



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 73:</i>	
<i>Question of Tibet</i>	469

President: Mr. Víctor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

AGENDA ITEM 73

Question of Tibet

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): In today's plenary meeting we shall begin consideration of agenda item 73, the Question of Tibet, which the General Assembly decided would be dealt with directly without being referred to a Main Committee. With regard to the item under consideration, a draft resolution has been submitted by the Federation of Malaya and Ireland [A/L.264].

2. Dato' KAMIL (Federation of Malaya): Before I proceed to open the debate on the item on the agenda, may I, on behalf of my Government and delegation, express to the delegation of India, and through it to the people and Government of India, how very distressed we are to learn of the disaster caused by the recent heavy floods which have brought great misery and suffering and loss of property to our friends in India. Our very sincere concern and sympathy go to all of them.

3. Speaking for my delegation, I would like to make our position clear at the very outset that in co-sponsoring [A/4234] the item under discussion and the draft resolution [A/L.264] now before this Assembly, we are concerned only with the issue of the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms. This is a grave issue that must intimately concern all freedom-loving peoples. We maintain that any systematic violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, be it in Tibet or anywhere else in any part of the world, must be a matter to be taken up by the United Nations.

4. It is not the intention of my delegation to turn this item into a controversial political issue that might aggravate international tension or prejudice the efforts now being made towards the improvement of international relations. On the contrary, we welcome these efforts and it is our hope that the negotiations now going on among the big Powers will ultimately lead to the realization of stable and lasting peace. We particularly welcome the meeting between President Eisenhower of the United States and Chairman Khrushchev of the Soviet Union, and their exchange of visits, as a contribution towards the relaxation of existing international tension. However, we are conscious that, in our desire not to take any action that might be prejudicial to these efforts, we must not be lulled into the belief that by ignoring the acts of repression in Tibet and the systematic violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of the Tibetan people we are in fact

making our contribution towards world peace—for peace cannot for long remain secure if it is not based on justice for all the respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all peoples.

5. As a newly-emerged nation we are making every possible effort with all the available resources at our disposal to accelerate our social and economic development and raise the living standards of our people. And I am sure we are not alone in this endeavour. Needless to say, we are convinced that only in an atmosphere of international peace and security and in an atmosphere of friendship among nations can we make real and undisturbed progress towards economic prosperity. Indeed, this is one of the very reasons why we deplore the acts of repression in Tibet since we consider that the systematic violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the Tibetan people might have the effect of increasing international tension and embittering relations among peoples at the very time when encouraging efforts are being made by responsible leaders to improve international relations.

6. I would like also to make our position clear that in co-sponsoring this item we are acting entirely on our own initiative and in pursuance of our own independent foreign policy and not, as some delegations have baselessly alleged, at the machinations of some other Powers. May I point out that my Government was in fact one of the first to pronounce itself on the question of Tibet. As early as March 1959, our Minister of External Affairs made a statement deploring the ruthless suppression of the Tibetan people and declaring that as an Asian people believing in the principles of the United Nations Charter, we were firmly opposed to all brutal measures of suppression. This policy was further emphasized in the election manifesto of the Alliance Party. The overwhelming victory of the Alliance Party in the recent general elections in the Federation of Malaya is a clear reflection of our people's endorsement of the stand we are taking on Tibet. The allegations that have been made against us in the General Assembly are therefore not only utterly groundless but most insulting to our people and to our foreign policy, which is an independent policy and entirely our own.

7. Some delegations have questioned the competence of the General Assembly to discuss the Question of Tibet in view of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter and on grounds of their claim that Tibet is part of China. It is not our intention to raise in this debate the issue of Chinese sovereignty or suzerainty over Tibet since, as far as my delegation is concerned, this issue has no real relevance to the draft resolution under consideration. We have always taken the view that, while the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of any State must be upheld, any problem which involves a violation of the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and which might have far

reaching effects of increasing international tension cannot be regarded as exclusively an internal problem. It is on this ground, for instance, that we have once again, together with other Asian and African Members, proposed the inscription of the Question of Algeria and the Question of race conflict in South Africa on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly. In taking up the question of Tibet we have been guided by this same principle.

8. Our record in the two years that we have been in the United Nations clearly points to the consistency with which we have adhered to this principle of our foreign policy. This, I hope, will make it sufficiently clear that in taking up the Question of Tibet we are not in any way prompted by a mischievous motive of aggravating the cold war, nor are we doing so at the behest of some other Powers as has been suggested by some delegations in this Assembly.

9. Since the spring of this year when fighting broke out in Tibet between the Tibetan people and the armed forces of the People's Republic of China, the outside world has been disturbed and alarmed over reports of ruthless acts of repression and suppression committed against the Tibetan people. Our sympathy and admiration must go to the Dalai Lama who, in his determination to keep the spirit of his people alive and to tell the world of their plight and sufferings, had to flee from his country risking his life and enduring severe hardships.

10. Since his flight from Tibet the Dalai Lama has made several official statements about the repressive measures that have been taken against his people—all consistently pointing to a gross violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the Tibetan people. In his appeal of 9 September 1959 to the United Nations Secretary-General, the Dalai Lama gave a series of examples of acts of repression committed against the Tibetan people. He made the allegations, among others, that thousands of Tibetans were deprived of their properties and of every source of livelihood and were thus driven to death and desperation; that men, women and children were forced into labour gangs and to work on military constructions without payment or on nominal payment; that thousands of innocent Tibetans were brutally massacred; that a number of leading citizens were murdered without cause or justification; that every attempt was made to destroy the Tibetan religion and culture, and to this end thousands of monasteries were razed to the ground and sacred images and articles of religion completely destroyed.

11. There may be some delegations in this Assembly that, while feeling sympathetic towards the Dalai Lama and the Tibetan people, may yet entertain some doubts as to the reliability of the Dalai Lama's reports and as to whether these reports are sufficient to establish prima facie evidence of violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Tibet. In this connexion I would like to point out that the allegations made by the Dalai Lama are supported in no uncertain terms by the International Commission of Jurists, an independent and respected body, whose preliminary report on the events in Tibet entitled The Question of Tibet and the Rule of Law was published in Geneva in July this year.^{1/} I would refer only to that part of the report dealing with the violation of human rights, in which the Commission declares that the evidence showing vio-

lations by the Chinese authorities of the fundamental human rights of the Tibetans is very strong. The report gives a summary of the rights denied to the Tibetan people, which altogether points to a denial of almost everything that contributes to the dignity of man.

12. The violation of human rights as summarized by this report includes the violation of the rights to life, liberty and security; the infliction of forced labour on the Tibetans; the infliction of torture and cruel and degrading treatment; the violation of the rights of home and privacy; the denial of freedom of movement; the infliction of forced marriages between unwilling parties; the arbitrary violation of property rights; the systematic denial of the freedom of worship and religion; the suppression of freedom of expression and communication and the freedom of association; the denial of free choice of employment; the wanton disregard for the economic rights of man in relation to his country's resources; the denial of the right to a liberal, non-discriminatory educational system; and the denial of the right to participate in the cultural life of the community. The report adds:

"In short, almost all the rights which together allow the full and legitimate expression of human personality appear to be denied to the Tibetans at the present time and, in most cases, for some time past. On the basis of the available evidence it would seem difficult to recall a case in which ruthless suppression of man's essential dignity has been more systematically and efficiently carried out."^{2/}

13. My delegation is satisfied that the official statements of the Dalai Lama and the report of the International Commission of Jurists are sufficient to establish prima facie evidence of an attempt to destroy the distinctive religious and cultural heritage and autonomy of the Tibetan people and of a systematic violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms as set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

14. It may be that, in the absence of an agreed covenant on human rights, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was approved by the General Assembly on 10 December 1948 [resolution 217 (III)] may not have binding force. It is nevertheless recognized as being declaratory of generally accepted standards of behaviour for any State. At any rate, the universality of the principles of human rights and fundamental freedoms has never been disputed. In this connexion, may I be permitted to point out that the People's Republic of China itself, as a subscriber to the Bandung Declaration,^{3/} has declared its full support for the fundamental principles of human rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, and of the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations. The flagrant violation of human rights in Tibet by the People's Republic of China must therefore be a matter for the moral consideration of Asian and African peoples who subscribe to the spirit of the Bandung Declaration. The question of Tibet does not, however, concern Asia and Africa alone. It is a problem of far-reaching implication—one that touches the conscience of mankind.

15. It is our contention that any systematic violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, in any part of the world, by whichever nation, great or small,

^{1/} *Ibid.*, p. 59.

^{3/} Contained in the Final Communiqué of the Asian-African Conference, held in Bandung in 1955.

^{1/} International Commission of Jurists, The Question of Tibet and the Rule of Law—A Preliminary Report (Geneva, 1959).

eastern or western, cannot be morally justified and is a matter of which the United Nations must be seized. I submit that this Assembly has a moral duty, in the name of justice and humanity, to record its judgement on the ruthless violation of human rights in Tibet. The fact that the People's Republic of China is not represented in this Organization does not constitute a justifiable ground for this Assembly to turn a blind eye to what has taken place. If this Assembly chooses to ignore the events in Tibet, its silence on the matter can only be interpreted to mean a connivance in the infringement of the very principles which it is pledged to uphold. And such a connivance, in the view of my delegation, can only lead to the diminishing of the prestige of the United Nations and the weakening of its moral force as the guardian of human rights and human dignity for all peoples.

16. My delegation shares with other delegations in this Assembly the aspiration that this Assembly may go down in history as the Assembly of Peace. It is only proper that this Assembly should pronounce itself on the Question of Tibet. For the Question of Tibet is one of human justice, and peace must be based on justice if it is to remain secure for long. I suggest that this Assembly should exercise all its moral force to see that peace is restored in Tibet, that the fundamental human rights of the Tibetan people are preserved and respected, that their right to maintain their distinctive cultural and religious heritage and autonomy is not violated, and that any reforms introduced in the interest of progress should be made only in a manner consistent with respect for fundamental human rights and not by the use of brutal force.

17. As a people which gained its freedom and independence only two years ago, we in the Federation of Malaya deeply treasure our newly won freedom and independence, our newly won status and dignity not only as a nation but also as individuals. Our deep sympathy therefore goes to our fellow men in Tibet, whose desire to live in peace and to maintain their freedom of worship and religion has been suppressed. I have no doubt that all peoples who cherish freedom and liberty, particularly those of small and weak countries, like our own, which have lately become independent, will share our feelings.

18. Unlike the big Powers, which can always fall back on their mighty armaments when other measures to thwart aggression have failed, we of the smaller countries have to look to the United Nations, and to world opinion channelled through this Assembly, as the source of moral force on which we can place our hopes for the preservation of our human rights and human dignity.

19. In adopting our stand on such a question as this, we should always be mindful of the fact that should we, because of individual national interests, connive at flagrant violation of human rights by any nation, big or small, we would only be exposing those very interests to the danger which will inevitably arise from such acts of violation, for, once the barrier of world public opinion, freely expressed in this Assembly, is down, it will only make future violations very much easier.

20. For these reasons, I make a strong appeal to this Assembly to adopt our draft resolution. The pronouncement made by this Assembly will then be heard in all corners of the world as the pronouncement of mankind.

It is our earnest hope and sincere belief that the strength of its moral force will serve as a restraining factor that cannot for long be disregarded, so that the acts of repression in Tibet will soon come to an end and the fundamental human rights of the Tibetan people, as well as their religious and cultural heritage, will once again receive the respect due them. If this Assembly adopts this draft resolution, I am certain that it will not only reinforce the faith and trust of all nations in this Organization, but also go a long way towards the restoration of peace, justice and human dignity in Tibet. And it will surely go down in history, in the true spirit of the President's prayer, as the Assembly of Peace and, may I add, of Justice.

21. Mr. AIKEN (Ireland): I should like first to join with my friend, the representative of the Federation of Malaya, in expressing to the delegation of India our sincere sympathy with the Indian people and Government on the occasion of the disastrous floods, accompanied by great loss of life, which have occurred in several districts of India.

22. As my delegation is co-sponsor of the draft resolution [A/L.264] which has been so ably moved by the representative of Malaya, I have the honour to second its adoption.

23. The item entitled "Question of Tibet" has been inscribed on our agenda [826th meeting], as the Assembly is aware, by 43 votes to 11. The voting seemed to my delegation to reflect the great concern which has been aroused throughout the world by the action of the People's Republic of China in Tibet. We have no doubt that that concern is as great among countries which felt obliged to abstain last week as it is among those which voted for inscription of the item. That concern cannot have been lessened in any way by the manner in which a few representatives saw fit to deal with the matter.

24. The representative of the Soviet Union had of course understandable difficulty in finding reasons to justify Peiping's action in Tibet. This difficulty was no doubt at the origin of his manner of referring to those of us who have sponsored the inscription. I regret that he felt constrained to describe Ireland and Malaya as agents and tools of another country. We neither wish nor need to reply in the same key.

25. The sympathy of the Irish people with victims of imperialism is nothing new. It goes out to the people of Tibet in their present sufferings as it did in the past. I may recall that in 1904, at the time of the British expedition to Tibet, Michael Davitt, the Irish patriot and social reformer, endeavoured to arouse public opinion in the United States for the cause of the Tibetan people. Davitt is rightly described in the Soviet Encyclopedia as a staunch fighter against colonial oppression. There can be no doubt that if Davitt were alive today his voice would be heard in protest against the much more ruthless and generalized manifestation of imperialism in Tibet which began in 1950 and came to a tragic culmination in the spring of the present year.

26. In view of these charges that my delegation is not acting as an independent agent in this matter, I think it may be interesting to put on the record here the statement I made more than six months ago when the course of events in Tibet became clear. I made this statement in Dundalk, the principal, largest town in County Louth. As I have represented that constituency without a break since 1923 I think I may fairly claim

to know something of the feelings and anxieties of the people to whom I was speaking. They were troubled about the news from Tibet and I spoke to them as follows:

"The most recent case of cruel injustice being inflicted by a powerful country against a weaker neighbour is the aggression against Tibet. This unprovoked aggression has shocked the conscience of the world, particularly that of small nations like our own which know the evils of foreign rule. The brave Tibetan people are being deprived of what remained of their autonomy, are being forced to conform to an alien way of life. They have seen their legal government overthrown and the traditional head of their country and their religion forced to flee abroad. Their attempts to defend their liberty have been met by the ruthless use of vastly superior weapons and forces.

"As in so many other cases where small nations are oppressed by more powerful neighbours, there is little that the outside world can do to help effectively the people whose liberties are thus being crushed. We can do little more than to hope that the people of Tibet may be sustained in their sufferings by the words of Terence MacSwiney 'It is not they who can inflict most but they who can suffer most, will conquer'."

I concluded this speech which I am quoting by saying this:

"So far it has not been possible to have the Tibetan case considered by the United Nations as were the cases of Korea, Hungary and Suez, but we can, however, record our condemnation of acts of oppression wherever and by whomsoever they are perpetrated. In doing so we are asserting a principle of the United Nations Charter which is not only vital to ourselves but also which is vital for world peace. Without due respect by powerful States for the rights of their weaker neighbours there can be no rule of law in world affairs, and without a rule of law in world affairs there can be no peace and security. Actions like the action of the Peiping regime against Tibet are therefore not merely unjust and oppressive in themselves; they retard the day when we can expect to see general acceptance of clear-cut rules of international law and morality. They thus threaten the preservation of world peace, without which in modern conditions no nation great or small can hope to survive."

27. In making this statement which I have just quoted, I need hardly say that I was responding, not to any outside suggestion—for there was none—but to the feelings which are invariably aroused in Irishmen by news of the oppression of a small people. It is for that reason also that we joined with Malaya in sponsoring the draft resolution which is now in the hands of the Assembly. That draft resolution represents, in our opinion, the minimum assertion of international morality below which the Assembly cannot fall without being untrue to the principles to which we are pledged.

28. Some delegations have stated that Tibet was once legally a part of the Chinese empire and have given that as a reason why it would not be proper for this Assembly to discuss the present oppression of the Tibetan people. Tibet, in their view, is a part of China and therefore the Question of Tibet is one which concerns China alone.

29. My delegation cannot claim to speak with authority on the complex question of the history of the international status of Tibet. We know, however, as the whole world knows, that the Tibetans are a distinct people by race, by language, by culture and by religious organization. We know that over the centuries they have developed a separate individuality and a characteristic way of life. We know that they have enjoyed self-government throughout most of their history and that in the present century Chinese authority has never been made effective in Tibet except during the period of two invasions—the Manchu invasion of 1910 and the incursions of the troops of the People's Republic of China in the present decade.

30. Our mind revolts against any idea that, by reason of legalistic claims which were never freely accepted by the Tibetan people, we should treat Tibet, which has always been acknowledged to be a distinct and separate entity, as an internal Chinese question which we have no right even to discuss. It seems to me that to take such an attitude would constitute a stultifying precedent, not least from the point of view of those—the majority of nations represented here, I believe—which have at one time or another been subjects of foreign Powers. I cannot conceive how any nation which has undergone foreign rule, whether for long or short periods, can regard the past periods of Chinese imperial hegemony over Tibet as depriving Tibet of a claim on our attention now. The doctrine "once a subject nation always a subject nation"—clearly implied by some of the interventions in this debate—is one that the vast majority of this Assembly would automatically and necessarily reject. If they reject that doctrine, it seems to me that they cannot logically refuse to record their judgement of what has happened in Tibet.

31. Some delegations have asserted that under Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter we are debarred from discussing Tibet, as being a matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of China. My delegation has, of course, always taken the more liberal interpretation of Article 2, paragraph 7, to the effect that it does not debar us from discussing wholesale violations of human rights wherever they arise. It seems to us that delegations which take that liberal interpretation of Article 2, paragraph 7, in other cases—as the majority in the Assembly do for example in the case of South Africa—ought logically to refrain from advancing a restrictive interpretation of Article 2, paragraph 7, in the case of Tibet. By doing so it seems to us that they would give their opponents in such cases an opportunity to level charges of opportunism and inconsistency. But even those who traditionally adopt a more restrictive interpretation of Article 2, paragraph 7, ought, in my delegation's view, to consider whether even the narrowest interpretation of that Article should debar us from discussing Tibet. Can it seriously be claimed that a country like Tibet which has become almost legendary by reason of its separateness from the rest of the world, and which has all the marks of a distinct national personality, belongs essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of another country? It seems to us, therefore, that neither those who follow the liberal interpretation of that Article of our Charter nor those who interpret it more narrowly ought to refrain from recording their judgement of what has happened in Tibet.

32. The reasons for inscribing this draft resolution have been stated very candidly and very convincingly in

the course of our debates by many representatives. I do not need to go over all the ground covered by them. I should like, however, to deal briefly with the two main arguments put forward by those who opposed inscription of the item in the Agenda and who may oppose the passage of the resolution. The first of these arguments is based on the fact that the People's Republic of China is not represented here and the second is derived from the recent efforts to improve the general international climate.

33. The first argument was put most forcefully by the representative of Indonesia in what was, if I may say so, the most thoughtful contribution which we have heard from any of our opponents in this debate. Mr. Sastroamidjojo said and I quote:

"This entire item clearly involves, in the first place, the relations between the peoples of China and Tibet. How, then, can we proceed in the absence of representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China? The plain answer is that we cannot proceed without them. Their presence here is a precondition for a constructive and fair debate." [826th meeting, para. 44.]

He then went on to say that:

"In excluding China from active participation in the process of mediation and conciliation, this Organization also has placed the People's Republic of China beyond the purview of its benign influence and control. Under these circumstances, a debate on the question of Tibet can serve no other purpose than to intensify the cold war..." [*Ibid.*, para. 52.]

I hope I am correct in reading into these words the implication that, if the People's Republic of China were represented here, the delegation of Indonesia would not have opposed a discussion of this problem.

34. We do not wish to minimize the importance of the point which the representative of Indonesia has made and which has also been stressed by many other speakers. My delegation, as the Assembly knows, is among those which have favoured a discussion on the question of the representation of China here. Among the reasons for which we have done so was the hope that such a discussion might lead to constructive results, helpful to China's smaller neighbours, and might ultimately draw the People's Republic of China within the range of what the representative of Indonesia has aptly called this Organization's "process of mediation and conciliation". But I cannot agree with the representative of Indonesia when he asserts that a discussion and the passage of a resolution in the absence of the People's Republic of China can serve no good purpose.

35. When a flagrant violation of human rights occurs it is our duty, we submit, to speak out in defence of the principles to which we are all pledged, irrespective of whether the Government responsible for such a violation is a member of this Organization or bound by the principles of the Charter. In that connexion I was most impressed by the argument of the representative of the Federation of Malaya who pointed out that the parties to the Bandung Declaration, including the People's Republic of China, had in fact pledged themselves in the first article of that Declaration to abide by the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations. The peaceful nations who subscribed to the high principles of Bandung have certainly reason to consider with anxiety the manner in which these principles have been

interpreted by the People's Republic of China in Tibet—the manner in which they have violated the principles of the United Nations which they pledged themselves to uphold at Bandung.

36. The second argument is that the effect of this discussion is to increase international tension at a time when efforts are being made by responsible leaders towards the reduction of that tension. The Soviet delegation and their friends argued that this proposal could only lead to an acrimonious debate, and indeed they proved half their case by injecting no little acrimony into their own remarks. As the record shows, my delegation, and those who supported the inclusion on the agenda of the Question of Tibet, did nothing to provoke acrimonious debate but we do not think that even a sharp debate, on such a subject, is something to be avoided at all costs. What we should avoid rather would be any tendency to maintain silence in the face of a systematic and massive violation of human rights such as has occurred in Tibet.

37. Like most other delegations we sincerely welcome the degree of improvement which has taken place in the international climate. We do not consider, however, that that improvement can be made healthy and enduring if it is to be used as a pretext for stifling debate on such actions as those which have been committed by the People's Republic of China in Tibet. We would welcome the end of the cold war but we would not welcome the establishment in its place of a kind of cold peace—a peace in which flagrant acts of oppression and injustice would be passed over in total silence as if they had never occurred.

38. My delegation recognizes, of course, that this question has of its nature an adverse effect on what is in other respects a somewhat more favourable international climate. But that adverse effect is not the result of our debate or of any resolution which we may pass but of the events in Tibet themselves. If the Government of the People's Republic of China wishes to follow the line laid down in Peiping itself by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, in the direction of peaceful international relations and an end to the cold war, then it can powerfully contribute to that good cause by respecting the rights and restoring the traditional liberties of the people of Tibet. That is what our draft resolution calls for. If that draft resolution is passed and if because of the high international authority behind it, and the force of public opinion which it would therefore represent, it has the effect of inducing the Peking authorities to reconsider their policies in Tibet, then in our belief it will have a very positive effect in bringing about, not a temporary and fragile, but a genuine and lasting improvement in international relations.

39. We are not asking the Assembly to call for respect for the rights of the Tibetan people merely to relieve that ancient and kindly people of their sufferings at the hands of their oppressors or merely to show our sympathy with them in their distress.

40. Nor are we doing so merely to denounce the actions of the Government of the People's Republic of China, unworthy as we think these actions are of the great people of China who themselves suffered so much at the hands of foreign Powers.

41. Nor, I need hardly say, are we doing so to prevent developments in the economic and social life of the

Tibetan people, developments the necessity for which the Dalai Lama himself has publicly acknowledged.

42. Nor are we doing so merely because it is a Communist regime which seeks to impose its ideology upon a people who reject it.

43. Nor are we doing so merely because we repudiate the contention advanced by the Soviet representative that, as the people of Tibet have not always since the beginning of time been able to resist being treated as subjects by a stronger Power, the case of Tibet is dead, never to be revived. Indeed to admit that contention would be to destroy the basis upon which most of our Member nations have established the right to live in freedom and to govern themselves in accordance with the wishes of their own peoples.

44. Nor are we doing so in the interests of small nations or of former subject peoples who won their freedom in recent times or of subject peoples who have yet to obtain freedom.

45. We are urging the United Nations to call for respect for the rights of the people of Tibet because we believe that cause is vital in the basic interest of all nations in the nuclear age: the expansion of the rule of law and the strengthening of world public opinion for its maintenance.

46. It seems to us that the great majority of delegations regard the question of Tibet as the Malayan and Irish delegations regard it. We must, we suggest, in the interest of all our countries, go forward to the rule of law or force will decide our fate. The law is only as strong as the public opinion which supports it. We must build a healthy world opinion strong enough to prevent such breaches of law as that which occurred in Tibet.

47. There was a time when a small distinctive people could be overrun and crushed into nothingness and its disappearance caused little more than a ripple on the surface of history. There was a time when such a historic nation as Poland could be crushed, divided and distributed with all the appearance of finality. After the savage suppression of the Polish uprising in 1863, the Foreign Minister of Czar Alexander II wrote triumphantly: "The question of Poland is dead", just as we have been told in this debate that the question of Tibet is dead. But the time came when the great Powers, in signing the Covenant of the League of Nations, recognized the right of even small peoples to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. These signatures were a great step forward. Had they been honoured consistently, the last great war would not have occurred.

48. Our fear is that, if this Assembly were not to turn its back upon the principles of its Charter and regard the question of Tibet as dead, the second great effort to build a peaceful world order might ultimately collapse in frustration, as the League of Nations collapsed, and with equally dire consequences.

49. But, if we have certain fears for the future, we are far from being without hope. Being only human and having to deal with a heavy heritage of past injustices, we have not at all times practised what our Charter preaches. But our failures are less significant than the progress we have succeeded in making. Old fashioned colonialism will soon be a thing of the past. Thirty new Members, most of them former colonial territories, have been added to this Organization since 1945. More are on the way. Great credit is due to those who made

this development possible, and I must add that among those who played a noble and vital part were many forward-looking statesmen and citizens of the colonial Powers themselves.

50. I believe that this Organization has every right to hope that if we can avoid world war we can attain respect for the human rights and the fundamental freedoms of all peoples under the protection of the rule of law and that thus the aspirations of all former subject peoples will be fairly met before many years have elapsed. Actions like that of China in Tibet have more than a local effect. They set the clock back the world over.

51. I wish to conclude with an appeal to the Government of the People's Republic of China and to the Chinese people. I want to say to them quite candidly that there is nothing this Organization can do to prevent them from crushing the Tibetan people. If they refrain from doing so, it will be of their own free and enlightened will, for in present circumstances nothing else can force them to refrain.

52. I would remind the Chinese people that, although Tibet and China have had their disputes, they have had fewer wars and more peaceful association than most European countries. By and large, they have been good neighbours. Indeed the Chinese Communist Constitution of 1951 recognized Tibet's right to self-determination, although this recognition was unfortunately not included in their Constitution of 1954.

53. It will not hurt the great Chinese people to open negotiations with the Dalai Lama for a peace settlement and to recognize the right of the small Tibetan people to control their own destiny, but it will greatly help the world, including China. It will help us all to build a world order in which the energy now used for destruction is turned to peaceful development, an order in which the earth is not scorched by fear and hate but gives abundance to all.

54. Mr. UPADHYAYA (Nepal): Please permit me to associate myself with the previous speakers in expressing my sorrow, as well as that of the other members of my delegation, on the great ravages done by the recent floods in India.

55. While considering the items of the agenda to be submitted to the fourteenth session of the General Assembly at the very beginning of the present session, my delegation had an opportunity to intervene in the debate on the question of the representation of China in the United Nations. In spite of our best efforts, the question of China's representation was postponed this year, as it was in previous years. Now a new item has been brought forward for the consideration of the Assembly, and this new item deals with the Question of Tibet in the form of a draft resolution [A/L.264] concerning recent events that have happened there.

56. It is perhaps not necessary for me to stress that the Question of Tibet is a question that is intimately connected with the question of China's representation in the United Nations. The Question of Tibet is being pressed for debate against a certain background of events that have occurred there during the last nine or ten months. The Dalai Lama has left Tibet and gone to India and received political asylum there. There has been an influx of Tibetan refugees into India and Nepal. For example, about a thousand refugees have come into Nepal from across the Tibetan border. These are

the events that lie in the background of this Question of Tibet. It is the Government of the People's Republic of China that is believed to be responsible for these events, but that Government still remains unrepresented in the United Nations.

57. It is true that many questions or issues have been brought before the United Nations which are claimed by interested Member States to be internal. The United Nations has actively taken up many such questions, such as race relations in South Africa and the anti-colonial struggle in Algeria. But in all these cases the interested States have always been represented in the United Nations. I venture to submit that the Question of Tibet is the only question that has been brought before the United Nations without the interested State, namely, the People's Republic of China, being represented. In our opinion, this kind of attitude is against the spirit of the United Nations Charter, the overriding objective of which is to ensure fair play and justice to small and big nations alike. We wonder what useful purpose has been served by bringing the question of Tibet before the United Nations when China itself is not represented here.

58. Then there is another aspect of the problem. There are many Member countries which have recognized China and which have also recognized the special kind of relationship that exists between China and Tibet today. So far as Nepal is concerned, there is a definite agreement between Nepal and China defining clearly our relations with China, including the matters connected with Tibet. There are many other countries which have somewhat similar agreements, arrangements or understandings. Such countries are by no means confined to the communist bloc, or even to Asia alone.

59. Both the memorandum that accompanied the request for inscription [A/4234] and the draft resolution that is before us, while claiming that there has been in Tibet a hindrance to the traditional cultural and religious way of life, speak merely of Tibetan autonomy, which indicates clearly that even the sponsors of the item recognize China's suzerainty over Tibet. Even Mr. Tsiang appears to hold the same view.

60. The question of human rights and their suppression has been raised many times by many countries in the General Assembly, as well as in the General Committee. If we speak of human rights and their suppression in Tibet, we should first try to find out what human rights the Tibetan people have enjoyed through the centuries and which of these human rights have been denied to the people of Tibet today. It is only after we have studied and examined these matters carefully that we can look at the question of Tibet in proper perspective. Even Tibet has to be viewed in the context of the new, changing, revolutionary Asia. In the tremendous transformation through which Asia is passing now, traditional patterns of life, the tempering with which the memorandum deplores, will have to be substantially modified, and we believe that Tibet will be no exception to this.

61. Therefore, in Asia today a call for a reversion to the traditional way of life may amount practically to a call for the maintenance of the social status quo, when this status quo is no longer desirable and can no longer be maintained. Therefore, while we still value the traditional way of life in every country, in so far as it does not stand in the way of political, economic and

spiritual progress, we are not inclined to accept tradition as an end in itself, as a sacred, absolute thing which should never be molested.

62. For these and many other reasons, we believe that no useful purpose has been served by bringing the Question of Tibet before the United Nations. In these circumstances, we could not support and vote for the inscription of the item on the agenda, and I am afraid that we will not vote for the draft resolution, and for the very same reasons. Moreover, we believe that at a time when the main efforts of the responsible statesmen of the east and west have been directed toward relaxation of tension and thawing of the cold war, the inscription of the item and the consequences that have followed from the inscription have worked in the direction of the defeating of that very purpose. The stand of my delegation on this question has been guided by the considerations I have set forth.

63. Mr. ENCKELL (Finland): Many delegations have expressed in this hall and in the General Committee serious doubts about the competence of the United Nations to deal with the matter now before us. The Finnish delegation shares these doubts. We feel moreover that the absence from our midst of the representatives of the People's Republic of China is bound to make any discussion of this matter one-sided and purposeless. We did not deem it possible to vote for the inscription of this item on our agenda.

64. I am bound, however, to refer here to the deep feelings aroused in Finland by the reports of the present situation in Tibet. We have in Finland a deep-rooted conviction in the right of all peoples to lead their own lives in undisturbed peace, whatever be their size, their status or their location. We dearly hope that this right will be universally respected. We also hold in high respect the fundamental rights and the basic liberties of man. It is our hope that mankind may everywhere, divided or not by national borders, live together in peace as good neighbours.

65. I should like finally to say that my delegation does not think that the adoption, without recourse to the normal ways of negotiation and conciliation, of any resolution by the United Nations would be in keeping with our role and duties in this Organization, as we see them.

66. If we are going to vote on the draft resolution before us paragraph by paragraph, my delegation will approve of the paragraphs containing declarations of a general character but not of those parts containing specific references to the situation in Tibet. My delegation will abstain in the final vote on the draft resolution, as it abstained in the vote on the inscription of this item.

67. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I should like to make it clear that I am speaking on behalf of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

68. First, I must express my regret that discussion of the non-existent "Question of Tibet" has been forced on the General Assembly. Like the majority of delegations, we would prefer to devote our time to really important questions designed to strengthen peace and develop co-operation among States, rather than be diverted into the discussion of questions which have been raised for the purpose of poisoning the international atmosphere and undermining the authority of

the United Nations. The Assembly should take advantage of the recent improvement in the international atmosphere and the enhancement of its role in the struggle for the consolidation of peace. In this connexion, it should be recalled that the visit to the United States of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev, his talks with the President of the United States of America, Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower, and their joint communiqué were warmly welcomed throughout the world as an important step towards the improvement of relations among States and the lessening of international tension. As a result, there are now promising prospects of ending the cold war and of directing international affairs into the rational course of peaceful co-operation among all countries in the interest of the preservation of peace and the progress of all mankind.

69. However, this development in international relations is apparently not to the taste of those circles which do not want a lessening of tension and which are seeking to bring about a deterioration in international relations and to complicate the situation in the United Nations.

70. Those responsible for raising the question of Tibet in the United Nations are attempting to give the impression that the discussion of this question in the United Nations does not constitute gross and intolerable intervention in the domestic affairs of the People's Republic of China. Either directly or by means of various subterfuges, they are also trying to cast doubt on the incontrovertible truth that Tibet is an integral part of China. We must remind the General Assembly of a number of historical facts.

71. It is well known that close ties of friendship have linked Tibet to China since earliest times. In the thirteenth century Tibet formally became part of China and, since that time, the political system, including the title, status and functions of the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama, have always been determined by the Government of China. Tibet was and still is an integral part of the Chinese State and forms one of its administrative regions.

72. True, history has seen many attempts by the imperialist Powers to detach Tibet from China, both by direct armed intervention and by inciting their agents to organize movements for Tibetan independence. For that purpose, the colonialists have used the reactionaries among the Tibetan feudal leaders as their tools.

73. As the Panchen Lama said in April of this year, the traitors to the Tibetan people were not in fact interested in the so-called independence of Tibet; they were merely using independence as a cover for their attempt to betray their native land for mercenary motives and to maintain their reactionary domination. This pretext of so-called independence is identical with the pretext of the independence of Manchukuo, used as a cover by the Manchurian traitor Pu Yi who sold out to the Japanese aggressors.

74. The attempts of imperialist circles to proclaim Tibet independent failed even when the forces of the Chinese State were paralysed by militarist dissension and by direct imperialist aggression. The present attempts to detach Tibet from the People's Republic of China are all the more certain to fail.

75. In the present changed circumstances, Tibet's status as an integral part of China has been reaffirmed

in quite unequivocal terms. An Agreement of the Central People's Government and the local Government of Tibet on Measures for the Peaceful Liberation of Tibet was signed in Peking on 23 May 1951; the agreement defined the status of Tibet as an autonomous region within the indivisible Chinese State. Basic principles of national policy, including the principles guaranteeing regional autonomy, were guaranteed in the Constitution of the People's Republic of China. As you know, the Dalai Lama, the Panchen Lama and other Tibetan representatives participated in the preparation and adoption of the Constitution of the People's Republic of China in 1954.

76. Hence, the inclusion of the so-called "Question of Tibet" in the agenda of the present session is, without question, a blatant attempt at intervention in the domestic affairs of the People's Republic of China and constitutes a violation of one of the basic principles of the United Nations Charter.

77. Realizing that their position is precarious and completely without legal foundation, the authors of the fictitious charges against the People's Republic of China are trying hypocritically to represent themselves as champions of humanity. In listening to some representatives, one might think that the Tibetan people is its own enemy and is opposed to any change in the brutal system of serfdom, and that the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights have been observed in Tibet in the Past. But it goes without saying that this is very far from being the case.

78. In this connexion reference should be made to well-known facts which will put matters in the correct light. Until recent times the Tibetan people were doomed to a hopeless life under a social system more barbarous and cruel than that which prevailed in the darkest period of the Middle Ages. All the land, forests, waters, pastures and other resources were in the hands of a small group of secular and religious feudal lords. That minority, constituting about 5 per cent of the population, were in complete control of Tibetan affairs; the overwhelming majority of the population, peasant farmers and herdsmen, were serfs, while until recent times some tens of thousands of Tibetans were still slaves. The serfs were obliged to give the landowner their services, at any time and without any restrictions, whenever he required them to do so. They worked without pay on the feudal lord's land for two-thirds, and sometimes three-fourths, of every year. In addition, they had to perform various duties, also without pay, for the feudal Government, the monasteries and the landlords. These facts are admitted even by those who cannot be suspected of any sympathy for the Chinese people.

79. The United States journalist Lowell Thomas, known for his active participation in subversive activities against the Chinese, wrote, after a visit to Lhasa, that in Tibet the aristocracy was almost a separate race. A broad gulf divided it from the peasants, herdsmen and other people of simple birth. Peasants on estates were bound to the land, as the peasants were bound to the land in Europe during feudal times. They paid their rent in labour, in money and in kind.

80. The United Kingdom authority on Tibet, David MacDonald,^{4/} in his book Country of the Lama, wrote that the position of the peasants on the large estates

^{4/} David MacDonald, Country of the Lama (London, 1929).

was not much better than slavery; they were required to work exclusively for their masters for a fixed number of days each month, and also to give them a substantial part of their harvest as a tax. They hardly succeeded in cultivating their own pitiful plots, the yield from which scarcely sufficed to keep them and their families from dying of hunger.

81. The feudal lords possessed unlimited "judicial power". They had the right to subject the peasants to any punishment, even imprisonment and the most brutal torture. The feudal lords could by their own arbitrary decision flog the peasants or cut off their arms and legs; murders of peasants were a common occurrence.

82. Let us cite several cases in recent times. In 1951 in the Dungenzun district (not far from Lhasa) a landowner, in order to secure the settlement of a small debt, demanded that a peasant serf named Diantzin should pay a quantity of grain which he could not have harvested even over a period of several years. Diantzin was forced to flee. Then the landlord executed his wife and enslaved his seven year old son. The boy did not obtain his freedom until recently. To give another example, one of the leaders of the reactionary clique, Pala Tudeneden, had more than 3,000 serfs and slaves. The Pala family had its own prison, instruments of torture, devices for putting out eyes, cutting off noses and so forth. Once a peasant named Ngakan began talking to the peasants about reform. Pala ordered his arrest, but he could not be found. Then Ngakan's older brother was put into prison and beaten to death. Ngakan filed a complaint with the former local Tibetan Government, but the case was referred to Pala himself for consideration. Pala threw Ngakan into prison where each night he was whipped until he finally died. The same picture prevailed throughout Tibet.

83. In short, the Tibetans had no conception of personal freedom; the feudal lords and their agents dealt with the peasants just as they pleased. That is your so-called "historical way of life"; that is what the reactionary élite exerted every effort to protect from change and what, with instigation from outside, they sought to protect by taking up arms against their own people and the Government of the People's Republic of China.

84. The peaceful liberation of Tibet was followed by the awakening of the Tibetan toilers. They saw a prospect of deliverance from the outrageous exploitation and brutal maltreatment of the serfs, and the possibility, at long last, of enjoying human rights and demanding to be treated as human beings. As the Panchen Lama said last week, the Tibetan toilers understood that the source of their misery was not fate, but the old regime in Tibet, the cruel oppression and exploitation by the reactionary ruling class of Tibet.

85. It is paradoxical that the representatives of those countries which are widely known as patrons of the most reactionary regimes and as the mainstay of the crumbling colonial system should be leading the chorus of mourners who are now shedding tears for the violation of human rights in Tibet. Their oratorical references to human rights are indeed the crocodile tears of the colonialists, who for centuries have mercilessly annihilated the enslaved peoples of Asia and Africa and still do not shrink from using the most inhuman methods to combat the national freedom

movement in their colonies. During the general debate at the present session the representatives of the African-Asian States gave striking new examples to illustrate this point. Many such examples are being cited at the present time in the Fourth Committee.

86. For example, world public opinion has been shocked by the brutal measures the colonial Powers have taken in Oman, Kenya, the Belgian Congo and many other regions. In these places human rights are really being violated and people are being denied the most elementary freedoms. Is it not obvious that, in making these oratorical references to human rights in connexion with the question before us, the colonialists are prompted by their desire to preserve at any price the rights of the reactionary ruling class, in other words, the feudal serfdom system, in Tibet? At the same time they want to impede the introduction of democratic reforms, as a result of which the Tibetan people is for the first time receiving real freedom and genuine human rights.

87. The hypocrisy of the attempts to accuse China of violation of "the religious and cultural autonomy of Tibet" are equally obvious. Such charges are also without foundation and are contrary to the facts. In reality, the Chinese authorities are strictly respecting the religious beliefs, customs and habits of the Tibetan people. In that connexion, Ngapo Ngawang-Jigme, who for more than ten years was a member of the former local Tibetan Government, stated recently that Government workers, sent to Tibet by the Central People's Government, consistently pursued a policy of religious liberty and did not permit the slightest interference in the affairs of any monastery.

88. The Panchen Lama said on 22 April 1959 that there have been no changes at all in the religious system or in religious beliefs in Tibet during the past eight years. That is a fact which the priests and the secular population have seen with their own eyes throughout Tibet. It is not the People's Liberation Army which is engaging in anti-religious activities, but the Tibetan rebels and reactionaries, who murder and insult monks and nuns, defile the images of Buddha, steal the sacrificial vessels, and even turn monasteries into strongholds of rebellion. Clearly these are not good deeds which reflect respect for religion, but evil actions which undermine it.

89. From these authoritative statements it is apparent that only the criminal activities of the reactionaries have represented a threat to some monasteries. It was the reactionaries who, for the sake of maintaining the system of serfdom, compelled the monks to take up arms contrary to Buddhist dogma, and did not balk at the most extreme measures, including the murder of those who refused to comply. On the other hand, as many Tibetan religious leaders affirm, the Chinese authorities, even when they were engaged in putting down the revolt, invariably protected monasteries and cultural and historical monuments.

90. It is necessary to point out that in China there is complete religious freedom. Many prominent individuals who have visited China and are interested in this question have been convinced of that. In particular, U Nu, a former Prime Minister of Burma, who has visited the People's Republic of China several times, said at a press conference in New York on 14 April 1959 that there was freedom of religion in Tibet and that in China that freedom was greater under the Communists than it had been under Chiang Kai-shek. The

vice-president of the international fraternity of Buddhists, the Nepalese priest Amritanand, who was in China in the summer of 1959, said that, during his journey, he had found in China not only rapid industrial and agricultural growth but also authentic religious freedom.

91. However, those responsible for raising this issue of the "Question of Tibet" are quite uninterested in the real facts. For the purpose of levelling absurd charges against the People's Republic of China, they have arbitrarily distorted and falsified the facts concerning the situation in one of the regions of China. In taking up these unfounded and at times laughable charges, the representatives of a number of countries have largely based themselves on the malicious and absurd inventions of several Tibetan reactionary emigrants and on the false materials manufactured by the instigators of this issue of Tibet.

92. In this connexion we cannot overlook the attempts of several representatives to support their charges with materials prepared by the so-called International Commission of Jurists. As is known, this Commission was brought into being to serve the aims of the cold war. Its activity up to the present has consisted solely in the fabrication and dissemination of lies about the socialist countries. The Commission used the same method to compile information on Tibet. In order to show what its findings are worth, I should like to remind you of one so-called disclosure made by a leading member of the Commission, Mr. Trikamdas. On 6 June 1959, on the basis of a report by Mr. Trikamdas, The New York Times announced that the Potala, the palace of the Dalai Lama at Lhasa, had been completely destroyed by Chinese artillery fire. Yet the editors of The New York Times could easily have ascertained, and probably did ascertain, the falsehood of that fabrication, as the palace of Potala was safe and sound. Professional and amateur forgers of slanders about the people of China obviously act on the principle that the bigger and blacker the lie, the better.

93. In connexion with the fabrications spread about Tibet by the enemies of China, we must touch on other aspects of life in Tibet. The Government of the People's Republic of China has done a great deal to advance the economy and culture of the area and the level of well-being of the Tibetan population. Road-building has been intensified. In addition to the repair of old roads, more than 7,000 kilometres of new motor roads have been constructed. That has made it possible to bring in by road large quantities of the manufactured goods and other products needed by the Tibetans. The People's Government has reduced taxes, raised the purchase price of wool and other local products, and granted the peasants large interest-free and irrevocable loans. The first Tibetan industrial undertakings have been brought into operation. Primary and secondary schools have been opened, a network of medical and veterinarian institutions has been established. All these measures have already given the Tibetans a foretaste of a new and better life.

94. At the same time, it must be stressed that, throughout the entire eight-year period, the Government of the People's Republic of China has taken into account Tibet's particular situation and followed a cautious policy in carrying out any measures there. On 22 April 1959, the Panchen Lama said in that connexion that while waiting for the reactionary elements to change their minds and repent, the Central People's

Government displayed great patience and repeatedly made concessions to them, treating them with extreme charity and good will.

95. However, the reactionaries among the Tibetan feudal leaders had no wish to see local democratic autonomy achieved, and in every way hindered the preparatory work for the establishment of an autonomous Tibetan region.

96. Moreover, in March 1959, a handful of Tibetan reactionaries, in collusion with certain imperialist circles and the corrupt Chiang Kai-shek clique, treacherously attempted, upon instigation from outside, to avert by force the inevitable collapse of serfdom in Tibet and to wrest Tibet from China. However, not only did the people of Tibet fail to follow the reactionaries but they gave their full support to the Government, with the result that order was quickly restored and the population was able to return to its peaceful labours.

97. This armed rising by the reactionaries among the Tibetan feudal leaders not only once again revealed them as foreign agents and enemies of national unity, but completely exposed them as violent opponents of the progress and well-being of the Tibetan people. Because the Tibetan people saw these reactionaries for what they were, they were able to free themselves from the fetters of serfdom and fulfil their long-standing aspiration for democratic independence and social progress. These reforms were demanded and supported not only by the peasants but by a great many patriotic and progressive people in the middle and upper classes.

98. The democratic reforms now in progress were instituted only after protracted consultations with prominent Tibetan statesmen and after all sections of the population had voiced their whole-hearted approval. They are being carried out by the Tibetans themselves, with the participation of the upper and middle classes. In that connexion, the Panchen Lama has said that Tibet would follow a policy of compensation in carrying out reforms, that is, their reforms would be effected by peaceful means in so far as Tibet's upper classes are concerned.

99. Vigorously repudiating attempts made by some circles, with the help of the United Nations, to disparage the Tibetan people's new way of life, the Panchen Lama stated on 14 October 1959 that the Tibetan people would in no circumstances be influenced by the hue and cry of the imperialist elements (the hue and cry now in progress in the United Nations) to deviate from their forward course. Under the leadership of the Central People's Government, they would definitely put an end to the cruel, barbarous, reactionary, feudal backward system of serfdom once and for all.

100. In view of the above facts, it is perfectly clear that discussion of the "Question of Tibet" in the General Assembly would be inadmissible and harmful under any pretext whatsoever. In this connexion, I should like to endorse the statement by the Chinese newspaper Jen Min Jih Pao (People's Daily) that interference by any State or by the United Nations is inadmissible under any pretext or in any form. Therefore, any question relating to Tibet can be solved only by China and in China, and not in any foreign State. That is the Chinese people's attitude in the present case towards the attempts of outsiders to meddle in Chinese affairs.

101. Why, then, has the General Assembly once again been forced into a violation of the United Nations Charter and why is it being used to stir up hostility and hatred towards the great Chinese nation?

102. Everything points to the fact that we are dealing here with a clumsy manoeuvre to bring the United Nations back to the bleak period of the cold war. The supporters of this enterprise are seeking to hinder the recent positive and constructive efforts to improve international relations. It is just those circles that are not interested in a relaxation of tension or a discontinuance of the armaments race which are responsible for the "Question of Tibet" having been raised on this session.

103. In this matter, the delegations of Ireland and the Federation of Malaya have acted merely as the instruments of those circles; they have played an unseemly role in the shameful farce put on by those who favour an increase in international tension.

104. The aggressive circles had to embark on such an undertaking in order to strike a blow at the collaboration between the People's Republic of China and other Asian nations, to weaken the solidarity of the Asian and African peoples in their struggle to consolidate their national independence and achieve lasting peace. Certain circles in the West which are unwilling to reconcile themselves to the loss of their colonial supremacy are frenziedly seizing on any means to check the further development of the peoples' struggle for national liberation and to prevent them from managing their affairs in accordance with their own wishes.

105. The peoples of Asia and Africa—and indeed of the whole world—are witnesses to the fact that in recent years certain imperialistic circles have sought by every possible means to build up tension in Asia and the Far East, to increase the military and subversive activities of the aggressive blocs, to extend these activities to neutral countries, to prevent the implementation of the 1954 Geneva agreements on Indo-China. The facts speak for themselves. United States troops still remain in South Korea, although the Chinese people's volunteers have long since been completely withdrawn from North Korea. The island of Taiwan and other Chinese islands are still being occupied and being used for aggressive operations against the Chinese people and to maintain tension in the Far East. Prompted from outside, the South Viet-Nam authorities are refusing to implement the decisions of the 1954 Geneva Conference on elections in North and South Viet-Nam. South Viet-Nam, Laos, Taiwan and South Korea are being used to create a threat to the peace and security of Asian countries.

106. Obviously, the present commotion over the "Question of Tibet" has deliberately been timed to coincide with the joyful celebration by 650 million Chinese and their friends throughout the world of their glorious tenth anniversary of the Chinese People's Republic, which has made huge strides in the development of the national economy and culture and brought about an unprecedented increase in the country's prestige.

107. There is no doubt that, like all previous attacks, these new malicious attacks on the People's Republic of China will have no influence on the triumphant progress of the Chinese people to socialism or on the further enhancement of their country's international standing.

108. The introduction of the so-called "Question of Tibet" in the United Nations also points to the desire of certain circles to divert the Assembly's attention from the really urgent international questions which are awaiting solution. It is not by chance that reports have recently appeared in the Press to the effect that certain delegations wish to use the "Question of Tibet" as a pretext for evading business-like collaboration on other items on the agenda at the current session.

109. The Soviet delegation believes that the positive trend towards an improvement in the international situation has created propitious conditions for broad and effective co-operation in the United Nations among the representatives of all States. The Soviet delegation, for its part, has endeavoured to co-operate with all delegations, and will continue to do so, in the search for solutions acceptable to all Member States of the important international problems on this session's agenda. We are ready to do our utmost to ensure that this session goes down in the history of the United Nations as the session of peace and friendship among peoples. Any practical step by other delegations to improve international relations will be given every possible support by the Soviet delegation.

110. At the same time, we clearly cannot support steps which are aimed at bringing about, not an improvement, but a deterioration in international relations. This affair of the so-called "Question of Tibet" is just such a step. It is impossible to advocate improved relations and, at the same time, to support the discussion in the United Nations of matters like the "Question of Tibet," which unquestionably have the effect of exacerbating those relations.

111. Our common duty—the duty of all delegations—is to work for the easing of tensions. We must refuse to allow the introduction in the United Nations of questions which will take us back to the period of the cold war. If we can fulfil that duty, then the peoples of the world will have no cause to charge the fourteenth session of the General Assembly with having created dangerous new cold war obstacles to the heartening trend towards a thaw.

112. The Soviet delegation is firmly opposed to the discussion of the so-called "Question of Tibet" in the United Nations. It goes without saying that the Soviet delegation will vote against the draft resolution [A/L. 264] on Tibet submitted by Ireland and the Federation of Malaya. Any resolution on this matter is irregular, since it is contrary to the United Nations Charter, which prohibits intervention in the domestic affairs of States.

113. In voicing its concern that the United Nations should fulfil its duty by solving the disarmament problem and dealing with other important measures designed to improve the international situation, the Soviet delegation expresses the hope that the fourteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations will not allow itself to be diverted into a course which is fraught with danger to peace and to the very existence of the United Nations.

114. Mr. BISBE (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): In his statement during the general debate [806th meeting] the Cuban Minister of Foreign Affairs, clearly expressing the thought of the revolutionary Government of the new Cuba, said that the use of force which occurred in Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Algeria and Tibet must not be repeated.

115. Coercive acts, no matter where or by whom they are committed, must necessarily be condemned by a Government which arose from the sufferings of a people subjected for seven years to the worst violations of human rights and the most horrible crimes and tortures imaginable.

116. It does not matter to us where abuse of freedoms and fundamental human rights takes place, or whether such acts are committed by an imperialist Power, a Latin American tyranny or a communist country. What we strongly object to is the fact that international organizations, where no factions of any kind nor any predetermined majorities should exist, recognize violations of human rights committed by one side but not by the other. It is inadmissible to us that during the tyranny of Batista, when his representative in this Assembly condemned repression in Hungary, no one spoke out against the crimes and violations of human rights which were being committed in Cuba and were denounced by us before international bodies.

117. In this debate, it should be immaterial whether Tibet is independent, has enjoyed some sort of autonomy, or is a province of China. Both the nationalist Chinese Republic in its day and the People's Republic of China at the present time have regarded Tibet as a Chinese province. After the failure of the United Kingdom's negotiations for the conclusion in 1893 of a treaty with China which would open the road to Tibet to British trade, Lord Curzon, the then Viceroy of India, concluded that Chinese sovereignty over Tibet was a constitutional fiction.

118. It may be stated that Tibet enjoyed *de facto* independence in various periods of its history, especially from 1911 until the arrival of the Chinese communist forces at Lhasa in 1951. But this definition of the constitutional status of Tibet does not, we repeat, affect any judgement we may form on the question now under consideration.

119. Whether it is a Chinese province, an autonomous form of Government, or independent, Tibet is entitled, under the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to recognition of the human rights and the fundamental freedom of its inhabitants, and to the assurance that those rights and freedoms will not be taken away or impaired for reasons of race, sex, language or religion.

120. Encouragement and respect for human rights—as proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—and the universal and effective recognition and observance of such rights are to extend both to the peoples of Member States themselves and to the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

121. Furthermore, we should, in considering this item, take no account of the social and economic characteristics of the Tibetan system of government. We are obviously confronted with a theocratic and feudal regime. The priestly class occupies a privileged position; but all this is part of a religious tradition which belongs to the life of the Tibetan people. For us it is forbidden ground; we cannot change this state of affairs by force; any change is a matter for the people of Tibet alone. The religious beliefs of Tibet, like those of any other nation, deserve absolute respect. Force cannot be used against the religion of any people. A people's religious beliefs must be free from any foreign intervention. What binds us, however, is our

obligation, under the Charter, to promote international co-operation in developing and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to religion.

122. Although, in our view, the factors which I have mentioned should not be taken into account in the debate, an analysis should be made of the 17-point Agreement of the Central People's Government and the local Government of Tibet on Measures for the Peaceful Liberation of Tibet concluded on 23 May 1951. That agreement was undoubtedly repudiated by the Dalai Lama, but not by the Communist Chinese Government. It is absolutely valid on one side, and it is therefore necessary to emphasize the guarantees which the representatives of the People's Republic of China gave the Tibetans. In that agreement the rights guaranteed to the Tibetan people included the exercise of regional autonomy and respect for their religious beliefs. In addition, it was stated that the authorities of the People's Republic of China in Tibet would not change the existing political system, that the functions and powers of the Dalai Lama would be maintained and that the lamaseries would be protected. Hence, in order to determine the extent of the violations of human rights alleged, it should be asked whether due respect and protection were accorded to these rights guaranteed by the People's Republic of China, or whether efforts were made to undermine the authority of the Dalai Lama, to eradicate religious beliefs, to destroy the monasteries or forcibly to change the existing political system, even if there were abundant reasons for the conclusion that that system was reactionary and anachronistic.

123. We are familiar with the events which compelled the Dalai Lama to leave his mountainous country and cross the Indian frontier near Kanzeymane, after requesting asylum from the Government of India—a request which that Government immediately granted. The Dalai Lama's first statements were issued in Tezpur, India, on 18 and 22 April 1959; the next statement was made in Mussoorie, India, on 20 June 1959. Between these two series of statements there is a considerable difference in tone. The first consists of a factual account, of very moderate tone, in which the words are very carefully chosen. The Dalai Lama confines himself to saying that his country and his people have gone through a very difficult period and that, for the time being, he only wishes to express his sincere regret at the sufferings which Tibet has experienced, and his fervent hope that the situation will be remedied without further floodshed. In the Mussoorie statement the tone has completely changed: the Dalai Lama denounces violations of human rights amounting to genocide, and appeals to the conscience of the world. He says:

"Ever since my arrival in India I have been receiving almost every day sad and distressing news of the suffering and inhuman treatment of my people. I have heard almost daily with a heavy heart of their increasing agony and affliction, their harassment and persecution and of the terrible deportation and execution of innocent men. These have made me realize forcibly that the time has manifestly arrived when in the interests of my people and religion and to save them from the danger of near annihilation, I must not keep silent any longer but must frankly and plainly tell the world the truth about Tibet and appeal

to the conscience of all peace-loving and civilized nations".^{5/}

124. After the Mussoorie statement, the question of Tibet took dramatic hold of the world's conscience. The Tibetans are Buddhists—that the Buddhism of Tibet has its own characteristics is of no significance—and Buddhists are lovers of peace. They cannot be conceived of as aggressors; rather must they be regarded as victims of aggression, particularly if it is remembered that their adversaries represent a Power 600 million strong in population. Of course, both sides must be heard. The spokesmen for the People's Republic of China state that, according to points 1 and 3 of the 17-point agreement, the local Government of Tibet should have united the Tibetan people, expelled the aggressive imperialist forces and exercised the right of regional autonomy under the united leadership of the Chinese Government. Besides—they add—in accordance with point 11 the local Government of Tibet should have gone ahead with the various reforms required. But what reforms, it is asked, were carried out in a little more than eight years? "The brutal feudal system", answer the spokesmen of the People's Republic of China, "remains intact, and the people continue to suffer under its bloodthirsty power".

125. That is the point at issue in the question of Tibet. The Dalai Lama himself, defending himself against this charge, denies emphatically in his statement at Mussoorie, that he or his Government ever opposed reform of the prevailing social, economic and political regimes of Tibet. It would be quite reasonable of course to seek some amplification of that statement, but the fact remains that the pressure exerted by the People's Republic of China is too obvious to be denied and has no justification whatever. In the 17-point Agreement itself the Government of the People's Republic of China undertakes not to carry out reforms by coercion.

126. While my delegation sympathizes with any attempt to introduce social, economic and political improvements in a theocratic and feudal State it does not regard even such aims as justification for the use of force, reforms imposed under duress, violations of human rights, and genocide, still less for religious persecution, since they all constitute flagrant transgressions of the essential freedoms of mankind. We know very well that when it comes to denouncing violation of human rights in Tibet we once more come up against Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. We heard in the debate on the inclusion of this item, and it is being said again now that the United Nations cannot intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State, and that the question of human rights falls within such domestic jurisdiction.

127. That is not the view of my delegation. Ever since we have had the honour of representing the revolutionary Government of Cuba in the United Nations we have maintained that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights has thus far been nothing but a beautiful cloud of promises obscuring the harsh realities that many peoples are suffering, that the present methods of the Commission on Human Rights are completely ineffective and that it is imperative that the draft International Covenants on Human Rights which appear again on the

agenda of this session should be adopted, in spite of the opposition of those nations great or small who consider the problem a domestic one and reject all international action in matters of human rights.

128. My delegation voted in favour of the inclusion in the agenda of this session of the item proposed by the Federation of Malaya and Ireland. In so doing we followed the highest Cuban tradition of respect for liberty and the essential rights of man. Our compatriot José Martí declared that the first law of the Republic should be the devotion of the Cuban people to the cause of human dignity, and that in religious matters every man had a right to his own beliefs.

129. We realize that some will contend that the discussion of this subject may provoke friction at the very moment when an attempt is being made to reduce or eliminate it, but such an argument is little more than a pretext. Our only motive in condemning the Tibetan situation is to avoid a recurrence of such events.

130. That is the position of my delegation with regard to the item and we shall vote accordingly.

131. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I give the floor to the distinguished representative of Guatemala who has asked to be allowed to exercise his right of reply.

132. Mr. KESTLER (Guatemala) (translated from Spanish): In the speech which the representative of Cuba has just made on the question under discussion, he repeated certain remarks made in the general debate [806th meeting] by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Cuba, to the effect that there ought to be no recurrence of the coercion practised in Guatemala, Guinea, Hungary, Algeria and Tibet. The representative of Cuba went on to say that acts of force are inadmissible from any quarter, meaning no doubt from both Western Powers and members of the Eastern bloc.

133. My delegation, exercising its right of reply, would like to explain certain facts to the representative of Cuba. My delegation shares the Cuban representative's anxiety with regard to the danger of acts of force which may threaten the integrity of other States. Nevertheless, it is regrettable that he should have confused the situation of Guatemala with those of Hungary and Algeria. Clear proof of the difference is that life in Guatemala at the present time is based on institutions which are in keeping with the standards and principles of a law-abiding State. I have satisfaction in informing the representative of Cuba that we do not live under a regime of dictatorship founded on force, and the present Government of Guatemala is a perfectly constitutional one, set up as the result of free elections in which many political parties were represented. Thus the reference just made to my country by the representative of Cuba was completely misplaced. Furthermore, I think the people of Guatemala are the only judges of their own way of life and institutions.

134. I therefore ask that it be placed on record that my delegation protests against the references made to its system of government which do not come within the jurisdiction of this Assembly.

135. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I give the floor to the representative of Cuba for a brief explanation.

136. Mr. BISBE (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): I should like to explain briefly to the representative of

^{5/} International Commission of Jurists, *The Question of Tibet and the Rule of Law—A Preliminary Report* (Geneva, 1959), p. 196.

Guatemala that the remark which he mentioned did not refer in any way to the present situation in Guatemala but to a previous event in his country's history.

137. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I think I should like at this point to remind the Assembly that the First Committee has had to break off the discussion of its agenda to give the General Assembly an opportunity to begin discussion of this item. The Secretariat informs me that there are only three

speakers on the list for this afternoon's meeting and only one for tomorrow morning. Consequently, to assist the work of the General Assembly and of the First Committee, I propose, if there is no objection, to declare the list of speakers on this item closed at the end of this afternoon's meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.