judgments and of a double standard, can lead us nowhere.

38. However, there is another aspect of the almost desperate attempt to keep the People's Republic of China beyond the pale of this international forum that deserves a few remarks. The great illusion that has been preserved here in the past twelve years seems to have given rise to a great contradiction.

39. Thus, the representative of the United States, in his statement of 1 December [1069th meeting], argued that the presence of representatives of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations would be disruptive and would not contribute to the solutions of the many dangerous questions which confront us. Yet there is hardly a representative among us who, at one time or another, has not acknowledged the necessity of the participation of the People's Republic of China in our deliberations for the settlement of international problems, and especially the settlement of the foremost problem before this Organization—the question of disarmament.

40. Even Mr. Stevenson, the representative of the United States, recognized this necessity when, in an article entitled "Putting First Things First", published in the American quarterly review *Foreign*

Affairs, in January 1960 (p. 203), he wrote in his usual lucid style:

"... it is clear that no general control of disarmament has any value unless it includes China, and it is difficult to see how China can accept international control when it is not formally a member of international society. Moreover, as a member of the United Nations, Communist China, with a quarter of the world's population, would be more accountable to world opinion than as an outcast."

We agree with this argument. It defines, to a considerable extent, our own present position on this matter.

41. Let me, however, give one other example of these apparent contradictions. On the one hand, we were told that the seating of the representatives of the People's Republic of China in our midst would be demoralizing and bad for the United Nations. On the other hand, we know that the Government of the People's Republic of China has participated in international conferences and in talks at Panmunjom, Warsaw and Geneva. This, by itself, is irrefutable evidence of the fact that it is not the authorities in Taiwan, but only the Government of the People's Republic of China, that can speak for and represent the interests of the Chinese people.

42. The representative of Cambodia, speaking for a nation which, though differing radically in its governmental structure from that of its great neighbour to the north, enjoys relations of mutual co-operation and benefit with China, referred in his statement of 1 December [1069th meeting] to the positive contributions made by the People's Republic of China to the success of the two Geneva conferences dealing with Indo-China. And only a few days after the representative of the United States argued against the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, the acting head of the United States delegation to the fourteen-nation conference on Laos,^{4/} Mr. William H. Sullivan, called this conference, in which the Government of the People's Republic of China participated actively and constructively, "a pattern for peace"—I repeat, "a pattern for peace not only in Laos, not only in South-East Asia, but throughout the world". Mr. Sullivan went on to say: "What we see in it is a template for a peaceful pattern, which gives hope that there can be peaceful settlement of major differences in major areas of friction."^{5/}

43. Well, if the Geneva conference on Laos—a conference designed to bring peace and stability to the Kingdom of Laos, a conference in which the People's Republic of China played such an important role—is "a template for a peaceful pattern", then why do we not follow this guide in the United Nations, in this Organization for peace? We really do not comprehend this contradiction, this double standard, whereby the voice of China is heard to advantage in one international forum and silenced in another; unless, of course, the United Nations is considered too delicate, too brittle, to face present-day realities. Or, possibly this Organization of 103 Members, many from Asia and Africa, is considered too unruly a body, too

^{2/} Treaty between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of Indonesia, signed on 22 April 1955.

^{3/} See *International Affairs* (published in Moscow), No. 6, June 1955, p. 154.

^{4/} International Conference for the Settlement of the Laotian Question, opened on 16 May 1961.

^{5/} This statement was published in *The New York Times* of 5 December 1961.

immature to confer with the People's Republic of China. We must definitely reject both of these postulates and we trust that this Assembly will do likewise. As I said at the very beginning, the time for decision has come.

44. I have referred to some extent to the statement made on this item by the representative of the United States. Permit me, however, one last quotation from that statement of 1 December. Mr. Stevenson declared:

"To consider this subject in its proper light, we must see it against the background of the era in which we live. It is an era of sweeping revolutionary changes." [1069th meeting, para. 10.]

We could not agree more with this statement. We are living in a rapidly changing world. This is 1961, not 1945. We must leave the past and adjust our thinking and our actions to the realities of the present and the needs of the future.

45. To a certain and commendable degree, the United Nations already reflects the revolutionary changes that are sweeping fast across the continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America. But in one vast area of our globe, inhabited by a fourth of mankind, the United Nations has blindly set its face against the inexorable wind of change. It has sought to hold back the clock—an effort that can only give rise to the gravest consequences and result in ultimate failure; for the hard reality can be pushed aside for a time, but in the end it will break through, and only those will suffer who, ostrich-like, have sought to deny its existence. Let us make certain, then, that the victim will not be the United Nations and the hopes of all mankind for international comity and peace.

46. We ask only that the United Nations face reality now. We ask only that, whatever the effort may be, this Assembly should act with objectivity and foresight. We ask that that decision should be taken which will restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations; for, in cherishing the past, let us no less clearly discern the present and work to unlock the promises of the future.

47. Mr. MEZINCESCU (Romania) (translated from French): The absence of the People's Republic of China from the United Nations profoundly affects the very foundations of the Organization. It detracts from its effectiveness and its capacity to tackle major international problems with full authority and responsibility. This has been emphasized from the rostrum of the United Nations on several occasions by many representatives at previous sessions and during the present session.

48. International developments have shown with the greatest clarity the serious jeopardy in which the obstructive attitude of the Western Powers towards the representation of China in the United Nations have placed our Organization.

49. The number of States that have declared themselves in favour of re-establishing the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations has grown year after year. Among these States we find most of the Asian and African countries, including all China's neighbours. As the debates at the present session of the General Assembly have shown, only the United States and some (not even all) of its allies continue to oppose an equitable settlement of this question.

50. The position of the Government of the Romanian People's Republic with respect to this problem is well known. It was clearly re-stated from this rostrum during the fifteenth session of the General Assembly by the President of the Council of State of the Romanian People's Republic, Mr. Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, who said that:

"... the Romanian People's Republic, together with all peace-loving States, demands that the General Assembly should decide to exclude from its ranks Chiang Kai-shek's puppets and to re-establish the legitimate rights of the great Chinese people in the United Nations." [891st meeting, para. 229.]

51. The Chinese State is one of the founder Members of the United Nations. China took part in the San Francisco Conference. It signed and ratified the Charter of the United Nations and, under Article 23 of that instrument, is one of the five permanent members of the Security Council. The proclamation of the People's Republic of China on 1 October 1949, as a result of the victorious revolution of the Chinese people, did not and could not in any way affect the status of the Chinese State in international law. The principle which applies in this connexion is that of the continuity of the State as a subject of international law, and this is one of the fundamental principles of contemporary international law. It is by virtue of this principle that the majority of representatives of Member States are now occupying their present seats in the General Assembly.

52. It is absurd to speak of the "admission" of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, as the representative of the United States did the other day. From the legal standpoint, the People's Republic of China is a Member of the United Nations. It has a right to be represented by its legal Government in all organs of the United Nations.

53. The only legal, true and effective Government of China is the Central People's Government, which functions in the capital of the People's Republic of China, Peking. This Government has effective authority and control over the huge territory of the People's Republic of China, and enjoys the full confidence and support of the Chinese people. In accordance with the rules of international law, this Government alone may represent China in its foreign relations and, in particular, in the United Nations; and this Government alone may speak and enter into international commitments on behalf of the Chinese people. All the great authorities on international law are in agreement on this point. To add just one quotation to the many already given by other representatives, I shall merely recall the opinion of the well-known American jurist, Quincy Wright, who wrote in this respect:

"The Peiping Government appears to control all of China except a few small coastal islands in the Straits of Formosa still occupied by Chiang's forces. It is, therefore, a general de facto government alone capable of binding China under the principle of international law ..." ^{6/}

54. In the speech, filled with hatred for the Chinese people, which he delivered from this rostrum a few days ago, even the United States representative himself was compelled to admit that the clique of refugees in Taiwan controls only a tiny part of Chinese

^{6/} See Journal of International Affairs, 1957, vol. XI, No. 2, p. 182.

territory; it is common knowledge that the puppets in Taiwan retain their hold over this small portion of Chinese territory solely because Taiwan is occupied by United States Armed forces.

55. Although the representatives of the monopolist circles in the United States, those deadly enemies of the Chinese people, continue to refer to the Taiwan refugee clique as a "government", this has no effect on political realities. China continues to exist as a great Power which occupies a large area of the globe and has a population of some 700 million inhabitants. This hard fact cannot be altered by the illusions of bankrupt politicians, the intrigues of the inveterate enemies of the Chinese people, or even by military adventures.

56. The United States Government recognizes and maintains diplomatic relations with the Chiang Kai-shek clique merely in order to provide some semblance of legal justification for the United States aggression against China constituted by the occupation of Taiwan and the other coastal islands. But under international law, illicit acts cannot confer rights upon the States that commit them, nor can they entail the suppression of the inalienable rights of the State against which they are committed.

57. As regards Mr. Stevenson's assertion [1069th meeting] that the de jure authority of the Chiang Kai-shek clique extends throughout the territory of China, it is evident that even the United States Government does not take it seriously. If that Government took seriously the statement made by its representative from this rostrum, it is not with the representatives of the People's Republic of China that the United States should be negotiating on the problem of settling the Laotian situation, as it is now doing at Geneva, but with the representatives of the Taiwan puppet régime—with whom, moreover, the United States diplomats would have reached an understanding—for they are apparently very docile!

58. The United States Government is not unaware that the representatives of the Taiwan clique cannot assume any legal commitments in the name of any State whatsoever, for they represent no one de jure and are quite incapable of fulfilling any international obligation into which they might enter.

59. The statement that the person occupying the seat in this hall that rightfully belongs to the People's Republic of China represents the Chinese State, a founder Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, is devoid of any foundation.

60. Ludicrous though it is, the United States representative has advanced as one of his main arguments in support of that contention the fact that the jurisdiction of the Chiang Kai-shek clique extends over a territory similar in size to that of Albania, Belgium, Cyprus, El Salvador, Haiti, Israel, Lebanon or Luxembourg. Such an argument can only be described as ridiculous in connexion with the representation of a permanent member of the Security Council.

61. The permanent members of the Security Council were certainly not designated on the basis of the sympathies, illusions or unjustified claims of certain countries or circles with greater or lesser responsibilities and with a greater or lesser understanding of the international balance of power. The permanent members of the Security Council were designated on the basis of their status as great Powers and, conse-

quently, of the part played by them in international affairs.

62. But if it were a matter of applying quantitative criteria of the type used by the United States representative, it would be sufficient to recall that the annual natural increase in the population of the People's Republic of China is, in itself, twice as great as the total population of Taiwan and that the Chinese island of Taiwan represents only four thousandths—0.004—of the territory of China. Mr. Stevenson considers that all these zeros provide sufficient justification for the Chiang Kai-shek clique to continue occupying a seat in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. The least that can be said of this kind of argument is that it is null and void. It is like claiming that the United States should be represented in the United Nations by the authorities of the island of Key West and not by the Government in Washington. But even this analogy which I have used merely in order to illustrate the absurdity of the United States argument, is too flattering for the Chiang Kai-shek clique, since the latter does not even represent the population of Taiwan. Everyone knows that the Chiang Kai-shek régime is detested by the population of Taiwan, which considers it completely alien and hostile to their aspirations. In passing, it should be mentioned that the United States armed forces and fleet are there for the purpose of defending that rotten and corrupt régime from the wrath of the people, which might at any time result in outbreaks of violence, as occurred not long ago.

63. All this is common knowledge. Professor Robert A. Scalapino of the University of California wrote as follows on 27 September 1960 in The New York Times:

"... it is well known here that the Kuomintang dictatorship in Taiwan is run wholly by a small clique of mainland refugees. The eight million Taiwanese have no voice in the government of this island."

64. A well-known United States author and expert on the problem of South East Asia, William F. Lederer, whose book on United States diplomacy is worth reading, writes as follows:

"It is barely a decade since Chiang's armies murdered and oppressed the Formosans, who, at first, had given them welcome and refuge. It takes almost a pathological desire for self-deception to assume the Formosans have forgotten this mass-murder and thievery so quickly. A warped imagination is required to believe that Formosans, only ten years after, now love the Chiang Kai-shek Government."^{7/}

65. The fact that the Taiwan régime is a fiction is recognized even by United States Senator Wayne Morse, to whom the Polish delegation has already referred and who has made the following statement:

"Everybody ought to recognize that Nationalist China is a puppet State"—it is not we who are making this statement, but United States Senator Wayne Morse!—"supported by American money and that it should not be permitted to dictate policies in that part of the world."

66. We trust that the majority of this Assembly, having neither a pathological desire for self-decep-

^{7/} See A Nation of Sheep, New York, W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1961, p. 47.

tion nor a warped imagination, will base its decision on the realities of the world in which we live. We trust that it will discard the fiction so ardently defended by the enemies of the Chinese people and will reinstate the true representatives of the Chinese people in their lawful rights.

67. As to the illusions of the enemies of the Chinese people, life itself has shown that, although the United States and other Powers refuse to recognize the People's Republic of China and are depriving it of its lawful rights in the United Nations, this has in no way hindered that country's consolidation and its continuous all-round development. In the course of twelve years of popular democratic rule, the Chinese people have wrought fundamental social and economic changes and have achieved major successes in the elimination of the grim heritage of the time when China was the subject of exploitation and bargaining on the part of the imperialist Powers.

68. By means of its foreign policy, based on the principle of peaceful coexistence, People's China has succeeded, despite the campaign of slander waged against it by the Western propaganda machine, in winning many friends in the countries of Asia and throughout the world. At present, the People's Republic of China has diplomatic relations with over forty countries in all parts of the world.

69. The United States delegation, to support its hostile stand against the Chinese people, is still referring to the so-called aggressive behaviour of the People's Republic of China and is still accusing it of refusing to renounce the use of force.

70. But at the very moment when Mr. Stevenson was speaking from this rostrum, United States cruisers, United States military aircraft and units of the United States Marine Corps were making their appearance off the coasts of the Dominican Republic with a view to the use, or attempted use, of "gunboat diplomacy" on yet another occasion. At that same time, United States pilots or instructors were active in Laos. United States experts in guerrilla warfare, packs of American dogs trained to attack defenceless people and tear them to pieces, and tons of United States munitions were being landed in South Viet-Nam in order to step up the war against the Viet-Nameese people.

71. The United States has spread its network of aggressive military bases like a spider's web over the Pacific Ocean, thousands of miles from its own territory. The United States air, land and sea forces, equipped with nuclear weapons and missiles, occupy extensive areas in the Far East, threaten the independence of the peoples, stifle national liberation movements whenever they can and engage in provocative military actions which constitute a serious menace to world peace.

72. This is the real situation as regards "aggressive behaviour" and "the use of force".

73. The United States still occupies South Korea with its armed forces and continues to use South Korean territory as a base for aggression against the People's Republic of China.

74. The United States assumes about 80 per cent of the cost of maintaining South Korea's army of over 700,000 men. That army is in fact under the direct control of United States generals, who are responsible for all the acts of repression committed by cor-

rupt governments against the South Korean people and for the suppression of all liberty in that country.

75. The aim of the fascist-type military coup d'état in South Korea of 16 May 1961 was to extinguish, by ruthless measures of repression, the patriotic struggle of the South Korean people for the peaceful unification of the country, and for South Korea's liberation from the colonial yoke of United States imperialism and the tyranny of a dictatorial and corrupt régime. The United States is to blame not only for the military aggression against the Korean people but also for all the misfortunes which have befallen that people during the sixteen years of United States military occupation.

76. In contrast, it is common knowledge that the People's Republic of China withdrew its troops from North Korea many years ago for the very purpose of facilitating the peaceful settlement of the problem of Korean unification.

77. Following the example of their United States masters, the mercenaries of Chiang Kai-shek, armed by the Pentagon, have engaged and continue to engage in acts of military provocation. We are familiar with the role they have played in the struggles in Laos.

78. Furthermore, U Nu, the Prime Minister of Burma, has more than once accused the United States of having aided the Chiang Kai-shek troops which invaded Burmese territory. In February 1961, the Burmese Government addressed a cable to the Secretary-General of the United Nations denouncing the aggressive activities undertaken in Burmese territory by Chiang Kai-shek guerrilla forces armed by the United States.

79. The People's Republic of China, for its part, has signed frontier agreements with Nepal^{8/} and Burma^{9/} settling complicated disputes which had existed for centuries. Certain imperialist Powers had tried more than once to use these differences to dismember Asian countries and bring them under colonial rule. On October 5, 1961, when the frontier agreement between China and Nepal was signed, King Mahendra of Nepal declared at Peking that the delimitation had been effected on the basis of the traditional frontier and in accordance with the principles of equality, friendship and mutual advantage and understanding.

80. Indeed we are convinced that any attempt to undermine the friendship between the People's Republic of China and its neighbours is doomed to failure.

81. Today nobody, not even the enemies of the People's Republic of China, can deny the influence that China exerts in international life. The People's Republic of China is a consistent advocate of general disarmament and of the permanent abolition of colonialism. It vigorously supports the struggle for national liberation of the peoples of all countries dominated by imperialism. Everyone also knows of the constructive proposals made by the People's Republic of China in August 1960 for the establishment of a denuclearized peace zone in Asia and the Pacific.

82. As the events of the past ten years show, no important problem in the Asian continent has been resolved without the participation of the Government of the People's Republic of China. Suffice it to recall

^{8/} Agreement concluded on 5 October 1961.

^{9/} Agreement concluded on 29 January 1960.

in this connexion the participation of the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China in the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indo-China^{10/} and in the current Conference for the Settlement of the Laotian Question.^{11/}

83. We know of no occasion in the history of recent international relations when the United States Government or the Government of any other Western Power has tried to negotiate with the Chiang Kai-shek clique with a view to finding solutions to important problems affecting world peace and security. On the contrary, it was with the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China that the Western Governments have had to sit down at the negotiating table, thus implicitly recognizing that only those representatives can speak on behalf of China and that only the Government of the People's Republic of China can assume international obligations on behalf of the Chinese people and State.

84. Mr. Stevenson has tried here to paint a dark picture of the situation that would be created in the United Nations if the People's Republic of China was to occupy its legitimate place. He tried to alarm the small States with one sinister prediction after another. But the representatives of many small States have sat at the negotiating table with the representatives of the People's Republic of China without showing signs of the fear apparently felt by certain great Powers and above all the United States.

85. In the circumstances, we might ask why, in the case of specific issues affecting international peace and security, the United States agrees to negotiate with the representatives of the People's Republic of China, whereas in the case of the United Nations, it does everything possible to prevent the representatives of the People's Republic of China from taking their rightful place. The answer is of course simple: the United States wants to continue subordinating the Organization to the aggressive aims of its foreign policy. It takes the view that what it cannot accomplish elsewhere it may accomplish in the United Nations.

86. Not long ago—and I do not bring these charges lightly—Mr. Stevenson stated before a Committee of the United States Senate that the United States finds in the United Nations an extremely important instrument of its foreign policy. Why does the United States representative not speak sincerely and admit to the General Assembly that his country's opposition to restoring the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is dictated, *inter alia*, by the desire to continue using the United Nations as a tool for the aggressive foreign policy of the United States?

87. The United States cannot get used to the idea that the Chinese people, at the cost of immense effort and sacrifice, have achieved a social and political system which has given them real political independence and has opened the way to progress and prosperity. The victory of the Chinese revolution—another great fact of our time—which dealt a very heavy blow to the entire colonial system, is also not to the taste of this colonial Power.

88. The attempts of the United States and other countries to impose their own absurd policy towards China on the United Nations can only be described as

arbitrary action, contrary to the Charter, and should be resolutely rejected by the General Assembly.

89. The delegation of the People's Republic of Romania considers that there should be no more beating about the bush on the question of restoring the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and that this question must be settled during the present session of the General Assembly.

90. The overwhelming majority of those who have spoken from this rostrum have been representatives of countries which follow an honest and friendly policy towards the Chinese people. Their own words have reflected their esteem for the Chinese people and their Government, the Central People's Government of China. They have, at the same time, expressed their profound concern over the harmful effects of the continued absence of the People's Republic of China from the Organization. They have expressed their concern over the deterioration of the international situation and the diminished ability of the United Nations to find solutions to problems of the greatest importance for international peace and security, such as general and complete disarmament and the prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons and of the danger of a nuclear war.

91. It is also necessary to bear in mind that the United Nations is legally incapacitated as regards the solution of such problems as enlarging the Economic and Social Council or increasing the number of non-permanent members of the Security Council, since it is not legally possible to amend the Charter unless representatives of the legal Government of China participate. All those who declare themselves in favour of restoring the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations must realize that on this matter no compromise solution is possible.

92. There is only one Chinese State, a founder Member of the United Nations, just as there is only one Government—the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China—which can represent and act on behalf of the Chinese State.

93. The Romanian delegation is convinced that most of the Members of the General Assembly fully appreciate that no Government worthy of the name, and still less the Government of a country such as the People's Republic of China, which contains one-quarter of the world's population, will ever consent to take a seat in the same place as the representatives of a small group of renegades who keep their hold on a fraction of the national territory solely as a result of foreign military occupation.

94. The problem of the representation of China can be solved only by expelling the persons who are usurping China's seat and by inviting representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China to take the seat which is theirs by right.

95. The United States has submitted a draft resolution [A/L.372] by which it is trying to create confusion in order to postpone—because, when all is said and done, prevention is impossible—a settlement of the problem of restoring the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

96. This manoeuvre is based on one premise which is true and another which is false. The true premise is the State Department's judicious evaluation of the fact that the number of those who vote with the

^{10/} Held from 16 June to 21 July 1954.

^{11/} Opened at Geneva on 16 May 1961.

United States against restoring the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China has fallen and will continue to fall progressively in the future. The false premise is the deliberate distortion of the nature of the legal action which the General Assembly should take in order to settle the problem.

97. Mr. Chou En-Lai, Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China, has said: "The United Nations must expel the Chiang Kai-shek clique and restore China's legitimate rights, otherwise it would be impossible for China to have anything to do with the United Nations." Commenting on this statement, Mr. Stevenson said the other day that the first part of the sentence meant the expulsion of the Republic of China from the United Nations [1069th meeting, para. 34].

98. But there is no question of that. The General Assembly is not called upon to discuss the expulsion of any Member State whatever, and still less of China. The General Assembly is called upon to put an end to a situation which is legally and politically abnormal, namely, one in which a State which is a founder Member of the Organization and a permanent member of the Security Council is not represented in the Assembly by its legal Government.

99. The decision which the General Assembly must take in order to ensure adequate representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is strictly a procedural decision. It is in no way different from the decisions taken, on the basis of the report of the Credentials Committee, regarding all the delegations here present. By a simple majority vote the General Assembly establishes the existence or non-existence of full powers issued by the legal Government of a Member State in accordance with article 27 of the Rules of Procedure.

100. There are no legal grounds for adopting different procedure with respect to the representation of the People's Republic of China from that adopted with respect to the representation of all States Members of the United Nations. Any vote in favour of the United States draft resolution can, therefore, only constitute an act of profound hostility towards the Chinese people and their legal Government.

101. The Romanian delegation will vote against the draft resolution submitted by the United States [A/L.372] and will give full support to the draft resolution submitted by the USSR [A/L.360], under which the General Assembly would resolve "to remove immediately from all United Nations organs the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique who are unlawfully occupying the place of China in the United Nations" and invite "the Government of the People's Republic of China to send its representatives to participate in the work of the United Nations and of all its organs".

102. Mr. Sisouk NA CHAMPAESAK (Laos) (translated from French): Since 1 December, the General Assembly has been discussing items 90 and 91 of its agenda, which concern the representation of China in the United Nations. For more than ten years this question has been raised in various organs of the United Nations. It has been and remains a bone of contention between East and West and it gives rise to many impassioned debates. From year to year a solution is postponed. Now the question is being debated in plenary in the General Assembly, which is giving it thorough consideration. This indicates the considerable importance attached by all countries to

the search for a just and equitable solution to this problem.

103. In taking part in this debate, we do not intend to discuss the merits and qualifications of the People's Republic of China, and still less its political and social system. We know that the People's Republic is a large country with vast manpower and immense resources and that the Central Government exercises full sovereignty on the Chinese mainland. Furthermore, the Government of the People's Republic of China played an active part in the Geneva Conference on Indochina in 1954 and is at present playing an important role in working out my country's status as a neutral. It is undeniable that the existence of a great country with 650 million inhabitants cannot be ignored or disregarded for long in international affairs.

104. My delegation considers that it has more than one qualification for participation in this debate. First, my country, the Kingdom of Laos, has a common frontier with China for several hundred kilometres; secondly, a large Chinese colony of nearly 100,000 people lives and does business in Laos; finally, China plays an important part in the affairs of South East Asia. My intention is not to study this problem from an emotional or legal standpoint, but to emphasize the disturbing nature of certain events which have their origin in Peking.

105. My country has never known peace, because of foreign interference from the north. With the support of Peking, the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam, playing the part of an intermediary, an agent, in the penetration of communism into South East Asia, has blatantly interfered in the domestic affairs of my country, provoking and instigating disturbances and civil war by its aggressive actions. The immediate proximity of my country to this "intolerant world" has meant, alas, that my people have not enjoyed the peace and prosperity which are essential if they are to realize and consolidate their independence. On the contrary, since it became fully free, my country has known nothing, year after year, but difficulties caused by threats, subversion and aggressive interference carried on with foreign support. My country, which has always wished to remain aloof from disputes and conflicts, has nevertheless found itself, and still is, caught in their net. Yet in Laos there is no suggestion of pomp or pride, of adventure or glory; everything bespeaks moderation and simplicity. Throughout their history the Lao people have practised a religion which tends towards inner tranquillity, tolerance and meditation rather than violence. The Soviet Ambassador to the Lao Court himself recognized this, when two weeks ago, he stated in Vientiane, after being received by our Prime Minister, H.H. Prince Boun Oum, and by General Phoumi Nosavan, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of National Defence, that in Laos "everyone was for peace and neutrality, including Prince Boun Oum and General Phoumi Nosavan".

106. We are against violence in all its forms and manifestations, in deed or in word. Yet for three years Laos has been subjected to an uninterrupted flow of slander and threats from Peking and Hanoi radio. This verbal violence, which is under official auspices and control, a violence which maintains anxiety and fear, is in shocking contrast to the Lao people's desire to live in peace and as good neighbours, according to the principles of peaceful co-existence. Peace cannot be built with threats and

insults. The language of peace and of peaceful co-existence must be spoken everywhere and in all circumstances. In particular, there must be an end to the present aggressive hostility towards our institutions, to the vicious denigration of our leaders and to the methods of violence and sabotage practised within our country by those who bear the mark of revolution and take orders from abroad. In such circumstances, how can we confidently stretch out our hands to those who daily rain down insults and threats upon us and who are trying to destroy our sovereignty and independence?

107. In considering the question of the admission of new Members to the United Nations, it is not our custom to exclude anyone or any country. This year, in my statement during the general debate in the Assembly [1011th meeting], I urged the admission of the Mongolian People's Republic and of Mauritania, and we are happy to see these countries taking part in our discussions today.

108. My delegation considers that the problem of the representation of China in the United Nations remains unsolved because the international situation has not improved, because methods of violence have been used too often and because the policy of force is being perpetuated everywhere, particularly in South East Asia, in the form of subversion. My country has largely borne the brunt of this policy, and now South Viet-Nam is also feeling its effects. I have listened very carefully to the arguments of those who have spoken in favour of the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations. Some of these arguments are logical and valid; others are based on pure speculation. I myself am still uncertain. I hesitate to venture any prophesy regarding the future, but cannot resist the temptation to ask a few anxious questions.

109. Does anyone imagine that the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations would solve all problems of war and peace, or even of disarmament, in an instant, as if at the touch of a magic wand? Does anyone really believe that that country's admission would add to the prestige of the United Nations? What are we to do with the Republic of China? What is its fate? It is one of the founder Members of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, and it has diplomatic relations with a number of countries. Can a Member which is loyally fulfilling its obligations under the Charter be expelled from the Organization? Is there not a danger that any hasty and imperfect solution might prove a failure? And would not the consequences of such a failure dangerously intensify the cold war? And, if we were to take such a course could we be sure that we were working to strengthen peace, in accordance with the Principles of the Charter?

110. These are some of the many questions that have not yet been answered. My delegation thinks it would be wise and realistic to take present political realities into account, although we should not allow the question to remain unsettled for too long.

111. I should now like to exercise my right of reply to the representative of the Soviet Union. In his statement on 1 December he spoke of United States interference in my country's domestic affairs, saying that the United States had "... organized a revolt by the Savannakhet group against the lawful Government of Prince Souvanna Phouma" [1068th meeting, para. 54].

The representative of the Soviet Union would be well advised not to raise the subject of interference in my country's domestic affairs, because I would have a good deal to say about it. I do not wish to engage in a controversy with him or to go into the background of the regrettable developments affecting the Lao people. All I should like to say here is that, with regard to the crisis through which my country has been passing for more than a year, neither the Government of the Soviet Union, nor the Government of the People's Republic of China, nor the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam can claim virtues which they do not possess except at the risk of distorting the facts. It is not proper for me to discuss the matter at length here. It is now being considered by the representatives of the fourteen nations assembled at Geneva. For the first time a gleam of hope has appeared and there is some chance of an international agreement being concluded which would enable Laos to follow its own path of neutrality and peace and which would protect it from foreign interference.

112. I am glad that the representative of the USSR at the Geneva Conference on Laos^{12/} has shown understanding and objectivity in dealing with my country's problems. That has seldom been the attitude of his colleague from the People's Republic of China, who have beaten all records for verbal violence.

113. Lastly, my delegation would like to say that it will support any reasonable and just settlement of this delicate problem, provided that it takes present realities into account and is consistent with the remarks I have just made.

AGENDA ITEM 93

An international investigation into the conditions and circumstances resulting in the tragic death of Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld and of members of the party accompanying him (continued)*

114. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I wish to draw attention to the decision taken by the General Assembly on 26 October 1961 in connexion with the tragedy which cost the late Secretary-General of the United Nations his life. In its resolution 1628 (XVI) the General Assembly decided that an investigation of an international character should be held into the conditions and circumstances of the tragic death of Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld and the persons accompanying him. In the same resolution the General Assembly decided to appoint a Commission of five eminent persons to carry out such an investigation and to report its findings to the President of the General Assembly within three months of its appointment.

115. However, the members of this Commission have not yet been named. Consultations have taken place among a number of delegations with a view to remedying this omission. These negotiations have led to the suggestion that the Assembly should be asked to approve the proposal that the Commission provided for in resolution 1628 (XVI) should be composed of the following members:

Mr. S. B. Jones (Sierra Leone);
Mr. Raúl Quijano (Argentina);

^{12/} International Conference for the Settlement of the Laotian Question, which opened on 16 May 1961.

*Resumed from the 1042nd meeting.

Mr. Alfred Emil Sandström (Sweden);
Mr. Rishikesh Shaha (Nepal);
Mr. Nikola Srzentić (Yugoslavia).

116. The consultations that have taken place on the membership of this Commission seem to show that there is broad agreement among Members of the General Assembly. If there is no objection to the appointment of these members of the Commission, I

shall take it that the Assembly approves the choice of the five persons I have just mentioned as members of the international Commission of investigation provided for in resolution 1628 (XVI).

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.