



CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Agenda item 8: Adoption of the agenda (continued)	
First report of the General Committee (continued)	57

President: Mr. Charles MALIK (Lebanon).

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda (continued)

FIRST REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE
(A/3926) (continued)

1. The **PRESIDENT**: Members will recall that this morning the Assembly voted on the inclusion and allocation of the items recommended by the General Committee in its first report [A/3926]. It now remains for the Assembly to deal with paragraph 8 of the report concerning the question of Antarctica, and paragraphs 11 to 15 concerning the representation of China.

2. With regard to paragraph 8, I take it that it is the Assembly's understanding that the representative of India does not wish to press for the consideration of the item "The question of Antarctica" for this session, at least, and that the item is therefore withdrawn.

3. I turn now to paragraphs 11 to 15 of the General Committee's report which deal with the item proposed by India entitled "Question of the representation of China in the United Nations". The General Committee has recommended the adoption of a draft resolution, the text of which is to be found in paragraph 12 of the report. The Assembly has before it also the amendments to this draft resolution submitted jointly by Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Nepal and the United Arab Republic [A/L.245], which were circulated this morning. According to the amendments the words "accede to" would be substituted for the word "reject" in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution recommended by the General Committee, and paragraph 2 would be deleted.

4. I would remind the Assembly of rule 80 of the rules of procedure. I shall avail myself of the right conferred upon me in the last part of the rule, and invite the Assembly to consider the amendments. It is clear, then, that after the debate on the amendments and on the pertinent paragraphs of the General Committee's report it will be my duty to put the amendments to the vote first.

5. **Mr. Krishna MENON (India)**: Before I address myself to the substance of the procedural matter that is before us I should like, with your permission, to state my understanding of the procedural position so that there may be no conflict of views or, if there is one, so we may understand it from the beginning.

6. We have before us a report of the General Committee. It is open to anyone to move that that report be referred back—that is to say, that the report be not accepted and that the contrary be accepted—in which case, according to our understanding of the position laid down by previous Presidents of the General Assembly, the debate would not be subject to rule 23 of the rules of procedure. But from all that one has been able to gather, some doubts have been expressed about the distinction between an adverse ruling and the reverse.

7. I was a little perturbed at the proceedings of the General Committee. There are no verbatim records of the General Committee's meetings, but the President according to this press release for which I do not vouch, seems to have put the matter in such a way that inclusion and non-inclusion are in the same category. It may be so philosophically. The request for the inclusion of an additional item and also the non-inclusion of an additional item are regarded as subject to rule 23. So, in order to put all doubts at rest, and also in order that the debate might come into some sort of order as far as we are concerned, the delegation of India, jointly with some others, has submitted the amendments to which the President has referred.

8. I am sorry for the delay in submitted the amendments. It has been caused partly by the hope that this procedure would not be necessary. May I however say that the draft resolution to which these amendments have been moved was itself put before the General Committee during the course of the same meeting! However, Mr. President, since you have not ruled out our amendments—which you could have done—and since you have been so gracious as to permit this, my delegation is extremely grateful to you.

9. So far as my delegation is concerned, we now have the opportunity of simply saying that the report should not be accepted. We also have the opportunity of moving these amendments. If, in moving that the report be not accepted we may not touch upon any part of the substance, then, of course, we come to the second solution—the substantive draft resolution before the Assembly and the amendments to it. This draft resolution then is like any other draft resolution that comes before us, and is subject to full discussion.

10. However, I propose at this stage of the discussion to place some limitations upon myself and confine my observations to the question of placing this item on the agenda, a matter very largely of procedure. It is not my intention at this moment to go into the very grave implications of the subject that we are at present discussing, implications far graver than perhaps some of the delegations have been able to ascertain. I, however, reserve to myself and to my delegation the right of reply to the debate which will ensue. It arises from the fact, Mr. President, that you have before you now a substantive proposal to which amendments have been

submitted and that, under your ruling, the amendments come first. So that, when I have submitted these observations and the large number of speakers who have been inscribed on the list have spoken—and I have no doubt that others will follow—I hope that you will allow me the right of reply in that debate. That position I reserve. If it is necessary at that time to go into the substance of the matter and place before the Assembly those facts which contribute to the gravity of the situation and of which we may be aware, I will do so within the limits that are imposed upon me as the representative of the Government of India.

11. Our position in this matter, is supported by the rulings of previous Presidents who have said that rule 23 does not apply in this case.

12. There are two legs to these amendments. The draft resolution recommended by the General Committee for adoption by the General Assembly is a unique procedure which has never been applied in any case in the history of the United Nations since the second part of the first session. Until that time, there were no rules of procedure. Anyway, this draft resolution is before us. I will deal with it in parts because I believe that here two different draft resolutions have been put together as one. The first part is merely a rejection of the request that the Government of India has made. It reads, in part, "Decides to reject the request of India. . .". With great respect, I submit that this did not require a resolution or a clause of a resolution; it only required an adverse vote! But the draft resolution is before us, and therefore I propose to deal with it.

13. I say here as I said before the General Committee, that the Committee was not entitled to submit this part of the draft resolution because the previous resolution of the General Assembly, resolution 396 (V), definitely laid down certain procedures in this regard. I agree with anyone that the Assembly at one session cannot be bound for all time by decisions taken at another session. But our rule is that once an Assembly has adopted a resolution, that resolution has to be rescinded if it is to be disregarded.

14. To understand the situation best, it will be necessary to go into some of the background of the whole problem. It would be quite unusual, vexatious, impertinent and entirely contrary form and procedure to request the representation of any particular Member State. That would be wrong. If all of us started doing that, there would be eighty-one draft resolutions and the Assembly could not proceed. Therefore, it is necessary to establish a prima facie case for doing this.

15. In October 1949, the present Government of China made application to the Security Council in regard to representation. On 18 November 1949 the Foreign Minister, Chou En-lai, who is now the Prime Minister of the Government of China sent a letter to the United Nations [A/1123]. No action was taken, however. Subsequently, the Security Council was asked to consider the matter by one of the permanent members of the Council. But it so happened that Mr. Tsiang who was the representative of the other side was President. He ruled that the document might be circulated, and no discussion took place at that time.

16. The matter came back to the Security Council at its 461st meeting on 13 January 1950. The draft resolution for the recognition of the new China, in sum and substance, was rejected by six votes—Cuba, Ecuador,

Egypt, France, the United States of America and the China represented in the Security Council—to three—India, the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia—with two abstentions which are significant today—the United Kingdom and Norway.

17. The debate went on. The then Secretary-General, at the end of the next meeting or at a subsequent time, decided to examine this proposal and he submitted a memorandum [S/1466] to the United Nations on the principle of the representation of States. I have no desire to go into detail on this matter because the document enters into the merits of the question of representation in the United Nations.

18. The problem before us is whether this item shall be discussed and not who should be represented in the United Nations. But Mr. Trygvie Lie's memorandum is a matter of great importance because it deals not only with China or Timbuktu; it deals with the general problem of who is entitled to represent a country.

19. That was in 1949. In 1950 the Security Council was again convened. This time the President was a representative of the Soviet Union. This time, too, he was on the other side. After some preliminary discussion the provisional agenda circulated by the President was discussed and on that provisional agenda was the recognition of the representation of the Central People's Government of China. As a result of the procedural debate which lasted three full days, the item on Chinese representation was removed from the agenda. But how? By a vote of five in favour of removal, five against with Egypt alone, that time, abstaining.

20. I go into all these details, first of all to show how old the problem is, to show that there has been some doubt about it for a very long time. Otherwise, it would be quite improper for a representative to come here and say that the credentials of a representative should be examined. There is, however, a long history behind this case. That is one reason. The second is that from all that I have read out to you, each time there has been a vote on it, although the vote was not quite even—in this last case it was even, five to five, with one abstention—there has never been an overwhelming decision either way!

21. Before this item came to the General Assembly for the first time in 1950, an ad hoc Committee was set up to examine what should be done in the event of two parties claiming the same seat. That can often happen. Normally, it should be decided by the Credentials Committee. But when political questions are involved, the Credentials Committee—which really examines the technicalities of representation, whether the signatures are right, whether the identities are the same, and so on—may not be adequate. Whatever the reason, an ad hoc Committee was appointed and on 14 December 1950 the General Assembly adopted resolution 396 (V).

22. There are two or three paragraphs in the preamble of the resolution which, if necessary, I can read out. But I do not think it is essential for the consideration of the matter. The preamble simply refers to the importance of these matters. Then come the following two operative paragraphs:

"1. Recommends that, whenever more than one authority claims to be the government entitled to represent a Member State in the United Nations and this

question becomes the subject of controversy in the United Nations"—which is the present case—"the question should be considered in the light of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter and the circumstances of each case;

"2. Recommends that, when any such question arises, it should be considered by the General Assembly"—not "it may be"—"or by the Interim Committee if the General Assembly is not in session;"

23. It is my submission therefore that what has happened in the last two or three years here is ultra vires, not only of the Charter, as I shall point out later, but of this decision of the Assembly itself. The Assembly has taken a decision and unless we rescind that decision by proper procedures, any problem of this kind where two parties contest the same seat and find themselves in such a position must first of all be decided in the light of the Charter. But paragraph 2, which governs the whole thing, states that it should be considered by the General Assembly. That is all we are asking you to do.

24. In casting a vote for the position I am putting forward, no one is committing himself to endorsement of the present régime in China or any of its actions. No one is saying that as a result of that vote, the representation should be changed. The plain issue before us at the present time—I am not going into the merits of it—is whether the Assembly, on an issue of this character, the gravity of which I shall point out to the extent that is necessary later, should have the right of free discussion. By covering up this matter, by evading an issue, do we really solve anything? What is more, is it not the right of the Members of the Assembly, of world public opinion and of the parties concerned on either side, that there should be open and free discussion of this matter?

25. Even at the risk of being regarded as repeating myself, I would like to say, again and again, that the item before us is merely the question of the representation of China and that what we are now discussing, as a result of the General Committee's report, is the inclusion of that item in the agenda. There is no reason whatsoever why those who want to argue against it should not place it on the agenda in order that their case might be established.

26. So far as the Government of India is concerned, its position is very clear. It does not want to include this item simply for the sake of discussing it. It wants this matter to be considered because it gravely concerns the peace of the world, stability and order in the Far East, and the implementation of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter. What is more, it merely takes into account the realities of the situation. The Charter stipulates that those who come in as Member States should be able to fulfil Charter obligations, and it is only a Government which, in the classical Austinian definition, is able to command the habitual obedience of the citizens of that State that is able to deliver the goods. If Charter obligations are to be carried out—and this has been pointed out many times in disarmament debates and elsewhere—and if any decision in regard to that vast land of 630 million people is to be implemented, it requires the consent, co-operation and implementation of the Government that can carry it out.

27. Therefore, as far as the Government of India is

concerned, while the issue before the Assembly is the inclusion of an item, when that item is included we shall point out why it is necessary to effect an alteration in the representation. It is not a question of admitting a new Member State. If that were the case, it would go first to the Security Council. China is a Member of the United Nations, China is a founder Member of the United Nations. China carries with it the obligation of a permanent Member of the United Nations responsible for world security. Those who vote on behalf of China can veto a resolution, can hold up the proceedings of the Security Council. They are among the five great statesmen who are responsible for the business of this Organization.

28. China is a founder Member. To say that China is a founder Member does not mean that this or that government of China is a founder Member. Article 3 of the Charter stipulates that Members of the United Nations are States, not Governments, and the State of China, in our humble submission, is not represented here. Therefore, we seek to establish a prima facie case in that way, because the objection to discussing this matter, to which I shall briefly refer, is that it is a controversial issue. I do not think that there are many issues before the Assembly that are not controversial. I do not think it is right for us to avoid an issue because it is controversial. The issue before us today is not only controversial; the serious consideration of this matter is integral to the maintenance of peace in the world. The issues will not disappear just because we refuse to look at them.

29. Secondly, if, as we think, the present government of China, its composition and political and economic policies are not the concern of this Organization, if that Government is in the position of being able to command the habitual obedience of its citizens, and if it is recognized by large numbers of people in the world, then the question arises as to whether it is right and ethical to exclude it from the Organization. Here I would like to give some figures.

30. Of the Member States of this Organization, twenty-nine recognize the People's Republic of China. The Government of the People's Republic of China has trade relations with at least sixty-eight other countries. The countries which recognize that Government have a population of 1,040 million. If one adds to that figure the population of the People's Republic of China itself, which today is 639 million, one arrives at a figure of 1,679 million people out of a total world population of 2,737 million, or a majority of the world population.

31. We cannot, of course, come here and argue in terms of population, because the United Nations is based upon the conception of one State having one voice and one vote, which we do not challenge. But in deciding these matters one has to refer to their impact, and to the great causes which lie behind them.

32. Therefore, I want to submit that in ignoring these views we are really ignoring the views of a large majority of the population of the world. But suppose we dismiss that argument and say that it is only a minority which takes this view—twenty-nine countries last year, twenty-five countries the year before that, and a fewer number before that. There has been an increasing number every year asking for the consideration of this problem. I wish to ask you, Mr. President, can an Organization such as ours survive in prestige, survive

in conformity with the principles of the Charter or in accordance with the ideas of free discussion and the protection of minority views, when a large group of countries—twenty-nine of them—want a question debated, some abstain and the remainder do not want the question debated, and the issue is not discussed? I submit that this suppression of the point of view of a very large and, if I may say so, significant minority is not good. No one expects a minority view to be carried, and no one expects a minority to become a majority as a result of a debate here, but the minority does have the right to put forward its views. It is largely in the hands of the President and of the General Assembly to see to it that these minority views are expressed.

33. I am very surprised not to hear some of those Member States which have long been wedded to liberal traditions and which have long traditions of parliamentary governments, such as the United Kingdom, come forward today and say, "Right or wrong, let us look into this matter because a large number of Member States here have a point of view which should be heard".

34. The reason for not allowing this question to be discussed is said to be that talking about it might create some difficulties. Well, that is no longer true. I believe that there are some twenty-two or twenty-five speakers inscribed on the list already. If it is the idea of some that we should keep the People's Republic of China out of the United Nations because of the resolution on the Korean War or because of its form of government or because of the behaviour with which it has been charged, the fact remains that it is one of the great Powers of the world with an enormous population and with considerable economic weight. We cannot put a country of that type out of bounds. To put China out of bounds is really to put ourselves out of bounds. China and India are close neighbours. We do not agree with everything which the Chinese Government does, and I do not suppose that they agree with everything that we do. We have a common frontier with them and it is our hope that the common frontier will be maintained without any war. We practically have common seas. It is our desire, and I am sure that it is the desire of our neighbours, to maintain these peaceful relations, and it is up to the United Nations to assist us and not to allow present tensions to continue.

35. I submit this item with a grave sense of responsibility. The Government of India submitted this item in June of this year and there has been sufficient opportunity for Members to review their decision. I think it is only fair to say that we even reviewed the question just before the Assembly was to begin, following the recent events which have taken place. It is our very considered view that the discussion of this problem is necessary and can do nothing but good. It will enable some progress to be made towards the solution of difficulties that are at present unresolved.

36. These are my remarks with regard to paragraph 1 of the draft resolution recommended by the General Committee; it is not within the competence of the Committee to make that recommendation. It is certainly within the competence of the General Assembly to adopt a resolution. However, it is for you, Mr. President, and for the General Assembly to consider whether a resolution can be adopted which really cancels a previous resolution without rescinding that resolution first. If that could be done, it would be difficult for us to convey

to the world that the decisions of our Organization have any binding force at all. We could adopt a resolution one year and the next year adopt a contrary one! As regards the General Committee, it acted beyond its powers and disregarded the mandate of the General Assembly. The General Committee is an organ of the General Assembly. It has no power in itself; it is merely a steering committee. It is not supposed to study questions of policy and it should not go into the merits of questions. If it is not right for the representatives to go into the merits, how can it be right for the General Committee to submit a proposal?

37. Therefore, I submit again that paragraph 1 of the draft resolution recommended by the General Committee is ultra vires of its own powers, contrary to the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, contrary to the Charter, inimical to the interests of maintaining peace and decreasing tension, that it prevents the expression of minority views and is an unfortunate exhibition of the power of the majority to prevent discussion. If this fully succeeded, it might have some value. However, what now happens is that there is discussion, but not a full discussion because we are limited by not being able to go into the merits of the question. We therefore have a half-baked discussion. We have all the evils of discussion without any of the merits. That is the result of the present approach to this problem.

38. I now come to paragraph 2, which reads:

"2. Decides not to consider, at its thirteenth regular session, any proposal to exclude the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China or to seat representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China."

39. So far as I am aware, this matter has been before the General Assembly seven times, and it does not speak much for the Assembly's prestige to say each year that we shall not consider this question for one whole year. This is not a procedure that redounds to our credit, at least that is my humble submission.

40. However, over and above that, I submit that this anticipates the findings of the Credentials Committee. After all, the Credentials Committee is to say, according to procedure, who should represent a particular group of people. In this case there are political issues. However, to say that this question should not be considered for twelve months means that we have already decided what the Credentials Committee should or should not do. While this may be appropriate in this case because of the political implications, it is a very bad example for us to adopt a resolution deciding that we shall not consider a person's right to sit in the Assembly even before the Credentials Committee has looked at his papers.

41. Then, and I only want to touch upon the merits at the moment, even if there was justification last year—and I should like my friends, particularly those opposed to my point of view, to take note of this—even if there was justification last year and the year before for saying we should not do anything for twelve months, does it redound to our sense of responsibility, does it correspond to reality at this time, when the gravest crisis in the world is related to this problem, to say that the United Nations will not discuss this matter while all this is going on? To bind our hands thus, in my view, would be the wrong thing to do at this time.

42. My delegation therefore asks for the full and complete deletion of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

43. If this item is not included in the agenda, that will be bad enough; but to adopt a positive resolution tying our hands, to anticipate the findings of the Credentials Committee, to proclaim to the world that we shall not consider for the duration of this session an issue which is connected with one of the gravest problems in the world—that seems to me to be an abdication of our functions which it is not right for us to do. That is my opinion.

44. I have said before that I reserve to my delegation the right of reply, because I submitted these amendments. I have no desire to go into matters further than one should, but I would just mention this. All the news from that part of the world, until about six hours ago, calls upon us to take a different view of this matter from the one that the General Committee has asked us to take.

45. We have made mistakes in the past in situations of this kind. My Government, with a grave sense of responsibility and with deliberation, submits this request to this Assembly which is composed of people drawn from different parts of the world—and the largest number of people who support the point of view I am putting forward are the neighbours of China, people who are, if nothing else, perhaps in a better position to sense physically and emotionally what is going on. I request the Assembly not to ignore the appeals they have made time after time, and today for the eighth time. I therefore request the Assembly to consider these amendments, to accept them, to place the item on the agenda and to delete paragraph 2 recommending that the item should not be considered.

46. As I said before, when I return to this rostrum I propose to go into the merits of the question, if the merits are raised during the debate. In any case it will be my duty to place before the Assembly the gravity of the situation which confronts us—I am not saying that other people are not conscious of it, but it makes a terrific impact upon us—so that the Assembly may realize, as it must, the gravity of the situation, so that we may submit to the Assembly that we are dealing with a question that may well drift into a question of conflict.

47. The Assembly will remember that only two or three days ago the Secretary of State of the United States, in his address to the Assembly, said that the United States would bring before the Assembly the issue of China. That is one more reason why the representatives of the People's Republic of China should be here to be castigated or to appear in their own defence. If a very grave crisis exists, it is more likely to be put off, more likely to be postponed, more likely to be alleviated, by this procedure. These are my views, and I reserve the right to take the rostrum again later.

48. The PRESIDENT: From the President's point of view, that is to say, from the point of view of the General Assembly as a whole, we have before us the draft resolution recommended by the General Committee and appearing in paragraph 12 of its first report [A/3926]. Amendments [A/L.245] have been submitted to the draft resolution. In accordance with the rules of procedure, the Assembly will be asked to vote on the two texts.

49. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I shall heed the President's admonition and shall, therefore, not go into the substance of the question. I am quite tempted, as a matter of fact, to do so because our arguments are, I think, very persuasive, but I can see the need for the admonition, and in the interests of orderly procedure I shall respect it.

50. On Friday, when the General Committee considered India's request for inclusion in the agenda of an item entitled "Question of the representation of China in the United Nations", the United States moved that this request be rejected and, furthermore, that the Assembly, as it has done ever since 1951, adopt a decision not to consider the matter during the present regular session.

51. I should like to read the draft resolution. It is very short. It is as follows:

"The General Assembly

"1. Decides to reject the request of India for the inclusion in the agenda of its thirteenth regular session of the item entitled 'Question of the representation of China in the United Nations';

"2. Decides not to consider, at its thirteenth regular session, any proposal to exclude the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China or to seat representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China."

52. Let me say that this draft resolution not only is something that the United States believes in but it appeared to be wise to a substantial majority of the members of the General Committee, who approved it by a substantial vote. This procedure, let me add, is the same procedure which was followed not only last year, that is to say, at the twelfth session, but at the sixth and eleventh sessions too.

53. We believe that the report of the General Committee should be upheld. The Members of the General Assembly are all familiar with all of the underlying factors. That is one reason why we shall not rehearse all those factors now. Another reason for not rehearsing them is that to do such a thing at this time of all times would assuredly add to world tensions.

54. The Indian amendments would just completely reverse the meaning of the recommendation made by the General Committee which is now before you. You could, of course, get a test vote equally well by not offering amendments and by voting against the draft resolution, but the Indian representative is well within his rights, of course, in doing it this way if he wants to. But it totally reverses the meaning of the draft resolution. Naturally, therefore, we urge that the Indian amendments be rejected and that the report of the General Committee on this subject be adopted.

55. Before I take my seat, let me say that I serve notice on the President that I reserve the right to request the floor again if it should be necessary to present further considerations.

56. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The delegation of the Soviet Union fully supports the Indian proposal that the question of China's representation in the United Nations should be included in the agenda of this session of the General Assembly.

57. Once again, just as for many years in succession,

the Assembly is confronted with this question, which would not have come before us at all if the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter had been strictly observed. At the present time, the question of restoring the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is unquestionably one of the basic problems of international relations.

58. Contrary to the clear provisions of the United Nations Charter, contrary to the generally recognized standards of international law and, finally, contrary to ordinary common sense, the representatives of China have been absent from our midst for many years—the representatives, that is to say, of a Power which was one of the founders of the United Nations and whose boundaries contain a quarter of the world's population. We are dealing here with a great country, a State with an exceedingly rich history and culture. I need only point out that in many spheres of science and culture China had already reached a position of eminence thousands of years ago. That is a statement of inescapable historical fact.

59. Even if we take just this one aspect of the matter and disregard all the rest, it alone proves the absurdity of the position of those who are preventing the legitimate representatives of the Chinese people from taking their place beside us in the United Nations.

60. What is the reason for China's absence from the United Nations, for this obviously abnormal and inadmissible situation? I am, of course, revealing no secrets when I say that the only reason is the hostile policy pursued by the United States Government towards the Chinese people and its State and the pressure to which the United States Government has consequently subjected many Members of the United Nations for a number of years whenever the matter of China's representation has come up.

61. The United States Government obviously has its reasons for fearing the restitution of China's rights in the United Nations. I need only point out that for the past eight years the United States has been occupying part of China's territory, the island of Taiwan and the Penghu (Pescadores) archipelago, whose seizure was an act of direct aggression against China. One can well imagine that the representatives of those who carried out this seizure would not find it particularly agreeable to meet the representatives of the country which suffered aggression face to face here.

62. We also know that the United States Government does not approve of the social system which the Chinese people established in their country after the people's revolution ended the rule of the foreign imperialists and their henchmen there. And when the United States Government, with its "position of strength" policy, does not approve of a country's domestic practices, it usually attempts to interfere directly in that country's affairs in order to impose its own will and establish practices which suit United States ruling circles. Washington still harbours plans of this kind with regard to the People's Republic of China, even though it must be clear to everyone that these are merely the unattainable dreams of a few United States politicians whose ambitions evidently far outrun their possibilities.

63. These politicians cling to the dream that the people's China will disappear. We might, however, observe that they could just as profitably utter incantations in the hope, say, of drying up the ocean; the

effect would be precisely the same. But another question calls for an answer: how long will the United Nations permit itself to be used as the instrument of the United States policy of interference in the domestic affairs of other States and of outright aggression?

64. The question of the restitution of China's legitimate rights in the United Nations raises a highly important policy issue. It involves a clash between two opposing attitudes towards international affairs. Those who believe that the provisions of the United Nations Charter should be strictly observed, that the principles of the equality of peoples and of non-interference in the domestic affairs of other States should be adhered to in actual practice, demand that the People's Republic of China should immediately be granted its legitimate place in the United Nations. On the other hand, those who think they can base their foreign policy on arbitrary behaviour towards States which do not suit them are opposing the restitution of China's rights in the United Nations and take the view that China's place there can continue to be occupied by a group of outsiders who have no connexion with the Chinese people and who at the very most are entitled to free visitors' tickets to the upper gallery of this hall. The Soviet delegation has already stressed the fact here—and I wish to repeat it once more—that the substitution of representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique for representatives of mighty China in the United Nations can only be regarded as a sorry farce.

65. The matter is also, of course, perfectly clear from the legal standpoint. It is not a question of granting the People's Republic of China some sort of favour or privilege, as political circles in the United States sometimes like to make out, but of restoring China's long-standing legitimate rights as one of the founders of the United Nations and as a permanent member of the Security Council. The chairman of the Indian delegation, Mr. Menon, has rightly drawn attention to this point. No manoeuvres or resolutions imposed by the United States by means of pressure on the countries dependent on it can alter the elementary fact that now, as in the past, China is a great sovereign, independent country. And it is this China alone, the only China that exists, which can play any part in international affairs, however much the apologists for United States aggression against China may try to underpin that aggression with some sort of "theoretical foundation" in the form of the spurious "two Chinas" formula they have invented. China always has been and still is in China, while the island of Taiwan and the off-shore islands are an inalienable part of Chinese territory which has been illegally seized by the United States and awaits liberation. The United States Government should take a more serious view of the acts of provocation it has undertaken in the Far East in the attempt to expand its aggression against China in such areas as that of the off-shore islands. The aggressors must leave Chinese territory and go back where they came from—the sooner, the better.

66. It is most unedifying to witness the current efforts of a group of United States politicians to close the eyes of the entire world to China's existence, to proclaim "non-existent" a great country which has just entered upon a period of power and prosperity after the triumph of the people's revolution in China ended a prolonged period of dismemberment, constant internecine strife artificially incited from without, brutal foreign exploi-

tation and, as a result of all this, national backwardness and poverty. One need only point out that a country which a decade or so ago was producing no machines more complicated than bicycles is now manufacturing its own automobiles, tractors, and complex tools and machinery on a large scale. It is invincible not only because of its inexhaustible resources, its large population, and the support it receives from its friends and allies, but above all because of the unity of the Chinese people, which has united in support of its Government and the policy it is pursuing. Never in the past has any Government of China enjoyed the unlimited confidence and the support of the entire Chinese people which is enjoyed by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. Only those who are politically blind can fail to see this.

67. Everyone who is familiar with the facts knows very well that in its foreign policy the People's Republic of China invariably seeks to strengthen peace among nations, consistently supports the fundamental purposes and principles of the United Nations, and strives for their fulfilment. From the first day of its existence, its policy has been to establish with all countries friendly relations based on the principles of equal rights, mutual respect and sovereignty, and it now maintains diplomatic relations with more than thirty countries—I repeat, more than thirty countries—whose population comprises approximately half that of the entire world. If we add to this the population of China itself, the picture becomes even clearer. The People's Republic of China maintains trade relations with virtually the entire world—excluding, of course, the United States, which stubbornly continues to cling to the idea of a commercial blockade of the People's Republic of China.

68. The principles of peaceful coexistence among States which were proclaimed by the Government of the People's Republic of China together with the Governments of India and Burma were unanimously supported by several dozen Asian and African States which took part in the Bandung Conference. They were also endorsed in resolution 1236 (XII) on peaceful and neighbourly relations among States which was adopted at the last session of the United Nations General Assembly.

69. Equally well known are the repeated proposals which the Government of the People's Republic of China has made with a view to easing international tension in the Far East, ensuring the peaceful settlement of international problems in that area, and strengthening the security of the Asian peoples. There is every justification for saying that in our day the People's Republic of China has become an important force for peace in international relations.

70. If the United Nations wants to deal with reality and not live in a world of illusions—the illusions, that is, under which the United States Government has laboured as a result of the failure of its imperialist policy towards China nine years ago—then the moment is due, indeed long overdue, for the Organization to open its eyes to all these facts. Those who try to pretend that they do not notice them are merely placing themselves in an awkward position. So far as the Governments of individual States are concerned we, as members of the United Nations, can of course leave this matter to their conscience and sense of responsibility. It is up to the United States Government to recognize or not to recognize China. The latter will not cease to

exist or suffer in any way as a result of the United States action, only the foreign policy and international prestige of the United States is being damaged—in fact, seriously damaged. On no account, however, can the authors of this policy be permitted to go on forcing the entire United Nations to follow in their wake.

71. There is no legal or political justification for linking the question of this or that State's diplomatic recognition of the People's Republic of China with the question of the restitution of China's legitimate rights in the United Nations. By what right should the hostile, unrealistic policy which the United States still sees fit to pursue towards China become the policy of the United Nations and be imposed on its other Members? After all, many Members of the United Nations have long had normal relations with the People's Republic of China, and in most cases these have been close and friendly relations. In the interest of strengthening peace and international co-operation, the purpose for which the United Nations was established, the abnormal situation imposed by the United States must be brought to an end.

72. It would, of course, be absurd to think that the People's Republic of China cannot exist without the United Nations. Regardless of whether it is represented in the United Nations, the People's Republic of China will continue to thrive and develop, playing an increasingly prominent role in international affairs with each passing day. Those States which still pretend not to notice China will no doubt very soon be compelled to reckon with the real China, just as even the United States Government has in effect been compelled to do since, as we know, it is now conducting official negotiations with representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China. However, the absence of Chinese representatives from the United Nations is damaging the Organization to an extent which it is dangerous to underestimate. It can be definitely stated that until representatives of the legitimate Government of the Chinese people take their places in this hall, and are seated at meetings of the Security Council and the other United Nations organs, our Organization cannot act as a truly international body.

73. It is, after all, a matter of common knowledge that many highly important international problems cannot be fruitfully considered without the participation of representatives of China. We have seen instances of this, and we shall see many more, when such problems as disarmament and the development of international economic relations are involved and, of course, particularly when issues relating to the situation in Asia are under consideration.

74. Finally, as a result of the absence of Chinese representatives, the most important political organ of the United Nations, the Security Council, which bears primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace, is being placed in a completely false position. As we know, the United Nations Charter provides that for the adoption of decisions by the Security Council on all but procedural matters the affirmative votes must include the concurring votes of all the Council's permanent members. That is what it says: all the Security Council's permanent members. China is a permanent member of the Security Council, and yet for almost ten years it has been denied the opportunity to take part in the work of the Council. Throughout these years, China's place in the Council has been occupied by individuals who do not represent

China and have no connexion with the Chinese Government and people. Consequently, there are good grounds for saying that the decisions taken by the Council during this period do not fulfil the requirements of the United Nations Charter. I am sure you will agree that, if we value the authority of the United Nations, it is time to put an end to this situation.

75. Furthermore, can it be said that Asia, with its numerous States, young and old, is properly represented in our Organization in present circumstances, when no representatives of the People's Republic of China are taking part in the work of the United Nations? I think every representative will answer that question in the negative. Until such time as there are representatives of China in the United Nations, it cannot be said that the interests of Asia are adequately represented here—Asia, the largest of the world's continents, whose role in international affairs has greatly increased and is continuing to increase with each passing day.

76. From this standpoint alone, the present situation is highly abnormal and attests to the fact that this question involves more than merely China. Therefore, it is not at all surprising that India, another great Asian country, has raised the question of Chinese representation in the United Nations—and, indeed, not for the first time. Asia and the Asian peoples will not be properly represented in our Organization until the legitimate representatives of the People's Republic of China sit beside us in the General Assembly, the Security Council and the other organs of the United Nations, and until the "Chiang Kai-shekists" are expelled from the United Nations.

77. Striving to achieve the impossible, namely, to find some basis or justification for its aggressive policy with regard to the People's Republic of China, for which there is no possible justification, the representatives of the United States Government are resorting to the most absurd and patently false arguments. Thus, the regrettable resolution which was illegally adopted eight years ago under United States pressure in connexion with the events in Korea is being used as a pretext to bar representatives of China from the United Nations. We again find references to this resolution in the statement concerning the "non-recognition" of the People's Republic of China which was issued last month by the United States Department of State for the obvious purpose of exerting further pressure on the United Nations in the matter in view of the forthcoming session of the General Assembly.

78. References to this resolution by statesmen in the United States merely represent an attempt to shift to others the responsibility for their own unseemly actions. They really amount to introducing into international relations the old and not particularly clever dodge of the thief who shouts "Stop thief!" as he makes off with the loot in order to divert attention from himself.

79. As far as the People's Republic of China is concerned, its Government is exercising the utmost restraint and patience in the present tense situation. It is warning the aggressors, it is making clear to them the imprudence and danger of their actions and it has even agreed to resume negotiations with the Power that has engaged in armed intervention in China's domestic affairs. We can only hope that the United States Gov-

ernment will be capable of correctly interpreting and duly evaluating this position taken by China and that it will cease playing with fire in the Far East before it is too late.

80. Special reference must be made to the United Kingdom's position on the question under consideration. We all know that diplomatic relations have been established between the United Kingdom and the People's Republic of China and that the United Kingdom recognized the People's Republic of China some years ago now. But what is happening? In spite of all this, the United Kingdom Government persistently objects to the representatives of the People's Republic of China occupying their lawful seat in the United Nations. The United Kingdom Government has been playing a double game on this matter for several years, apparently unaware of the fact that it has long since over-played its hand. Perhaps the British or, to be exact, the United Kingdom Government, since we know that opinion is divided on this question in the United Kingdom, considers that such a double game is in keeping with the traditions of British diplomacy? We shall not argue the point, for that may well be so.

81. The United Kingdom Government bears no small responsibility for the present situation in the United Nations in regard to the representation of the People's Republic of China. It is unlikely that anyone will question the proposition that if the United Kingdom wished to take a more objective attitude toward this question, the United States Government would have to take that fact into account. Indeed, the United Kingdom occasionally has something of its own to say on a particular subject and its ally—the United States—listens. We do not propose to give any examples, for they are well known to all participants in the General Assembly and best of all to the Americans and the British themselves.

82. In referring to this matter, the Soviet delegation merely wishes to stress the point that the United Kingdom cannot simply hide behind the back of its senior NATO partner and disclaim responsibility for the present state of affairs in connexion with the representation of China in the United Nations.

83. Mr. Lloyd, the British Foreign Secretary, will probably once again defend the position of the United Kingdom Government. But his is a difficult task because the ammunition which the United Kingdom Government is bringing up for this defence is very meagre, to say the least.

84. We naturally realize that the majority of the countries which support the United States Government's position on the question of the representation of China in the United Nations do so only because they are under United States pressure. Nobody will deny this, and it is hardly necessary to expatiate on the subject. The success the United States Government has so far had in preventing the restitution of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and even the very discussion of this question by the General Assembly is not, of course, due to arguments and reasoning likely to convince anyone of the justice of Washington's policy. Less and less attention is being given to arguments and more and more to blatant pressure upon those who yield to it.

85. The United States abuses its position by imposing its will on States which are dependent on it and are

caught in a web of military and other treaties. As stated in the communication of 19 September from Mr. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, to Mr. Eisenhower, President of the United States—which, as is known, was not to the liking of some people—"the countries maintaining relations with Chiang Kai-shek's clique find that such recognition is a heavy burden and is drawing to a close." Mr. Krushchev continued:

"Surely, most States which, under pressure from the United States, still maintain diplomatic relations with Chiang Kai-shek, will be relieved when a state of affairs obviously contrary to common sense and to the interests of the peoples of these countries comes to an end, and when China occupies its rightful place in international organizations."

86. It is quite conceivable that those countries which the United States Government is dragging in its wake, compelling them to follow its policy towards China, find this situation oppressive. Indeed, they have every reason to do so. Those who take part in the farce which is regularly performed in the United Nations whenever the question of the representation of China arises are fully aware of the reaction produced in the Chinese people by their policy on this question. They know, too, that it will live in the memory of more than one generation of Chinese.

87. It would, however, be wrong to conclude that these countries bear no responsibility at all for their position on the question of the representation of China. Occasions do occur—admittedly infrequently—in the work of the United Nations when the overwhelming majority of States, including small countries dependent on the United States, show their mettle, so to speak, despite the fact that this displeases the United States Government. An example of this was the General Assembly's consideration at its emergency special session of the question of the withdrawal of United States forces from Lebanon and of United Kingdom forces from Jordan, and the decision which it adopted. This example shows that small countries have considerable opportunities of contributing to a reduction of international tension and to an appropriate settlement of the question under consideration.

88. No one has proved that, when the question of the representation of China in the United Nations is under consideration, these countries cannot take the same line as they did during the discussion of the question of the withdrawal of United States and United Kingdom forces from the Near East, and achieve a correct solution together with other States which are pressing for an end to the unjust situation that obtains with regard to China. Let us hope that this will not be long delayed, that such a result will be achieved; we can then confidently say that new strength will be injected into our Organization and that the cause of peace will benefit.

89. It is no accident that, in countries whose Governments usually support United States policy, the movement in favour of establishing normal relations with the People's Republic of China has recently gained much ground and there is a growing realization that the policy of barring the People's Republic of China from participation in the work of the United Nations is doomed to failure. It is noteworthy that an increasing number of prominent political and public figures in the

United States itself are strongly urging the cessation of acts of provocation with regard to China and the adoption of a policy based on realities and not on dangerous illusions.

90. The absence of China from the United Nations is a flagrant violation of the legitimate rights of the Chinese people and of the principles of the United Nations Charter. As we know, the Charter defines the United Nations as a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in maintaining peace and international co-operation. But it may well be asked what sort of centre the United Nations is when representatives of a State numbering about one-quarter of the world's population are deprived of an opportunity of expressing their views from this rostrum. Is it not clear that if this state of affairs continues, the United Nations may become, not a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations, but a centre for intrigues, blackmail and pressure by some States against other States? Even today the United Nations is, as we know, far from immune from such ills, but there is no doubt that continuation of the present situation can only serve to make matters worse in this respect.

91. The situation can be rectified only if the States Members of the United Nations set themselves above temporary considerations dependent on the prevailing circumstances and based on a reluctance to quarrel with the United States on this issue. Although it is understandable that some Member States should have such an attitude, it cannot be justified, for if United Nations activities are to be directed along the lines desired by United States circles, then the drill-sergeant methods we have frequently seen United States representatives use in the United Nations with respect to certain countries will be practised on an even larger scale. It seems to us that this would be dangerous, above all to small countries, and for quite obvious reasons.

92. Dozens of States with the most diverse social systems and forms of government are represented in the United Nations. This is rightly regarded as a virtue of our Organization as an international centre for uniting the efforts of all these countries to promote peace. When Governments now assert that this or that State should be barred from occupying its rightful seat in the United Nations simply because its "régime" or, in other words, its social system is not to their liking, we have every reason to say that they are seeking to force the United Nations along a slippery and dangerous path.

93. If this path is followed, the result may be that, say, only the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will remain in the United Nations. This would probably be very convenient for certain Powers which would then enjoy complete "freedom" to order the United Nations about as they please. But if that happens, what will be left of the United Nations Charter, of the international Organization and of the principle of universality on which it is based? There may perhaps be some politicians who like to turn the Members of the United Nations into a squad of drilling soldiers blindly obeying their orders. If so, these politicians should frankly admit that they are seeking to do away with the United Nations.

94. Thus, the question of the representation of China

in the United Nations, which the delegation of India has proposed to include in the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly, has long ceased to be a problem concerning only two Powers. It now concerns every Power and country in the world, and profoundly affects the fate of the United Nations itself. If we all truly value the United Nations as an international organization of equal States established to safeguard peace, the injustice done to the Chinese people must be ended by restoring the rights of its legitimate representatives in the United Nations. The responsibility for any further delay in settling this matter will, of course, continue to rest with the United States Government which is instigating and organizing acts of sabotage in order to prevent restitution of the legitimate rights of China in the United Nations. It is once again demonstrating to the world at large that its policy is inconsistent with the requirements of co-operation among States in accordance with the principles of the United Nations to which the United States Government, too, has subscribed.

95. The Soviet Union considers that the United Nations must be guided in its actions not by the precepts of the "positions of strength" and "cold war" policy of which the world has already had more than enough, but by the principles of peaceful co-operation among all States irrespective of their social system, and by respect for the sovereign rights of every State. That is why the USSR delegation unreservedly supports the proposal of the delegation of India for the restoration of the legitimate representation of China in the United Nations.

96. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of the United States on a point of order.

97. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): In the General Committee and now again in the General Assembly the Soviet Union has seen fit to engage in talk of a kind which is clearly subject to a point of order. I did not raise the point of order in the General Committee because I want to be very slow to engage in parliamentary tactics of any kind. I would have been well within my rights here this afternoon to interrupt the representative of the Soviet Union, because at least on twelve different occasions he was clearly out of order. That is not right and should not happen in this body.

98. But far more important than his being out of order is the fact that his whole speech was nothing but an attack on the United States. He did not address himself to the China question. He took advantage of this opportunity to make an attack on the United States. Every Member here may well ask himself what his motive was and what kind of game he is playing here this afternoon.

99. Now, I would like to cite specific illustrations to back up what I say. At the beginning of his statement the representative of the Soviet Union says:

"I need only point out that for the past eight years the United States has been occupying part of China's territory, the island of Taiwan and the Penghu Islands, whose seizure was an act of direct aggression against China." [Para. 61.]

We did not occupy that territory. We did not seize it. That statement is totally wrong.

100. The next quotation is as follows:

"We also know that the United States Government

does not approve of the social system which the Chinese People established in their country after the people's revolution ended the rule of foreign imperialists and their henchmen there." [Para. 62.]

That implies that we approve of foreign imperialism. Of course, our whole history is against all forms of foreign imperialism.

101. Mr. Gromyko goes on to say:

"And when the United States Government, with its 'position of strength' policy, does not approve of a country's domestic practices, it usually attempts to interfere directly in that country's affairs in order to impose its own will and establish practices which suit United States ruling circles." [Ibid.]

Now let us analyse that. He objects to our having a position of strength. It is all right for him to have a position of strength, but we must have a position of weakness. What kind of consideration is that to bring into a debate on Chinese representation?

102. He speaks of direct interference in the affairs of countries, of imposing our will. We have never interfered. We have never sought to impose our will. There is no country on the face of this earth that has ever been enslaved by the United States. It ill becomes the Soviet Union with its record of slavery to make such charges against us.

103. He speaks of the "ruling circles of the United States". Here again he is confusing our situation with his. In this country the people rule. Here there is not a little clique that have managed to get up to the top of the slippery pole who are giving orders to execute this or that brutality.

104. Now I come to the next quotation:

"Washington still harbours plans of this kind with regard to the People's Republic of China, even though it must be clear to everyone that these are merely the unattainable dreams of a few United States politicians whose ambitions evidently far outrun their possibilities." [Ibid.]

The inference that the men who have been duly elected to govern this country are conducting the policy of the United States in order to gratify their appetites is an unworthy insinuation which reflects no credit on the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union.

105. Then Mr. Gromyko said:

"The United States Government should take a more serious view of the acts of provocation it has undertaken in the Far East in the attempt to expand its aggression against China in such areas as that of the off-shore islands." [Para. 65.]

The United States has initiated no provocations in the Far East. We are not seeking to spread aggression against China. We are seeking peace and every single statement that President Eisenhower has made—and you have all read them—is proof of that fact.

106. He continued:

"It is most unedifying to witness the current efforts of a group of United States politicians to close the eyes of the entire world to China's existence, to proclaim 'non-existent' a great country which has just entered upon a period of power and prosperity after the triumph of the people's revolution in China

ended a prolonged period of dismemberment, constant internecine strife artificially incited from without, brutal foreign exploitation and, as a result of all this, national backwardness and poverty." [Para. 66.]

It seems hardly necessary to say that there are no United States politicians or Americans in official positions who are trying to close the eyes of the world to the existence of China. We deplore the fact that this group has taken possession of China, yes, in the way we deplored the group that took possession of Germany under the Hitler régime. We can deplore that without being accused of denying the existence of China. It is because we value the existence of China that we hold to the policy that we hold. We are enemies of foreign exploitation and backwardness and poverty, and we shall match our record against that of the Soviet Union in trying to help people—with no strings attached—to end that backwardness and that poverty.

107. Mr. Gromyko continued:

"If the United Nations wants to deal with reality and not live in a world of illusions—the illusions, that is, under which the United States Government has laboured as a result of the failure of its imperialist policy towards China nine years ago..." [Para. 70.]

We have never had an imperialist policy towards China. I suggest that Mr. Gromyko read history and read about John Hay and the "open-door policy" of fifty years ago, and he will see to what extent our policy has always been one of keeping China free from foreign domination.

108. I now come to the next point:

"We naturally realize that the majority of countries which support the United States Government's position of the question of the representation of China in the United Nations do so only because they are under United States pressure." [Para. 84.]

Is that not a polite, charming thing to say about the Members of this body who happen to stand with us out of their convictions? Is that not a delicate, gentlemanly way for one Member of a body to talk to his colleagues? Apparently nobody here can have an honest agreement with us. If a country votes, with us, it is because it is under United States pressure. Again I say to Mr. Gromyko that he is confusing our position with his, because his Government operates by pressure, by putting the screws on people, by intimidating people, by threatening people. He thinks that that is the way we operate. We could not operate that way; we do not know how.

109. The same thing can be said about the following remark:

"The United States abuses its position by imposing its will on States which are dependent on it and are caught in a web of military and other treaties." [Para. 85.]

The Soviet representative cannot find one State on which we have imposed our will. He knows very well that it is on his side that the iron discipline exists. Our side is voluntary and he knows that as well as I do.

110. I come to another quotation:

"It is quite conceivable that those countries which the United States Government is dragging"—dragging in its wake, if you please—"compelling them to

follow its policy towards China, find this situation oppressive." [Para. 86.]

I have already commented on that type of accusation.

111. Then we have the following quotation:

"An example of this was the General Assembly's consideration at its emergency special session of the question of the withdrawal of United States forces from Lebanon and of United Kingdom forces from Jordan, and the decision which it adopted." [Para. 87.]

Mr. Gromyko cites that as a defeat for the United States. As a matter of fact, we announced that we were delighted when the ten Arab countries, under the leadership of Foreign Minister Mahgoub of the Sudan, had agreed upon this resolution which was on all fours with the resolution which Norway had sponsored and which we were supporting. We expressed our great pleasure. I did not call attention to it at the time because I am a kindly sort of man who does not go around looking for an argument. But, as the Soviet representative has brought this up, I shall call attention to the fact that the Soviet Union had to withdraw its draft resolution calling upon the United States to evacuate its troops from Lebanon. It withdrew the draft because it knew that it could not muster the necessary votes. If anyone suffered a defeat at that session, it was the Soviet Union.

112. I shall cite one more quotation:

"The responsibility for any further delay in settling this matter will, of course, continue to rest with the United States Government which is instigating and organizing acts of sabotage in order to prevent restitution of the legitimate rights of China in the United Nations." [Para. 94.]

I need scarcely say that we do not inspire nor do we organize any sabotage.

113. Before I conclude, let me say that an accusation of the kind which Mr. Gromyko has just made against the United States ill becomes the spokesman of a Government with the brutal record of the Soviet Union. I heard only last week from a very dependable source—a man who had just returned from Eastern Europe—that the number of people currently escaping from East Germany to West Germany has reached a new high of 5,000 persons a week. Now that is the argument to end all arguments. That is the most eloquent testimony to the humane character of Soviet communism; whenever the people get a chance to get away from it, they get away from it.

114. No, the fact is that the Chinese Communists are at this moment seeking, by force of arms and in flagrant contravention of the United Nations Charter, to conquer territory they have never possessed. They have fired some 300,000 rounds of high explosive shells at the island of Quemoy. That is in the neighbourhood of three rounds of high explosives for every man, woman and child on the island. This barrage against Quemoy, which was started less than a month ago, recalls the attempted invasion in October 1949 and the attack against Quemoy in September 1954. In this latest barrage 1,000 civilians have already been killed.

115. We think that this is not only a further disqualification to be added to the already long list in so far as United Nations membership is concerned, but that it would also justify the United Nations in taking strong

steps against that kind of behaviour. The Chinese Communists are rapidly shooting themselves, and the world, out of a chance to settle this question as it should be settled.

116. I suggest to the representative of the Soviet Union that, instead of villifying us, he use whatever influence he may have with the group now in power in Peking—and we can all of us imagine how great or how small that influence is—to persuade them to cease their violent and their murderous activities.

117. The PRESIDENT: I will once again make a strong appeal to all Members of the Assembly to keep their arguments as moderate, as measured, as unprovocative and as much to the point as possible, because the atmosphere is sufficiently charged for us to be most careful in what we say and in what we do not say. I beg the Members, therefore, not to wander off into substance too much, and certainly not to say anything that would provoke a reaction and that would therefore add to the already tense atmosphere.

118. Mr. TSIANG (China): The talk about imperialism against my country leads me to say something at the very beginning of my intervention. My Government has been frequently characterized as the "Nationalist Government". The party in power in my country at this moment has often been called the "Nationalist Party". That characterization is largely correct. We are nationalists. My Government came into power in a movement which adopted the slogan, "Down with imperialism". No Government in Asia or anywhere else has fought imperialism more than my Government.

119. The second remark I should like to make in this connexion is that in the centuries of China's relations with the Western Powers one country has seized more territory from my country than all the other Western Powers combined. The greatest aggressor against China has been the Soviet Union.

120. There is another fact I should like to state. In all China's history, in all China's relations with outside Powers, there has been one country which never asked China for a single square inch of China's territory, and that country is the United States of America. We know in China who is the imperialist and who is not. The relationship between my country and the United States has been always friendly and based on terms of mutual respect—respect for each other's sovereignty.

121. Now, to return to the subject under discussion, the General Assembly has been urged at the instance of the Indian delegation to include in its agenda an item which calls in question the right of my Government, the Government of the Republic of China, to represent the Chinese people in the United Nations. In years past, the General Assembly in its wisdom consistently voted down proposals of a similar nature. I feel confident that it will do the same again this year.

122. It has been stated that the Government that I have the honour to represent no longer represents the Chinese people. This, I submit, is a cruel slander, not only of my Government but of the Chinese people as a whole.

123. It has been stated that the time has come when the Chinese Communists should come in here to occupy the seat of China. Communism is an ideology alien to China. It is contrary to Chinese character, tradition and moral values; indeed, it is contrary to everything the Chinese people stand for.

124. A moment ago the representative of the Soviet Union declared from this rostrum that China is a great country. I agree with him. He also said that China has a long history and a great tradition. I agree with him. But that great history and tradition of my country are an anathema to the Chinese Communists. They are doing everything in their power to destroy that great tradition.

125. Communism as a political system has been imposed on mainland China by force and conspiracy with the military help of the Soviet Union; it has never had the moral consent of the Chinese people. Since the establishment of the Communist régime which cynically calls itself "the People's Government of China", the whole country has become one gigantic slave camp. That régime has spawned a frightful system of surveillance, repression, torture and terror, the like of which history has never known in China. Millions upon millions of innocent people have been slaughtered. Millions upon millions have been condemned to prison and labour camps.

126. Yet the Chinese people are not subdued. Nine years of unremitting terror, nine years of brainwashing propaganda, have failed to destroy their thirst for freedom. They continue to resist their oppressors. As long as a spirit of resistance endures, there is hope. We refuse to believe that communism is in China to stay. Under the polished surface of seeming stability there is a boiling, seething mass of bitter resentment and continuing revolt.

127. The Communists do not and cannot represent the Chinese people. They represent world communism and a tiny minority known as the Chinese Communist Party. They are a hated minority, who have put themselves in power by blood-letting. The Government that I have the honour to represent is, in the eyes of all the Chinese people, the only legally constituted and freely constituted Government of China. Its power is derived from the Constitution drafted and approved by the Constitutional Assembly elected on the basis of universal suffrage in the winter of 1947 - 1948. It is therefore the only Government that can truly represent the entire Chinese people in the United Nations.

128. In this connexion let me quote what I said on 15 November 1956 at the eleventh session of the General Assembly, when a similar attempt was made to call in question the right of my Government to represent the Chinese people. On that occasion, I said:

"Now, it is very important for us to know what the 500 million people of China want. Do they want the Communists to represent them here, or do they want my Government to continue to represent them here? I should like to state, upon instructions of my Government, that, if the United Nations could conduct among the entire people of China a free vote as to whom they wished to represent them in the United Nations, my Government would abide by the results of such a free choice by the Chinese people." [578th meeting, para. 154.]

My statement still stands today. Would the Communists allow such a plebiscite? I think not. They are afraid of free elections. They are perfectly aware that if such a plebiscite were to take place they would be ejected by an overwhelming majority of the Chinese people.

129. I stress this point somewhat because, when this

Assembly considers this question of Chinese representation, it is only right that all of us should ask the question, "After all, what are the wishes of the Chinese people?" A few years ago this Assembly set up machinery to ascertain the wishes of the Chinese prisoners of war in the camps of the United Nations Command in Korea. The Government of India, through its representatives in Korea, took a prominent part in the screening of the prisoners of war. My Government which had neither military nor civilian representatives in Korea, did not participate. What was the result? Fourteen thousand Chinese prisoners of war or about 75 per cent of the total elected to go to Taiwan instead of returning to the mainland. This figure is very significant. These prisoners of war, let us remember, were soldiers of the Chinese Communist Army. They had undergone years of indoctrination and brainwashing. They had undergone strict military discipline. Yet 75 per cent of them elected to leave their families and friends behind on the mainland and to go to free China on Taiwan. This is a sure indication of the true wishes of the Chinese people.

130. Nor, is this all. Since 1949 vast numbers of Chinese people have fled the country. Thousands continue to do so everyday even at the risk of their lives. Many of them have gone to Taiwan. Others have found their way to refugee camps in Hong Kong. They represent a cross-section of the Chinese population: students, small traders, professional men, artisans, peasant workers and even a sprinkling of deserters from the Communist Army. The lot of the Chinese refugees is not an easy one. They suffer much, yet they prefer a life of extreme hardship to the infinitely worse conditions prevailing on the mainland. It is, therefore, ridiculous to maintain that the Communist régime has the support of the Chinese people and that they should come here as the Chinese representatives.

131. That the Indian delegation should try to confer honour and prestige on the Chinese Communists, and to do this in the name of the Chinese people, is unworthy of a great country which professes to cherish ideals of justice and humanitarianism. My Government was one of the sponsors in the founding of the United Nations. We have represented the Chinese people in the United Nations since its foundation. The Charter of the United Nations specifically states that the Republic of China is one of the five permanent Members of the Security Council. We have faithfully carried out all the obligations of membership. I think I will not be immodest if I should say that my delegation has made its due share of contributions to the constructive work of this Organization.

132. It has been said that the phrase "the Republic of China" refers to the State. Let us turn to another passage, the very beginning of the Charter which says, "We, the peoples of the United Nations". This being so, the case of my Government in the United Nations is all the more unchallengeable. I think I have already made it abundantly clear that it is my Government, not the Communist régime, which truly reflects the wishes of the Chinese people.

133. Let us turn for a moment to another angle of this question, the angle of the United Nations itself. The United Nations was founded to maintain peace and security in the world through collective action. How far alas do our endeavours fall short, in practice, of the principles and of the purposes laid down by the Charter.

There are Members of the United Nations who have wilfully violated the faith they have pledged. Great nations and people have fallen under totalitarian communist domination and tyranny. Small nations are obviously frightened. Over the peoples everywhere hangs the baleful shadow of world communism. Our ears have heard the faults and mockeries of evil men who believe that they are riding the wave of the future, seeking to impose their mode of life and their ideology upon the whole of mankind. It is all too easy to forget that membership in the United Nations is not a right to be claimed. The Charter contains nothing about rights of any nation to membership. It says rather that membership is open to all "peace-loving States which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter, and, in the judgement of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations". Can anyone seriously argue that the Chinese Communist régime is "peace-loving"? Can any régime condemned by the United Nations as an aggressor in Korea be fit for membership? Can any régime that has slaughtered millions and millions of innocent people be said to respect fundamental human rights and freedoms as well as the dignity and worth of the human person? Can any régime that has shown an arrogant contempt for law and justice be admitted to an organization dedicated to uphold law and justice? I leave it to the Members of this Assembly to answer these questions. For me there can be only one answer. The answer is "No!"

134. I know that there are those among us who pride themselves on being "realists" and believe it is expedient to admit the Chinese Communist régime in the interest of "peace". They tell us that without the Communists in the United Nations no "settlement" in the Far East is possible. Now, let me ask, what do they mean by "settlement"? Do they mean that what freedom still remains to the Chinese people must be used as a bargaining counter in exchange for a communist promise for good behaviour in the Far East? If so, the United Nations is in effect being asked to participate in an immoral and criminal act to be committed against the Chinese people. The United Nations has no right, I submit, to barter away the freedom of a people in order to appease the Communist régime in China.

135. No appeasement can induce the Chinese Communists to mend their ways. Their hostility toward the rest of the world is rooted in the communist ideology which calls for implacable enmity toward the non-communist countries. Under the leadership of Moscow, the Chinese Communists push forward, with dedicated earnestness, toward the inexorable goal of extending their control over the whole of the Far East and Asia. They have never made a secret of their intentions. They consider the eventual "communization" of the world as inevitable. Every step they take is intended to carry them nearer to that goal. Mao Tse-tung, high priest of Chinese communism, reaffirmed his faith in communist inevitability before the world when he said at the fortieth anniversary celebration of the October revolution on 6 November 1957:

"It is equally clear that since the October Revolution any Government that refuses to be on friendly terms with the Soviet Union only harms the real interests of its own people. . . In the end the socialist system will replace the capitalist system. This is an objective law independent of human will. No matter how hard the reactionaries try to prevent the advance

of the wheel of history, revolution will take place sooner or later and will surely triumph."

Nothing, therefore, can deflect the Communists from the goal of world domination. Nothing can deflect the Chinese Communists from the goal of dominating the Far East and Asia. Appeasement can only whet the appetite. The malice of the wicked cannot be placated by weakness, nor can the cause of international peace be served by compromising the principles of the United Nations Charter.

136. History bears witness to the fact that appeasement leads not to peace or settlement but directly to disaster. Weak and imperfect as it is, the United Nations still represents the best hope for the future of mankind. During the past thirteen years of its existence the work of the United Nations for peace and human happiness has been irreparably damaged by the obstructionist tactics of the Soviet delegation. By its unconscionable abuse of the veto power the Soviet Union has reduced the Security Council to virtual impotence. There is no way in the present circumstances to remedy this sad state of affairs, but there is no reason whatsoever why the United Nations should commit suicide by strengthening the forces of evil within itself. Like many other organisms, the United Nations can swallow a certain amount of poison and go on functioning, even though with diminished efficiency and effectualness. But there is a limit to the amount of poison it can absorb. Beyond that limit the consequences can be fatal.

137. I am frankly shocked, as well as saddened, by the fact that there are some Asian delegations in this Assembly which have shown themselves either unable or unwilling to comprehend the threat posed by the Chinese Communists. Perhaps they think that by championing the cause of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations they are serving the interests of their respective countries. If so, they could not be more mistaken. Those who set out to play the Communist game in the belief that they are serving their countries will in the end find, when it is too late, that they are in fact serving the interests of the Communists at the expense of their own.

138. In all sincerity, I say to my fellow Asian representatives that the fate of the Republic of China is closely bound up with that of the rest of all Asia. We are in the first line of defence. Our stand is for a free Asia, where free men can hold up their heads and breathe the air of freedom. I therefore appeal to them to stare the ugly realities squarely in the face and take courage. The course of timidity, adopted from the desire for security, may be found to lead to mortal danger. Virtuous motives are not enough. Goodwill is of no avail. There is no defence against the dedicated and armed wickedness of communism.

139. The Chinese people is facing tragic times, fateful times. The Communists have, since 23 August, been carrying on their aggressive operations in the Taiwan Strait. These military operations are but a preliminary to a much vaster plan of conquest. We are determined to resist the aggression with all our strength. For us it is a life and death struggle. We do not ask much. We hope that the United Nations will stand for principles in this particular instance.

140. This, then, is the issue before the General Assembly. It is an issue of freedom or slavery, not only

for the Chinese people but for all Asia, and perhaps for the whole world. I trust that delegations will make their decisions wisely.

141. Mr. LUKANOV (Bulgaria) (translated from Russian): At this thirteenth session of the General Assembly the Indian delegation has once again placed before us the question of the representation of China in the United Nations—an extremely important question and one that is vital to the normal operation and success of this Organization. The solution of this question has a direct bearing on a number of other major problems of great importance to all mankind, such as the peaceful coexistence of States irrespective of their social or political structure, disarmament, the safeguarding of peace in the Far East, and the halting of imperialistic intervention in the domestic affairs of other States.

142. This problem is still unsolved because of the hostile attitude of the United States Government towards the People's Republic of China and its stubborn opposition to a correct and prompt solution.

143. In its endeavour to maintain and extend its domination over certain Asian countries, the United States is making use of the services of the Chiang Kai-shek clique which has been expelled by the Chinese people. It is trying to make out that this clique is the Chinese Government and to force other States to close their eyes to the facts and to behave as if they were not aware of the existence of the People's Republic of China with its population of over 600 million or one-quarter of the population of the globe.

144. Every year the United States intrigues and manoeuvres to prevent even the discussion of restoring to the People's Republic of China its lawful rights in the United Nations. In order to ensure that the consideration of this question is deferred the United States delegation resorts to the most varied arguments and to every possible sort of slanderous assertion. To take one example: the United States delegation found in the complex international situation obtaining at that time a pretext for excluding this question from the agenda of the eleventh session while at the twelfth session it again invoked the hackneyed contention that the People's Republic of China is not a peace-loving State. Clearly, the United States is seriously afraid of a discussion of the representation of the People's Republic of China. It is afraid that its attitude towards the People's Republic of China can no longer be defended and that the majority of Member States can no longer be forced to follow blindly in its wake. United States policy on this issue is so far removed from reality that even its most faithful allies repudiate it and consider it entirely impractical.

145. I shall now refer briefly to some of the "arguments" advanced by the representatives of the United States and its allies against the inclusion in our agenda of the question of representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

146. They have, for example, defended the position that to raise and discuss the question of the representation of China would still further aggravate the tense international situation and in particular the situation in the Far East and would thus adversely affect the work of the current session. Surely, however, it is clear to everyone that the United Nations cannot ignore or by-pass controversial international issues.

One of its important functions is precisely that of promoting the peaceful solution of controversial international questions, thus helping to eliminate tension and to maintain and strengthen peace throughout the world. There is every reason, therefore, why the United Nations should be asked at this particular juncture to solve this vitally important question—that is to say, the question of restoring to the People's Republic of China its rights in the United Nations.

147. A very odd "argument" has been advanced, namely, that discussion of the question of the representation of China in the United Nations would create an unpropitious atmosphere for the negotiations that have just started in Warsaw on the controversial issues arising from the occupation of Taiwan and other islands in the Formosa Strait by United States armed forces. There is absolutely no justification for this assertion. On the contrary, solution of the question the representation of China in the United Nations would create a much more favourable atmosphere for the Warsaw negotiations.

148. The continued absence of the People's Republic of China from the United Nations will not only diminish the authority of the United Nations and prevent it from becoming a universal organization, but it is utterly unrealistic into the bargain. As other speakers have remarked, over thirty States with more than 1,000 million people, including two permanent members of the Security Council, now maintain diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China; sixty-eight States have established trade relations and a still greater number maintain cultural ties with it. One cannot but agree with Prime Minister Nehru of India who told the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference that there could be no settlement on any problem in the Far East without China being brought into the picture and that the absence of the People's Republic of China and certain other States weakened the United Nations.

149. The United States Government is trying to prevent the matter of the People's Republic of China taking its rightful place in the United Nations from even being discussed, thereby violating the elementary rules of democracy, a course scarcely compatible with its vaunted democratism. Be that as it may, let us now turn to some of the more recent "arguments" advanced by the United States delegation.

150. Today, Mr. Lodge stated from this rostrum—as others have done before him—first, that throughout its nine-year existence, the "Chinese Communist régime" has not extended its control to Taiwan, the Pescadores and the other islands in the Formosa Strait; and secondly, that the "Communist régime" is trying to extend its authority over these islands by force and that this presumably constitutes armed intervention and a threat to world peace.

151. I shall keep to the point, as the President suggested, and I shall be brief. In the Declaration of Cairo by the United States, the United Kingdom and China on 26 November 1943 defining the purposes of the war against Japan, there is a passage which states that "...all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese such as Manchuria, Formosa and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China...".

152. After the end of the Second World War, Manchuria, Taiwan and the Pescadores were returned to the Chinese State in accordance with that Declaration.

They were returned to the Chinese State as such, as it existed in 1945, and not to the Chinese Government of that time. States and not their Governments are the subjects of international law and the persons in whom rights and duties are vested. It is generally recognized in international law that where changes occur as a result of internal events, the State is represented in international relations by the Government which exercises de facto authority within the territory of that State.

153. In a memorandum by the United Nations Secretariat on the legal aspects of the problem of representation in the United Nations dated 8 March 1950 we read:

"Where a revolutionary Government presents itself as representing a State, in rivalry to an existing Government, the question at issue should be which of the two Governments in fact is in a position to employ the resources and direct the people of the State in fulfilment of the obligations of membership. In essence, this means the inquiry as to whether the new Government exercises effective authority within the territory of the State and is habitually obeyed by the bulk of the population." [S/1466.]

154. Can there be any doubt that authority within the territory of China is exercised by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and that it is obeyed by the bulk of the population?

155. By virtue of the generally recognized norms of international law on the transfer of rights whereby a revolutionary State succeeds to all the rights of the former State in relation to its entire territory, the People's Republic of China is the sole lawful heir to the territories of Taiwan and the Pescadores. From the legal point of view all these territories are in the same position: they were all mentioned in the Declaration of Cairo of 1943 and they were all handed over to the Chinese State; and, in addition, by virtue of the transfer of rights, they are all part of the territory over which the People's Republic of China holds sovereignty. Does anyone have the temerity to contend today that Manchuria, for example, is not part of the territory of the People's Republic of China? We cannot escape the same conclusion in the case of Taiwan and the Pescadores, not to mention the small off-shore islands which have never been separate or independent from the mainland.

156. Once the Government of the People's Republic of China had extended its authority over the whole territory of mainland China and once not only the bulk of the population but the entire population of the country, except for a pitiful handful of counter-revolutionaries, had accepted the popular democratic Government with enthusiasm, this authority should have been extended to the entire territory of China. The extension of this authority involves the exercise of sovereignty over China's own territory and the organization of the internal order within that territory in accordance with the will of the victorious revolutionary Chinese people. That is the only solution which is in keeping with the rules of international law. Any interference by a foreign State with this process of extending the authority of the Central Government of the People's Republic of China to the whole territory of the Chinese State can only be termed intolerable intervention and aggression in the sense in which it is condemned by the Charter.

157. Consequently, United States intervention in the civil war in China through the occupation of Chinese territory—Taiwan and the Pescadores Archipelago—is direct and flagrant aggression against the Chinese people. The argument that this aggression is taking place in pursuance of treaties is pointless, since these are treaties with a pseudo-Government which represents no one and which consists of traitors to China's national interests who have been driven out by the Chinese people. The reason why the People's Republic of China does not in fact already exercise sovereignty over the territories of Taiwan and the Pescadores, which belong to it, lies in unlawful actions of the United States which constitute criminal aggression against the Chinese people. It is an elementary principle of law and ethics that no one may profit from his illegal, culpable and criminal actions.

158. Consequently, the United States cannot make profitable use of the fact that its intervention and aggression have prevented the People's Republic of China from exercising its sovereignty over Taiwan and the Pescadores. The United States can produce no arguments which have any legal or moral value or which carry any implications detrimental to the People's Republic of China. From this point of view, it is absolutely absurd to consider the lawful extension of the sovereignty of the People's Republic of China over its own territories as armed intervention. After all, armed intervention against whom, when on the other side no entity under international law exists?

159. There is no doubt that the People's Republic of China is within its rights not to tolerate any longer the occupation of Taiwan and the adjacent islands by United States troops and not to tolerate in future hotbeds of counter-revolution in the territory of China which threaten peace and security in the Far East. This was made particularly clear by the responsible Chinese newspaper *Jen Min Jih Pao*, which said on 15 September:

"Today's China is no longer the weak, decrepit China which in its helplessness had to accept oppression and dismemberment. It is a new, powerful China, in which 600 million people have taken their fate into their own hands. Gone is the day when imperialists could make common cause to meddle in China's internal affairs and compel it to renounce its sovereignty."

160. Whether or not the United States wishes to recognize and establish diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China is its own concern and a matter for it to decide in accordance with its own views. However, the carrying out of a hostile policy against the People's Republic of China and the endeavours of the United States to prevent the People's Republic of China from entering the United Nations and from exercising its lawful rights both with respect to the territory of China and in the United Nations are not matters which concern the United States alone. They concern all the peoples which hold dear peace and co-operation between States.

161. Acting on their convictions, the leading circles of the United States can, and indeed have the right to, incur the ill will of the peoples towards their foreign policy, and that is precisely what they have achieved in the Arab world and are now achieving in the whole of Asia. But we, the Members of the United Nations, have

the right to take the view that such a policy is not a peace-loving policy, that it is fraught with danger for the cause of peace, and that it is constantly creating situations dangerous for peace. We have the right to disregard the feelings of certain influential circles in the United States and to decide questions in the way dictated by the interests of peace and security, which are the interests of the United Nations itself.

162. In objecting to the consideration of the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations—as we have seen and as we have just heard again from the representative of the United States speaking from this rostrum—the United States uses the mendacious and cynical pretext that the People's Republic of China is an aggressive State, and it would have us believe that the effort to clear Chinese territory of foreign invaders is an act of aggression. But, in international parlance, aggression always presupposes two different parties; no one can commit aggression against himself, against his own territory.

163. Taiwan is an inseparable part of China, and this has been recognized in two highly important international documents, both in the afore-mentioned Cairo Declaration of 1943 and in the Potsdam Declaration of 1945. These documents constitute the legal basis for determining what comprises the present-day territory of China. It is a basis that cannot be altered arbitrarily and unilaterally by anyone.

164. There are not two Chinas. Even the Chiang Kai-shek clique does not dare to assert that Taiwan is not Chinese territory. The Central People's Government, the only Government of China, has for its part repeatedly declared that it does not intend to tolerate for long the seizure of its territory and that it will in due course and by appropriate means liberate the remainder of its territory and unify its country. It is not the Chinese, but the ruling circles of the United States who would like, and are trying, to create two Chinas. It is only because of the armed intervention of the United States of America that Taiwan and the off-shore islands are not already within the fold of the Chinese fatherland. It was none other than Mr. Truman, the former President of the United States, who said on 27 June 1950:

"The occupation of Formosa by Communist forces would be a direct threat to the security of the Pacific area and to United States forces performing their lawful and necessary functions in that area.

"Accordingly, I have ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa. . . The Seventh Fleet will see that this is done. The determination of the future status of Formosa must await restoration of security in the Pacific, a peace settlement with Japan, or consideration by the United Nations."

165. The reference to so-called "lawful" activity by United States forces or to security in that area could not and cannot fool anyone. The truth of the matter is that only a few months after the formation of the Central People's Government of China, the United States, acting on this declaration by President Truman, committed an act of overt aggression against the People's Republic of China by occupying with its armed forces the Island of Taiwan.

166. Who, then, is the aggressor? He who seeks to liberate his own territory from the expelled and

repudiated remnants of a reactionary and anti-popular régime, or a State which sends its armed forces tens of thousands of kilometres from its borders in order to dictate the status of a usurped portion of Chinese territory, thereby disavowing the Potsdam document it had signed only five years before?

167. United States military and political leaders also say that in Taiwan they are achieving certain strategic objectives and protecting their positions. Obviously, every State is entitled to act on the basis of strategic considerations. However, what strategic interests can the United States have tens of thousands of kilometres away from its borders, except aggressive designs? But, with the United States striving to carry out its aggressive intentions in certain Asian countries, it may well be asked: Are the States Members of the United Nations to tolerate and even support such a policy? On the contrary, should we not openly expose and condemn this position taken by certain circles in the United States and demand that it should be abandoned? Can the United Nations tolerate such a situation, bearing in mind that its aim and purpose is to do away with every kind of aggression, to protect peace and security, and to promote co-operation among the peoples.

168. There can be no doubt that if the People's Republic of China had not been prevented from liberating the whole of its territory, from unifying the fatherland of the great Chinese people, and from putting a stop to the provocative activity which has been continuing now for nine years on its very borders, and if the People's Republic of China had assumed its rightful place among us here, there would be no tension in the Far East at this moment and we would not find ourselves faced with an immediate danger of a new world conflict. If the situation has not been righted in all these years, then surely the time has come for the United Nations in the name of peace to take such action, which is long overdue.

169. As regards the Bulgarian people and its Government, they welcomed the formation of the People's Republic of China in 1949 and have always sympathized with the struggle of the Chinese people against imperialism and its lackeys, the Chiang Kai-shek clique. After the liberation of the Chinese people from the century-old domination of imperialism and local warlords, our country, with great satisfaction, recognized the People's Republic of China and established diplomatic relations with it. The successes achieved by the People's Republic of China and its transformation into a bulwark of peace and security in the Far East have gladdened our hearts because, for the Bulgarian people as for all peace-loving peoples throughout the world, they are a guarantee of the ultimate victory of the Asian peoples' struggle for peace and security.

170. In a bare nine years the People's Government of China, thanks to the whole-hearted and enthusiastic support of its people, has achieved remarkable successes in the economic and cultural development of a once backward country. Every honest person in the world can only rejoice that in so short a period of time the People's Republic of China has been able to develop its heavy industry, reorganize its agriculture and achieve a cultural revolution, and all this to such a degree as to enable the country to set itself the goal of catching up in the volume of industrial production within a very short time, the next ten or fifteen years, with one of the most advanced countries of the capitalist

world, the United Kingdom. These facts of themselves demonstrate the peace-loving nature of the people's Government in the People's Republic of China and show that it has set itself goals which excite the admiration of all mankind. Conversely, it cannot be contested that anyone who hampers this development is an enemy not only of the Chinese people but of human progress.

171. For all these reasons, the Bulgarian delegation fully supports the proposal of the Indian Government regarding the consideration of the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and insists that this question should be decided at the present session.

172. We must reject the United States draft resolution. We must act quickly, while peace can still be preserved.

173. Mrs. ROSSEL (Sweden): In the report now before us, the General Committee has recommended a draft resolution the adoption of which would mean the rejection of India's request for the inclusion in the agenda of the item concerning the representation of China. Furthermore, by adopting the draft resolution, the General Assembly would decide not to consider the matter during the present session.

174. The question of the representation of China is one to which my Government attaches great importance. I shall therefore very briefly state our position.

175. As Sweden has recognized the Government of the People's Republic of China, we find it natural that the question of the representation of China should be included as an item in the agenda of the General Assembly. Now what is this question which the Assembly would be called upon to discuss? Obviously it is not whether China should be admitted to the United Nations. If this were the question, it would have to be considered in the light of Article 4 of the Charter, which lays down the conditions for membership in the United Nations. But according to Article 3, China is an original Member of the United Nations; moreover, the Charter explicitly says that China shall be a permanent member of the Security Council. The dilemma confronting us results from the fact that two Governments claim to be the rightful representative of China in the field of international relations.

176. A majority of the Members of the United Nations hold the position that the Government which has taken refuge on the island of Taiwan should still be considered the Government of the Member State of China. On the other hand, a minority of Members, among them Sweden, considers that this position is based on purely fictitious premises. As long as the United Nations treats the Taiwan Government as the legitimate Government of all of China, the United Nations has no relations whatsoever with the mainland of China and its approximately 600 million inhabitants.

177. The Swedish delegation considers that the General Assembly should at least be given an opportunity to discuss the serious practical disadvantages which follow from this anomaly. *Inter alia*, it is obvious that there can be no solution of the problem of disarmament without the participation of the Chinese mainland. We have been reminded again of this fact when considering the report of the recent experts' discussions in Geneva.

178. Furthermore, a peculiar consequence of such a policy is that the small part of the Chinese people

which now lives on the island of Taiwan is raised to the rank of a world Power seated among the permanent members of the Security Council.

179. The Swedish delegation has noted the reasons advanced in support of this policy. However, the numerous arguments presented have not convinced us. We feel that it is rather the emotional reaction following upon the Korean War which has continuously dictated the resistance to the recognition of the Peking Government. Although we can understand this reaction, we think that it is not in the interests of peace and international harmony to let the policy towards this large country be governed by emotions.

180. For these reasons, my delegation will vote in favour of the amendments [A/L.245] to the draft resolution recommended by the General Committee and against the draft resolution itself.

181. Mr. ENCKELL (Finland): Numerous and weighty are the arguments which have been put forward again this year in the Assembly and in the General Committee in favour of the inclusion in our agenda of the item proposed once more by the delegation of India.

182. The Finnish delegation does not think that it could further this debate by reiterating once again what has already been said. I shall therefore state very briefly my delegation's opinion on this very important matter.

183. In joining the United Nations, we pledged ourselves to contribute to the success of the Organization. We have consistently striven to avoid all such measures as might engender, prolong or deepen any kind of conflict. We want to look particularly for practical and acceptable solutions which might reasonably be conceived as improvements. In order to do so we consider it necessary to recognize the real facts on which to base our common endeavours to promote international understanding. In defining our attitude on this question, we have been led by the same constructive spirit. Finland recognized the People's Republic of China many years ago. Finland is among the many countries which have normal diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China. There is not for us, therefore, and there could not reasonably be, any question as to the right of the legitimate representatives of China to their seat in the United Nations.

184. For all these reasons, my delegation does not share the view expressed here that we ought to reject the initiative taken by the delegation of India. My delegation fails to see how the successful activity of the United Nations could be furthered by not considering this matter here. My delegation, accordingly, will vote in favour of the amendments to the draft resolution recommended by the General Committee. If the amendments are rejected, my delegation will vote against the draft resolution.

185. Mr. DAVID (Czechoslovakia) (translated from Russian): The current session of the General Assembly is again examining a draft resolution submitted to the General Committee by the United States delegation in contravention of rules 40 and 41 of the rules of procedure and now recommended, under pressure from that delegation, to the General Assembly by a majority of the Committee.

186. The draft resolution before us is a repetition of an old transparent manoeuvre by the United States

delegation, the purpose of which is to delay an examination of the question of the representation of China in the United Nations.

187. The ruling circles of the United States of America, however, do not content themselves with obstructing, by every means in their power, the restoration of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. Acting as a self-appointed international policeman, the United States has for many years been committing military aggression against the People's Republic of China. Its armed forces occupy illegitimately part of the territory of the People's Republic of China: the island of Taiwan and adjacent islands; and it is threatening to use these forces against the Chinese mainland also.

188. The United States armed forces have lately intensified their dangerous provocations and their attacks on the Chinese people. Such acts of aggression have for some time been part of the aggressive policy pursued by the United States in the Far East in order to maintain and extend its power in that area—a policy which is mainly directed against the national liberation movement in Asia. The network of its bases extends over thousands of miles from the West Coast of the United States across the Pacific Ocean, reaching from South Korea to Japan, Okinawa and the Philippines, and from there to Taiwan and South Viet-Nam.

189. In the last few days the United States has concentrated strong naval and air forces in the Taiwan area; according to comments in the United States Press, this is the strongest concentration of United States naval forces since the Second World War. In contravention of international law, the United States warships violate Chinese territorial waters, while United States aircraft violate the air space of the People's Republic of China.

190. The United States resorts to threats and military blackmail in order—even at the cost of another war—to prevent the Chinese people from exercising their inalienable right to liberate Chinese territory still under occupation: Taiwan, Penghu (the Pescadores) and the off-shore islands. The United States intends to retain the islands of Taiwan and Penghu for an indefinite period as strategic atomic and rocket bases in the immediate vicinity of the Asian continent to be used for aggressive action against the Chinese people and other peace-loving peoples of Asia.

191. The peace-loving peoples of the entire world condemn the aggressive actions of the United States of America against the People's Republic of China, and the current of opinion favouring the cessation of United States aggression and the withdrawal of United States forces from Chinese territory is daily gathering strength.

192. Taiwan, Penghu and the off-shore islands have been Chinese territory since the beginning of time, and the Chinese people have an inalienable right to liberate them. In its statement of 11 September 1958, the Government of the Czechoslovak Republic expressed the Czechoslovak people's full support for this position which the Government of the People's Republic of China had rightly adopted.

193. United States aggression against the Chinese people has taken on such dimensions that it not only constitutes a serious threat to peace and security in the Far East, but may lead to a world conflict. It can-

not be justified by references to any obligations of the United States towards the Chiang Kai-shek clique, which has no connexion with the Chinese people. That people expelled these discredited traitors from the mainland in 1949; it is firmly resolved to purge of their presence the remaining islands in which they are still holding out, thanks to United States military protection.

194. In their hatred of the Chinese people, the ruling circles of the United States have gone so far as to declare their intention to prevent the liberation also of the Chinese off-shore islands, on the pretext that their importance for the "defence" of Taiwan and Penghu is now greater than ever before. A glance at the map will suffice to show that they are important to the United States not for defence, but for an offensive, and that these islands, which have for nine years been used by the Kuomintang for terrorist and diversionist activity on the Chinese mainland, are now to serve the United States as a base for aggression against the People's Republic of China.

195. It has not been forgotten that it was the United States which interfered in the Chinese people's war of liberation in order to save Chiang Kai-shek's troops from complete defeat. Yet today the United States, on the one hand, describes as aggression the legitimate struggle of the Chinese people for the liberation of territory which is an inalienable part of China, and on the other tries to justify the Chiang Kai-shek clique's terrorist attacks on the Chinese mainland.

196. The enemies of the People's Republic of China have indulged in a great deal of slander of its peace-loving policy and its relation to the United Nations.

197. What are the facts? Since its foundation, the People's Republic of China has been consistently pursuing a policy of peace and friendship among peoples, a policy of peaceful coexistence and friendly co-operation with all States, irrespective of their social structure, and has thus become a force for peace not only in the Far East, but throughout the world. The People's Republic of China—not the United States of America—has, jointly with other peace-loving Asian and African countries, proclaimed the well-known principles of peaceful coexistence. It has been instrumental in greatly strengthening the solidarity of the Asian and African peoples, which the colonial Powers had been setting against one another for centuries.

198. A very important factor is the support of the People's Republic of China for the national liberation movement in the colonies and for the efforts of the Asian and African peoples to repel attacks on their freedom and independence. The People's Republic of China also made an acknowledged positive contribution to the relaxation of international tension and the strengthening of peace in the Far East and in Asia by participating in the Geneva Conference on Korean and Indo-Chinese problems in 1954 and in the Bandung Conference of Asian and African countries in 1955.

199. As part of its policy of reducing international tension, the Government of the People's Republic of China, by agreement with the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, withdrew the bulk of Chinese volunteer detachments from Korea, and before the end of this year, all such detachments will be withdrawn. The United States, on the other hand, not only continues to maintain its interventionist armies

in the south of the country, but is arming them with nuclear and rocket weapons. It is thus prolonging its occupation of South Korea, converting it into a permanent danger spot where conflict may break out at any moment, and preventing any progress whatsoever towards the peaceful settlement of the Korean question.

200. Despite the efforts of United States ruling circles to induce other capitalist countries to pursue the discriminatory embargo policy, the political and economic relations of the People's Republic of China with other countries in all parts of the world are steadily expanding. More than thirty countries have already recognized the People's Republic of China and have established diplomatic relations with it. These countries represent more than 1,000 million of the world's population. It is common knowledge that other countries, too, are seriously considering recognition of the Government of the People's Republic of China and that they intend to establish diplomatic relations with it.

201. The People's Republic of China maintains and is steadily strengthening trade relations with more than seventy countries. Important political visits to the People's Republic of China by foreign statesmen bear witness to that country's ever-growing international prestige and to the desire of many countries to develop close co-operation with it in every sphere of endeavour.

202. The course of events during the last few years has demonstrated conclusively that the unlawful exclusion of the People's Republic of China from participation in the work of the United Nations is no impediment to that country's irresistible advance, but that it is harmful above all to the United Nations itself. Basic questions, on the solution of which hinges the fate of mankind, such as the disarmament problem, cannot be resolved without the participation of the People's Republic of China.

203. The People's Republic of China is successfully moving ahead, discharging the tasks of socialist construction for the benefit of the Chinese people, with a speed unprecedented in history.

204. It will be remembered that before the foundation of the People's Republic of China, Chinese economy was for centuries extremely backward. Before the liberation, a little over half a million tons of steel was produced in China. During the current year, steel output will be 10.7 million tons, and there will be a steep rise in the subsequent years.

205. The coal output for the current year will be at least six times greater than in 1949. The Chinese people have set themselves the task of catching up with the United Kingdom in basic types of industrial production within fifteen years or less—and the results so far obtained show that this task will be accomplished much sooner than in fifteen years.

206. The People's Republic of China has achieved even greater progress in agriculture. The production of grain, which in 1949 amounted to some 130 million tons, will reach 350 million tons during the current year, and will increase still more in the future.

207. It is, however, not only in the development of its productive potential that the People's Republic of China is moving forward at a giant's pace. Under the ten-year plan for scientific development the Chinese people have set themselves the task of catching up with the most advanced countries of the world in the basic branches

of science. As part of their cultural revolution the Chinese people aim at liquidating illiteracy during the next five years.

208. How is it that despite the age-old backwardness of China, such successes have been achieved during the nine years the people's régime has been in power? The answer is that the Government of the People's Republic of China is the first government in that country's history to enjoy the respect and support of 640 million Chinese. It is the first government in the history of China to be exclusively concerned with promoting the interests and welfare of the Chinese people.

209. All these facts prove conclusively that the increasing stature of the People's Republic of China and the role it plays in international life are making themselves felt throughout the world. International developments demonstrate ever more clearly that without the participation of the People's Republic of China no major settlement of disputed Far Eastern and Asian problems can be reached and, what is more, no effective world-wide measures or agreements can be adopted.

210. It is only under pressure from the United States that the United Nations still tolerates the presence of private persons who represent no one, agents of the Chiang Kai-shek régime, which is maintaining itself in Taiwan only because that Chinese island is occupied by United States armed forces. It is for the United Nations to end this absurd situation without delay. Only representatives appointed by the sole legitimate Chinese Government, i.e. the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, can speak on behalf of China in the United Nations.

211. The endeavour of the United States to exclude from international co-operation a peace-loving State, the population of which constitutes more than one-fourth of all mankind, is incompatible with the basic principles of the Charter and undermines the international prestige and authority of the United Nations. It is high time for the United States to recognize that no procedural manoeuvres can prevent the further powerful advance of the People's Republic of China and the growth of its prestige in the eyes of all peoples.

212. The Czechoslovak delegation categorically rejects the recommendation included in the report of the General Committee and approved by a majority of that Committee under pressure from the United States, because this recommendation is incompatible with the interests of international co-operation, for which the United Nations, according to its Charter, should be a centre.

213. On the other hand, the Czechoslovak delegation fully supports the amendments submitted by the delegations of seven Asian and African countries, which is intended to ensure that the question of the representation of China in the United Nations is examined at this session of the General Assembly.

214. Sir PIERSON DIXON (United Kingdom): In coming to a conclusion on the question of Chinese representation, Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom has taken into account the fact that it recognizes the Government of the People's Republic of China as the legitimate government of China. We also respect the sincerity of those who believe that the time has come for discussion of this question by the General Assembly. We do not, however, share that view. And it is

because we hold a different view that we have come to our present decision.

215. In our judgement there is still such a deep division of opinion on this subject in the United Nations that discussion of it would embitter the Assembly's proceedings and might indeed do serious damage to the work of our Organization. The Assembly does, of course, discuss each year a considerable number of controversial questions, but this question appears to us to be on a different level since it affects the very structure of our Organization and since the feelings which it evokes are particularly strong.

216. Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom has in the past voted for a postponement of the discussion of this question. It has decided that the considerations which led it to do this in the past remain valid today.

217. The United Kingdom delegation will, therefore, vote in favour of the resolution recommended by the General Committee.

218. Mr. SMITH (Canada): The Chinese question which we are discussing in connexion with the report of the General Committee is, as has frequently been said from this platform this afternoon, one of the most important with which the United Nations Organization is faced. There are factors and views which complicate the issue when military activities taking place in the Taiwan Straits area threaten the peace of the world. It would be unrealistic, in the view of my delegation, to regard the Chinese question here in the General Assembly in isolation from what is happening in the Taiwan Straits, for surely the events there have a bearing on the matter.

219. It is the opinion of the Canadian delegation that it would not be timely for the General Assembly to consider the question of Chinese representation at this session, because the international tension which has resulted from the military pressure in the dispute over the Chinese off-shore islands would not afford the proper atmosphere for a discussion of the question of Chinese representation in the United Nations.

220. My delegation, for this reason—and I emphasize "for this reason"—will vote in favour of the draft resolution which would effect the postponement of the consideration of this question for the present session, and will vote against the amendments. Representatives have expressed the hope that the talks between the United States and the Communist Chinese representatives, now going on in Warsaw, will result in arrangements which will alleviate the dangerous situation off the China coast, and I earnestly join in this hope. I trust that the warlike activities will cease, since resort to force and the threat of force produce nothing but the danger of war.

221. Mr. SHTYLLA (Albania) (translated from French): One of the most important questions for the United Nations, namely, the restoration of the legitimate rights of China in the Organization, has not yet been resolved. As a result of the extremely hostile policy of the United States towards the People's Republic of China, there has for years been an abnormal and absurd situation in the United Nations which is not only an unprecedented violation of the principles of the Charter but is very harmful to the cause of international peace and security.

222. The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania considers that the Indian proposal for the question of the representation of China in the United Nations to be discussed at the current session of the General Assembly is one which deserves the warmest support because it renders great service to the Organization and meets an imperative need.

223. The time has indeed arrived for this problem to be properly solved. A number of years have now gone by, and the great Chinese nation with over 600 million people, one-quarter of the world's population, is not represented in the United Nations. The peoples of the world will not forgive the Assembly for playing into the hands of one Power whose policy in this matter is dictated by hostile and selfish considerations.

224. China is one of the founding Members of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council. The arbitrary presence in the Organization of the representative of the corrupt clique of Chiang Kai-shek, who was expelled by the Chinese people and no longer represents anything, has no legal foundation and is contrary to the provisions of the Charter. The fallacious arguments adduced by the United States against the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations are incapable of convincing anybody. They are so absurd and ridiculous that their proponents, fearing an open discussion of the true facts, find it more convenient to rely on a voting technicality, as they have done at previous sessions, and to request that the question of the representation of China in the United Nations, as proposed by the Indian delegation, should not be included in the agenda of the current session.

225. Thus a situation is brought about in which one Member of the United Nations, the United States, is seeking to impose its will on the General Assembly because the Government of the People's Republic of China unfortunately does not please the United States Government.

226. The question of the Government of the People's Republic of China is an internal affair which concerns nobody but the Chinese people. In this case, the United States is not being asked to recognize the Government of the People's Republic of China; what is involved is the restoration of the legitimate rights of China in the United Nations. Other States whose Governments do not enjoy the sympathy of United States ruling circles are Members of the United Nations. But the United Nations is not and cannot be an American club.

227. There are, moreover, a number of Member States that not only do not maintain diplomatic relations with each other but are separated by disputes and litigation. Yet is that a plausible reason why those States should refuse to recognize the right of each other to be represented in the United Nations? Is that sufficient grounds to prevent their co-operation in the United Nations? If that were so, what would become of the principle of universality?

228. Nine years ago, after a long and heroic struggle and at tremendous sacrifice, the great Chinese people liberated their country from imperialist enslavement and from the age-old feudal rule. They established control and proclaimed the People's Republic of China. During these nine years the peace-loving people of China have, by their creative work in building socialism in the country, made gains which evoke the admiration

of the whole world. The People's Republic of China is going forward rapidly in its economic and cultural development; it is making great strides towards the industrialization of the country and has already made very substantial progress in agriculture.

229. The People's Republic of China is known by all countries as a great peace-loving world Power which is playing a very important part in safeguarding peace in Asia and throughout the world. It is striving for a relaxation of international tension and is pursuing a policy based on the principles of peace, peaceful co-existence and co-operation with all States, regardless of their social system, all of which is in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

230. Everybody is familiar with the great contribution of the People's Republic of China in the peaceful settlement of international problems, such as the conclusion of an armistice in Korea and in Viet-Nam, and with its efforts to convert those armistices into lasting peace. The participation of the People's Republic of China in the Bandung Conference is eloquent proof of the devotion of the great Chinese people to the principles of peace and peaceful co-existence.

231. In agreement with the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, the Government of the People's Republic of China has decided to withdraw the volunteers of the Chinese people from North Korea, and that withdrawal is to be completed in the course of this year. That is further evidence of its goodwill and its sincere and unremitting efforts to help create conditions favourable for the peaceful unification of Korea and the strengthening of peace in the Far East.

232. The proposal of the People's Republic of China for a treaty of friendship and co-operation among the countries of Asia and the Far East is indisputable evidence of its policy of peace.

233. It is particularly fitting to emphasize at this time the exceptional significance for the cause of peace of the patience and composure shown by the Government of the People's Republic of China in the face of the recent and current provocations to war resulting from the actions of the United States in the area of the Taiwan Strait.

234. The Chinese Government is still trying, as it has always done in the past, to eliminate by peaceful means the tension created by the United States aggressors. This is borne out by the initiative it has taken in organizing the talks now under way between the Chinese and United States ambassadors at Warsaw.

235. The efforts of certain Powers, primarily the United States, to isolate the People's Republic of China have dismally failed. The People's Republic of China has diplomatic relations with more than thirty States and is building up economic relations with sixty-eight countries. It has followed and is firmly continuing to follow a policy of peace and friendly relations with all countries without exception. As an example of its friendly and co-operative relations for the mutual benefit of all parties, let me mention its relations with the neighbouring States of Asia, such as India, Burma, Nepal, Indonesia and Ceylon, which know from their own experience how peace-loving is the People's Republic of China.

236. The People's Republic of China occupies a leading place on the international scene, and its role as a

great peace-loving Power is becoming increasingly important. There is not the shadow of a doubt that international problems such as disarmament and the like can today be settled only with the participation of the People's Republic of China. Without its participation, no problem relating to the Far East or to the cause of peace and international co-operation is capable of settlement.

237. The delegation of the United States, which stubbornly refuses to face facts, has offered no valid argument in support of its untenable position. Indeed, the hostile attitude of the United States with regard to the restoration of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is part of its aggressive policy towards that country. It is clear from all the actions of the United States Government since the victory of the people's revolution in China in 1949—and this is confirmed specifically by the State Department statement of 9 August 1958 and by the aggressive activities now taking place in the Taiwan area—that the United States is harbouring the wild hope of overthrowing the people's democratic régime in China and of restoring the colonial and feudal régime that was abolished for all time. It has illegally occupied and holds by force of arms the Chinese island of Taiwan and a number of off-shore islands of China which are an integral part of Chinese territory. It has concentrated large land, naval and air forces in that area which are equipped even with atomic weapons. It has launched a campaign of dangerous provocation. It is not only seeking to deny the Chinese people the legitimate right to liberate and reunite with the mother country the Chinese islands occupied by the United States, but it is also attempting to use those islands as bases for aggression against the mainland of the People's Republic of China and against other peace-loving countries. When, however, the People's Republic of China, defending its sovereign rights, answers the imperialist instigators, the United States Government has the audacity to accuse it of aggression, sends additional military reinforcements to Taiwan and speeds up preparations for war. It even dares to ask that the People's Republic of China should cease fire. Does this not have the appearance of a thief who forces his way into your house and who, when in self-defence you try to throw him out, turns upon you and accuses you of being the aggressor?

238. The great Chinese people is determined to liberate the island of Taiwan and the off-shore islands which are an integral part of Chinese territory, and no force in the world can stop it. Not only the countries allied to the People's Republic of China but all peace-loving countries, all peoples and all clear-thinking and impartial statesmen recognize that the cause of the People's Republic of China is sound and condemn the aggressive and senseless policy of the United States, the effects of which throughout the world have been very different from those expected by its makers.

239. The United States has embarked on a very dangerous adventure in the Taiwan area; it is playing with fire. In the interests of peace, this aggression must be promptly stopped, the United States Seventh Fleet and the land and air forces of the United States must be immediately withdrawn from the area of the Taiwan Strait, from Taiwan itself and from the other Chinese islands, and the United States must put an end to its policy of interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of China.

240. In the light of these facts and this situation, the urgency of settling the problem of the representation of China in the United Nations becomes clear. There can be no doubt that by taking an active and effective part in the work of the United Nations, the People's Republic of China will make a very great and essential contribution.

241. The delegation of the People's Republic of Albania considers that the time has come to put an end to the obstructionist, unprincipled and absurd position of the United States. Doubtless the Member States which support the negative approach of the United States on this matter by their vote do so against their will; we know that they would prefer to see the seat of China in the United Nations occupied as soon as possible by the genuine representatives of the great Chinese people, by the representatives of the People's Republic of China. Each year a growing number of Member States vote in favour of such a logical solution. The day is clearly not far off when the People's Republic of China will assume its rightful place in the United Nations, but we feel that the sooner that happens, the better it will be for the United Nations and the cause of peace.

242. The People's Republic of Albania, which has the most friendly ties with the People's Republic of China, stands solidly behind it. Our people have feelings of sympathy and deep respect for the great Chinese people, whose talent and grandiose achievements are rapidly transforming China into a great socialist State with a highly developed industry, agriculture and culture, and who are making a major contribution to the defence of peace and human progress.

243. The Government of the People's Republic of Albania strongly and unreservedly supports the legitimate right of the People's Republic of China to occupy its place in the United Nations and urges an end to the injustice thus far committed against the Chinese people. The individual who unlawfully occupies the seat of China represents nobody.

244. The Government of the People's Republic of China, which rallies around it the entire population of China, is the only true government of China. It is the only government capable of representing China in the United Nations. It is the only government empowered and capable of discharging, in the name of the Chinese people, the obligations imposed by the Charter. Recognition of that irrefutable fact can no longer brook delay.

245. For all the reasons that have just been given, the delegation of the People's Republic of Albania rejects the recommendation of the General Committee and wholeheartedly supports India's proposal for including in the agenda of the current session the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. It appeals to all delegations to consider that proposal with all the seriousness it deserves.

246. Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan): The question of the representation of China in the United Nations has been brought before the General Assembly many times. Therefore, it is a question which is well known to all members of the Assembly. Moreover, it is one of those problems which has attracted and is attracting more and more the attention of the world public whose opinion has been and is being expressed in all parts of the world. It is a problem which has been the concern of a great number of the Members of the United Nations, a

concern which has been expressed in several sessions of the General Assembly. Therefore, it is not a question to be ignored or to be denied the consideration which it deserves.

247. But, Mr. President, on this occasion the question before us, as we understand it and as you have also stated it, is to express the views of the Afghan delegation on the draft resolution recommended by the General Committee in its first report [A/3926] and on the amendments submitted by Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Nepal and the United Arab Republic [A/L.245]. We shall try to be very brief and avoid repeating arguments presented by previous speakers.

248. I would say, first of all, that my delegation cannot accept, in its present form, the recommendation contained in the draft resolution of the General Committee. The recommendation does not consider that right of a Member State to propose the inclusion of an item in the agenda of the General Assembly for discussion. Furthermore, it does not consider the fact that the United Nations is a place for peaceful negotiation and discussion of all problems, particularly international problems, which would cause or prolong international tension between two or more countries. We think that not acceding to the request of a Member State to bring a problem to the United Nations for discussion cannot mean anything except standing in the way of peaceful negotiation in this Organization. Peaceful negotiations, good understanding and efforts to reach agreement on the solution of problems facing the world are the tasks of the United Nations. Consequently, we think that such an action means that international problems should be allowed either to be discussed outside the United Nations or dealt with by methods other than peaceful negotiation. Those who believe that all problems should be discussed in the United Nations cannot favour such a recommendation, particularly when there is no other suggestion for the solution of the problem outside the United Nations or for a procedure which would mean peaceful negotiation and which would be considered more desirable than the consideration of the question by the General Assembly. Therefore, such action means either completely ignoring an international problem or leaving it to be solved by methods which would not conform to the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations—that is to say, by methods which would create or increase international tension, or harm relations between peoples and nations and thus harm the cause of promoting or even preserving peace.

249. The draft resolution recommended by the General Committee not only rejects the request of a Member State for inclusion of an important question in the agenda of the Assembly, but also excludes any proposal that would deal with this problem before such a proposal has even been submitted.

250. The draft resolution recommended by the General Committee does not explain in any way any of the reasons which would at least throw some light on the desirability of rejecting the item from the point of view of those who are against the discussion of this question by the General Assembly at its thirteenth regular session. One would think that if the recommendation of the General Committee was based on the undesirability of discussing this question in the General Assembly, the General Committee would have seen that, by recommending such a draft resolution to the General As-

sembly, it was not serving its own purpose. I say this because the General Assembly is engaged in discussing this question.

251. On the question of the desirability of discussing this item in the General Assembly, one or two delegations have referred to the present situation in Taiwan and of how the situation would be affected by a discussion of this question. My delegation appreciates this point of view and this concern. But we think that the United Nations, particularly in this case, has waited long enough to give rise to situations which have come recently into existence, while there is no guarantee that conditions in the future will be any more favourable for the consideration of this item by the General Assembly. We do sincerely hope that the decisions taken by the United Nations at this session of the General Assembly will not create any complications in the future.

252. The request of the delegation of India, as the Afghan delegation understands it and the representative of India explained it, did not and does not ask for the exclusion of the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China or the seating of the representatives of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. Therefore, paragraph 2 of the draft resolution is obviously completely out of place, and that is why its deletion has been suggested.

253. These are the main reasons which have led my delegation to co-sponsor the amendments which are before the General Assembly. They are self-explanatory, and we hope that they will be favourably considered by the Assembly. Our first concern in this matter is that we see that the situation in Asia in connexion with the non-recognition of the legitimate government of the People's Republic of China, which has been recognized by Afghanistan and many other countries in that area and in other parts of the world, is becoming more and more serious. We think that Afghanistan, which is a neighbour to China and which has a common frontier with it, is in a position to see and to analyse the situation. We deem it our duty to bring our understanding of the situation to the attention of the United Nations. This is the reason for our taking part in the suggestions made and in drafting the amendments which are before the General Assembly, and that is why we are making an intervention on this subject.

254. Since we are not discussing the substance of the matter, we would like to state that the recommendation of the General Committee is unacceptable to us and that the adoption of the amendments is the only proper and desirable course to be followed by the General Assembly. It is in this manner that the delegation of Afghanistan gives its support to the request of India for the inclusion in the agenda of the thirteenth session of the General Assembly of the item entitled, "Question of the representation of China in the United Nations". If these amendments are adopted by the General Assembly, as we hope, the Assembly will make a contribution to world peace and to the lessening of international tension. If these amendments are not adopted, we should like to have our vote recorded as against the recommendation of the General Committee.

255. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia): The position of my delegation on the question of the representation of China in the United Nations is well known. It has been expressed in numerous statements and votes in

this Assembly. If, therefore, I take the rostrum today, it is not so much for purposes of clarification as to impress upon the Assembly the very great importance that we attach to this matter.

256. My Government recognizes the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China as the legitimate government of China. We profoundly regret that this country of more than 600 million people, a founding member of the United Nations, is still not seated in our Organization. Its exclusion cannot but have the most serious repercussions upon our efforts to ease international tensions and strengthen worldwide co-operation. We are, in fact, today already reaping the bitter and dangerous fruits of this abnormal situation.

257. And what about the future? Can we have effective disarmament without the participation and co-operation of the 600 million people of China? Can we achieve a ban on nuclear weapons tests under effective international control without the participation of the People's Republic of China? The world has rightly hailed the significant work accomplished by the Conference of Experts to study the possibility of detecting violations of a possible agreement on the suspension of nuclear tests. But can anyone imagine that this work will be realized while we maintain here the fiction of Taiwan? Moreover, can we discuss safeguards against the possibility of surprise attack while ignoring China? And can we even hope for an end of the recurring crises in the Far East?

258. These and many more such questions that I refrain from formulating, illustrate the urgent necessity of discussing the question of the representation of China in the United Nations. And this is the crux of the matter. We are not at the moment concerned with the merits or demerits of seating the People's Republic of China in this Organization. What is relevant here is that no one can deny the serious implications and consequences of this question.

259. I think that I can say without fear of contradiction that there are two things on which there is general concurrence: first, that the question of the representation of China is a subject of controversy and, secondly, that a solution of this controversy is of tremendous significance to this Organization and to the world at large. This is even acknowledged by those who year after year seek a postponement of this item. All they say, in effect, is: "Yes, this question of the representation of China is a serious subject of controversy and, therefore, let us postpone consideration of this matter for another year".

260. Now, we do not question their right to request postponement year after year, but we certainly do question the wisdom of their policy.

261. Why, if it is a serious matter on which strong opinions are held, should debate be postponed? It is just on questions of this nature that it is most urgent to invoke the full potentialities of the United Nations as an instrument of reconciliation and peace. It is, indeed, strange and incongruous to hear, on the one side, that all countries should exert greater efforts to utilize the possibilities of this Organization, and, on the other side, that we cannot even discuss an item that endangers international peace and co-operation. Such an attitude surely does nothing to enhance the effectiveness and prestige of this high body. Nor is it in keeping

with the principle of free expression to silence the community of nations.

262. We are aware of the fact that, at the present time, talks are in progress in Warsaw between the representatives of the United States of America and the People's Republic of China. We agree that nothing must impede the successful outcome of these talks. But what my delegation cannot accept is that the Warsaw talks should constitute any grounds for gagging this Assembly. On the contrary, they merely confirm the need for Assembly debate on this question of the representation of China. Their only bearing upon the issue is again to underline the recklessness and, indeed, the impossibility of ignoring a country of more than 600 million people.

263. Moreover, the General Committee's recommendation is that the General Assembly decide not to consider this item entitled "Question of the representation of China in the United Nations" at its thirteenth regular session is incompatible with the suggestion for a postponement for the duration of the Warsaw talks, unless those who support postponement on this ground have some mysterious way of knowing beforehand that the Warsaw talks will drag on for the period of the thirteenth session. But what if these talks are concluded, in one fashion or another, this week or the next? Then obviously there would be no more grounds for avoiding a debate on this item. And this only goes to show that paragraph 2 of the draft resolution recommended by the General Committee is not only inadmissible in that it far exceeds the Committee's jurisdiction and contravenes the clear provisions of General Assembly resolution 396 (V), but it is also eminently impracticable. Of course, the representatives who seriously feel that a discussion of this item should await the conclusion of the Warsaw talks are free to urge this procedure after the inclusion of the item in the agenda. I am sure that such a request, following a precedence established in many other such cases, would receive sympathetic consideration.

264. But let us not pick at every straw in the wind to avoid a debate in this Assembly of nations. We cannot go on hiding from reality. There is a Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. It is recognized by many Member States and has commercial or other relations with the overwhelming majority of countries represented here. It is conducting talks right now with one of the permanent members of the Security Council. If the crisis in the Far East comes before the United Nations, it is very likely that a representative of the People's Republic of China will be invited to participate in the discussions. Why then should we, representatives of responsible Governments, be barred from taking up a question that weighs so heavily upon the United Nations? We are told that the People's Republic of China should not be allowed to "shoot its way into the United Nations". This is not our terminology, and I do not intend to examine its merits now. But is not the United Nations, by continuously postponing consideration of this question, in fact inviting the People's Republic of China to find its way into silencing the United Nations and incapacitating its potentialities for promoting tranquillity and understanding in international relations? This is indeed a sad development. For us, an Asian country, it may well be catastrophic. We are not thousands of miles removed from China. China is our neighbour, and the establish-

ment of peace and tranquillity in the Far East is naturally a matter of immediate concern to my Government and people. Even if we so desired, we could not hide from reality. In fact, it is our considered opinion that the abnormal situation obtaining in the United Nations endangers all of mankind. But if our opinion is to be disregarded, then the least we ask is that our real fears and anxieties be given the attention that they deserve.

265. We do not demand any specific solution. We merely ask the United Nations, after years of procrastination, to face up to this question of the representation of China. I think that we have a right to expect that our request and views in this matter will receive priority, that they will be heeded. We desire a settlement of this long-standing and increasingly acute controversy. We want peace in our region as well as in the world at large.

266. Therefore we urgently request the Assembly to support the amendments which we have the honour of co-sponsoring with other delegations.

267. Mr. AIKEN (Ireland): Our delegation would have preferred to postpone public debate on this question to some time later in the session in order not to interfere with the Warsaw talks, but we failed to secure this. The question of whether this item is to be included in our agenda for this session has therefore to be decided now.

268. May I emphasize that the issue raised by the draft resolution and the amendments under discussion is not whether the Communist Government in Peiping should be admitted to this Organization with or without conditions, this year or next year, or at all. The issue is, in our opinion, whether this Assembly is to feel free to debate openly and comprehensively any important question affecting international relations.

269. There can be no doubt that the question of whether Communist China should or should not be represented here is one of major importance. There can be no doubt that the situation in the Far East not only affects the interests of China and Korea, but is an immediate threat to local peace and to world peace. Indeed, I wonder whether refusal to discuss it in previous years may not have contributed to the present dangerous situation in the Far East.

270. Those of us who represent functioning democracies and who wish to see this Assembly a model and exemplar of democratic procedure may perhaps ask ourselves how a question of the same relative importance would be handled in our own parliaments. Could a Government properly refuse to allot government time for such a debate or refuse to allow opposition deputies to submit a motion regarding it? Discussions on major issues of policy are often an embarrassment to democratic governments. Opinions are often expressed and proposals made which are anathema to the Government and sometimes detrimental to the national interest and to national morale. But in Ireland we take the view that in the long run free and open parliamentary discussion leading to a well informed public opinion on the issues involved is by far the better and the more healthy course to pursue. If damage is done by debate, it is less than would be caused by suppression of debate and by the uncertainties and suspicions aroused through the denial of the rights of minorities or of individual deputies. We might all detest what a deputy says, but in our

tradition we must unite to defend his right to say it in an orderly way in a free parliament.

271. It is not a question of whether we approve or disapprove the doctrine and methods of Chinese Communists. My own country is unalterably opposed to doctrines which involve the suppression of religious freedom and to methods which have caused death and suffering on a great scale inside and outside China, and which have helped to bring about the division of ancient nations. The Irish people know historically what it means to be deprived of religious and political freedom. They detest oppression whatever form it takes, and it has taken many forms. They are a freedom-loving people in the fullest sense of that term. But can the cause of freedom really be served by shirking discussion?

272. The Chinese Communists, like other Communists, deny the right of free discussion. But for peoples of the democratic tradition, that right is fundamental. If this Assembly decides to have a free and open debate on this question, that decision will not be, in our opinion, a victory for Chinese communism or any other communism. It will be a victory for the vital principle of the democratic tradition and not that merely, but an important step towards the securing of peace by making this Assembly what it should be, a parliament for the nations of the world.

273. For these reasons, we must vote for the amendments which have been submitted in the name of Afghanistan and six other countries.

274. The PRESIDENT: I know very well that the hour is late, and I have before me a point of order. However, I should like to explain to the Assembly the predicament in which I find myself.

275. This is certainly a very important debate and it must proceed in an orderly fashion. At the same time, we have cut into the general debate. Several foreign ministers have come here to make statements in the general debate and have made plans to return home immediately thereafter. I must therefore choose between these two courses: first, proceeding with the present debate in an orderly fashion, or secondly, resuming the general debate.

276. I am entirely in the hands of the Assembly. The Assembly may adjourn whenever it wishes, but I shall not adjourn the meeting for the reasons which I have just given.

277. I call now on the representative of India on a point of order.

278. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): Before I raise my point of order I should like to state that under rule 114 of the rules of procedure my point of order should have been put before the President spoke.

279. Under rule 78, I move the adjournment of the meeting until tomorrow at 10.30 a.m. This session of the General Assembly has just begun and it is only in extraordinary circumstances that we meet after 6 p.m. or on Saturday. I regret that I cannot agree with the President's statement that we have cut into the general debate. If there has been a debate it is because a majority of the General Committee did not want the item to be included in the agenda, and the expression of that opinion lends more colour to the idea that minority views should not be expressed. I therefore take exception to the statement that we have cut into

the general debate. Foreign ministers are here, as well as others. We know that foreign ministers are very important people, but so are defence ministers. The general debate is important, but so also is an open debate on the question of China.

280. I therefore move the adjournment of the meeting until tomorrow at 10.30 a.m. Under the relevant rules of procedure, this motion should be put immediately to the vote.

281. The PRESIDENT: I shall put the motion immediately to the vote. It is a motion under rule 78 for adjournment till tomorrow at 10.30 a.m.

282. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (from the floor): On a point of order.

283. The PRESIDENT: I am sorry; under the rules of procedure, I cannot recognize anybody, until the voting is completed.

The motion for adjournment was adopted by 51 votes to 9, with 9 abstentions.

284. The PRESIDENT: I shall give the floor to the representative of the Soviet Union if he confines himself to an explanation of vote.

285. Mr. GROMYKO (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian) Mr. President, I expected you to give me an opportunity today to express some views concerning the conduct of our meetings. I am aware that a decision has now been taken to adjourn the meeting and the debate. However, I cannot remain silent regarding your attempts to exert pressure on the General Assembly. During the meetings, and especially at this afternoon's meeting, you have made several such attempts. I think that you would be acting more correctly and more objectively if you did not base yourself on the views expressed by the representatives

of only one side during the examination of this question, but took a more objective position as President of the General Assembly and refrained from making any statements which exert any degree of pressure on the General Assembly.

286. I think that the vote just taken is significant in this respect, and you, Sir, will no doubt draw the appropriate conclusions. In any case, the Soviet delegation would like to hope that you will draw the appropriate conclusions and will in future not exert such pressure.

287. It goes without saying, of course, that the Soviet delegation fully supports the decision just taken. However, we will have another meeting tomorrow. We should like to avoid the problems artificially created by your conduct of the meeting—I will not say "arbitrarily" created; I assume that "arbitrarily" does not apply. I do not wish to aggravate the situation and will say nothing more. I think that you will take this request into consideration and that our debate on this question will have an orderly and profitable conclusion.

288. The PRESIDENT: Before we adjourn, I should like to tell the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union that I do my best to observe the rules of procedure, that I am grateful to him for any observations he makes, but I assure him I did not need these observations at all.

289. I want also to assure him that my attitude will always be objective, that it will always be impartial and guided only by the interests of orderly procedure in this Assembly. I put before the Assembly the predicament in which I found myself, in all simplicity, and I left it to the Assembly to decide its own course of action. Certainly, the Assembly is its own master, and we will all abide by its decision.

The meeting rose at 7.50 p.m.