

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records



**1600th
PLENARY MEETING**

Monday, 20 November 1967,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 93:

*Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's
Republic of China in the United Nations . . .* 1

President: Mr. Corneliu MANESCU (Romania).

AGENDA ITEM 93

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

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): This morning the Assembly will begin consideration of agenda item 93, on which two draft resolutions [A/L.531 and A/L.532] have been submitted to it.

2. I beg those representatives who wish to speak to have their names entered in the list of speakers as soon as possible. I also urge Assembly members who intend to submit new proposals or amendments to do so at the earliest opportunity.

3. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia) (translated from French): The General Assembly has been examining and discussing the problem of China for two decades. Those who oppose restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China argue as if the matter concerned the admission of a new Member as well as the recognition of a Government. Every year they resort to dishonest and unworthy delaying tactics to postpone the inevitable. This year again, they have submitted a draft resolution [A/L.532] requiring a two-thirds majority vote whereby the People's Republic of China would be judged on its merits.

Mr. Molina-Ureña (Dominican Republic), Vice-President took the Chair.

4. Let us have a look at their draft. They contend that:

"...whenever more than one authority claims to be the government entitled to represent a Member State in the United Nations and this question becomes the subject of controversy in the United Nations, the question should be considered in the light of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the circumstances of each case".

5. To those who are in good faith the government which since 1949 has been representing China and 750 million Chinese is the Government of the People's Republic of China. The controversy in the United Nations has been created by the United States imperialists and their satellites. For it is the United States and the Governments dependent on it that have persisted in claiming that the handful of refugees

who are directed by Chiang Kai-shek and are under the protection of the United States Army and Marines in the Chinese province of Taiwan represent the 750 million Chinese, with whom, incidentally they have had no contact for twenty years.

6. This is a unique situation. A man who is able to maintain himself in power in Taiwan only because of United States aid is laying claim to all of China! Even today, his representatives peremptorily inform Members of the United Nations that Chiang Kai-shek is still China's overlord and that the Chinese people are fervently hoping he will return!

7. The only reality in Taiwan, that world of illusions, is military. The true reasons for maintaining in Taiwan a military force 500,000 strong are two. First, this is a way of obtaining money from the United States, which has been paying for this army, in foreign currency, to a total of over \$3,000 million since 1950.

8. Secondly, and this is very important, for this army of 500,000 is not what would stop the Chinese people from liberating the Chinese province of Taiwan, this large military presence enables the handful of refugees driven out by the Chinese people to maintain an absolute dictatorship over the Island of Taiwan. Nevertheless, despite the presence of 500,000 men under arms, Chiang Kai-shek would not last a month without United States support.

9. In the minds of the Chinese, Chiang Kai-shek is bound up with a period in their history which they have left behind them and during which they were in an inferior status. For a number of centuries, the Chinese people were humiliated by the West. As that great and famous Chinese writer, Mrs. Han Suyin, wife of a Kuomintang general, writes in her book, The Crippled Tree,

"...the land did not belong to the Chinese; there were British and French and Belgian and other concessions, and barbed wire, so thick you could not see through, between [the Europeans] and the Chinese" ^{1/}

After giving a few examples, the author recalls that in 1900 the Chinese peasants rebelled against foreign domination. Immediate reprisals followed:

"Peking was sacked by the armies of the West and Japan, fifty thousand people died. The wells were filled with corpses, the streets with bodies of men, women and children in pools of blood." ^{2/}

^{1/} Han Suyin, The Crippled Tree, (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1965), p. 293.

^{2/} Op. cit. p. 112.

10. Mrs. Han Suyin also mentions that in a book on China published in 1934, the author quoted a remark by a German officer having his fun in Peking:

"When I go pheasant shooting, I shoot cocks and spare hens, I kill the old birds and let the young ones go; but when hunting Chinese I kill them all, men and women, old and young" ^{2/}

And she says in conclusion:

"If today China is Communist, it is the Western Powers which have forced her into it; and if the peoples of Asia are beginning to believe that nothing can be achieved except by the power of the gun, it is because that was proved by decades of violence. Everyone is conditioned by experience; our future made before we are born. Today the same lesson is being taught to future generations, the lesson that the gun is sole arbiter in the end, and it is still the West which teaches this lesson." ^{3/}

11. Mrs. Han Suyin also furnishes interesting information on the position of the former collaborators of the old régime:

"I... met and talked with dozens of people whom I had known when my husband was a general of the Kuomintang. I met some of his military colleagues, at one time serving Chiang Kaishek... They were alive, healthy, useful, rallied to New China. ... Among such people now in Peking, working or in sinecures because of age, are quite a handful of old warlords, with the blood of hundreds of Communist revolutionaries, decapitated or tortured, on their executioners' knives, ... yet there they were, unhurt, in Peking. But then, that is China; that is why the Chinese Revolution is different from any other, and why so many like my father rallied to it; it did not slaughter out of hand, there was forgiveness for those who showed repentance and told the truth; there was a place for everyone, even for an ex-Manchu Emperor, in this Revolution." ^{4/}

12. After totally freeing themselves from the foreign grip, the Chinese plunged into the work of national construction, a task of whose magnitude and duration they are fully aware.

13. The opposition of the United States of America to the restoration to the People's Republic of China of all its rights in the United Nations stems from political considerations completely at variance with the spirit in which the United Nations was founded. There is no question but that, in accordance with the principles of the Charter, the Chinese people, like the people of the United States and like any other people, was fully entitled to install a political régime of its own choosing without losing its international rights on that account. A good many other countries have experienced popular revolutions but have nonetheless kept their seat in the United Nations. In view of that fact, why should a discriminatory and entirely arbitrary measure be applied to the People's Republic of China?

14. The question before us is not whether or not China should be admitted to the United Nations, but who represents China and its population of 750

million. Is it the Chiang Kai-shek régime, which was driven out by the Chinese people, has taken refuge in the Chinese province of Taiwan under the protection of United States imperialists, and cannot survive without their aid, or is it the popular régime at Peking, which has the approval and support of 750 million Chinese?

15. The People's Republic of China is not a Power suing for admission to the United Nations. It is a country—China—which is not only a Member of the United Nations, but one of its founding Members and a permanent member of the Security Council.

16. It is incorrect to claim that it was a régime—the "Republic of China" as it existed in 1945—that took part in the creation of the United Nations, for the Charter, in Article 3, does not speak of régimes, but only of States.

17. Two years ago, the spokesman of another founding Member of the United Nations and permanent member of the Security Council, France, said:

"In providing that China would assume the special responsibilities incumbent upon a permanent member of the Security Council, the Charter did not intend to confer rights and obligations upon a Government. Those rights and obligations were to be assumed by a State, taking account of all that that State represented and the weight it carried in the world balance of forces. In other words, the exercise of these rights and the assumption of these obligations devolve upon the Government which has effective control of the territory, which has charge of its resources and which represents the people in question. It is therefore the Peking Government alone which, having achieved and maintained the unity of the country, is able to speak and act on its behalf." [1372nd meeting, para. 39.]

18. It should be noted that three out of the four members of the Security Council have recognized that the Government of the People's Republic of China represents the Chinese people and that it alone has the right to speak for it and to represent it here in the United Nations.

19. China is a Member State and no one can deny that its government is the Government of the People's Republic of China. From the legal point of view, all the General Assembly is called upon to do is to enable the representatives of the People's Republic of China to take their rightful place, which is to say the place of China, in the United Nations, and to vote by a simple majority on the credentials they will present, since what we have to deal with is neither an admission nor a decision on an important question within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter.

20. For the reasons I have given, my delegation rejects out of hand the draft resolution [A/L.532] sponsored by the United States.

21. In recent times, some countries have been actively seeking to separate the Chinese province of Taiwan from China. We cannot for a moment entertain this immoral solution of "two Chinas", for there is only one China in the world. To take the opposite view would not only create a dangerous precedent; it would constitute an injustice and a flagrant violation

^{3/} Op. cit., p. 265.

^{4/} Op. cit., p. 56.

of the principles of the Charter which no independent and sovereign country could tolerate.

22. Both *de jure* and *de facto*, Taiwan is part of China's territory. During the Second World War, the Declarations of Cairo (1943) and Potsdam (1945), which were signed by the United States, confirmed the status of Taiwan by proclaiming that the Chinese territory of Taiwan, which Japan had seized after the Sino-Japanese War of 1894, should be restored to China at the war's end. When Japan surrendered, the then Chinese Government officially took Taiwan back and proclaimed it a province of China. This is a fact recognized by a great many countries, including the United States. If today Taiwan has not yet rejoined its mother country, United States armed occupation of the island is alone to blame

23. It is certain that, unless the province of Taiwan, administered without any right by the United States, is restored to the People's Republic of China and unless that country is invited to resume its place among us, with all its rights and prerogatives, the United Nations will never be able to play its destined role; on the contrary, its impotence will become more obvious every year.

24. All the independent countries of the Asian continent which border on or lie close to the People's Republic of China, namely, India, Pakistan, Nepal, Afghanistan, Burma, Mongolia, Cambodia, Ceylon, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam—naturally excepting Thailand, that colony and base of United States aggression in South-East Asia—favour the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and agree that the Government of the People's Republic of China is the sole legitimate representative of the Chinese people and is alone competent to represent China in the United Nations.

25. To those who clamour that China is guilty of "aggressiveness" and therefore does not belong in the United Nations, my delegation would say that, if China seeks to spread its ideology, the United States imposes all over the world its military bases, its occupation troops, its "local" wars, and its fascist governments arising from *coups d'etat* engineered by the CIA.

26. There cannot be the slightest doubt that the general policy of the People's Republic of China has been conditioned by the United States policy of blockade, pressure and threats.

27. In this connexion, I should like to quote some passages from a book written by a former special assistant of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. In *The Bitter Heritage, Vietnam and American Democracy, 1941-1966*, Arthur M. Schlesinger writes:

"What, therefore, is the view from Peking? It is obviously of a gigantic American effort at the encirclement and strangulation of China."^{5/}

It should be noted that this view has been borne out by the recent statements of Mr. Dean Rusk and Mr. MacNamara. Mr. Schlesinger goes on to say:

^{5/} Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. *The Bitter Heritage, Vietnam and American Democracy, 1941-1966*, (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967), p. 36.

"But it really should not astonish us that a crew of dogmatic Marxist-Leninists should so interpret the extraordinary deployment of American armies, navies and military bases thousands of miles from the United States and mobilized—on the word of American leaders—against no one but themselves. Imagine our own feelings if the Chinese had 400,000 troops in southern Mexico, engaged in putting down what we had hoped to be a pro-American rebellion; if massive Chinese military bases were being built there; if Chinese planes were bombing northern Mexico every day; if a great Chinese fleet controlled the waters along our Pacific Coast; and if Peking was denouncing the United States as the world's greatest threat to peace. The question, which so engages on our own sense of righteousness, of who the 'aggressor' is, depends a good deal on who looks through what glass and how darkly. The leaders in Peking are fully as devoted students of Munich as the American Secretary of State. They are sure that we are out to bury them; they believe too that appeasement invites further aggression; and, however deep their reluctance, at some point concern for national survival will make them fight. 'To save our neighbors,' as Peking announced on November 4, 1950, is to save ourselves."^{6/}

28. Certain countries which are dependent on Washington claimed during the general debate that China is engaging in "nuclear blackmail" when it is making every effort to constitute a deterrent force, whereas the United States, not satisfied with having piled up enormous stocks of atomic and thermonuclear weapons, continues to make underground tests. According to its own press, the United States in this year alone has carried out twenty-four such tests.

29. China's present position with regard to nuclear disarmament is identical with the position taken earlier by France.

30. In response to the Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests, signed in Moscow on 5 August 1963, China, in the same spirit, proposed a conference of heads of government of all countries with a view to the conclusion of a treaty the signatories of which would undertake not only not to manufacture, test or sell nuclear weapons, but also not to use them and to destroy them. China repeated this proposal when it made its first nuclear test in October 1964, but it received no other reply from Washington than a reference to a possible conference of the Five if Peking agreed to ratify the Moscow Treaty.

31. The United States has never shown any willingness to give up its monopoly, or drastically reduce its stock of bombs and rockets, or undertake not to be the first to use nuclear or thermonuclear weapons, whereas China, each time it makes a nuclear or thermonuclear test, solemnly repeats that at no time and in no circumstances will China be the first to use nuclear weapons, and adds:

"As in the past, the Chinese people and Government will continue to wage a resolute struggle, together with other peace-loving peoples and countries, with the lofty aim of complete prohibition and destruction of nuclear armaments."

^{6/} Op. cit., pp. 36 and 37.

32. It is madness to keep the Chinese people in isolation and a status of guilt and inferiority, and it is important that the United Nations should recognize without delay that no agreement concerning international peace and security is valid without the participation of China, a Power with a population of 750,000, which has now become a nuclear Power.

33. It is the United States Government, and not China, that is practicing "nuclear blackmail." In that connexion, I should like to quote a few passages from a book written by President Johnson himself, *My Hope for America*, and published in 1964. Here is what the President of the United States had to say:

"In every area, America today is stronger than she has ever been before. She is stronger than any adversary or combination of adversaries. She is stronger than the combined might of all the nations in the history of the world. And that strength is increasing.

"The first area of this increasing strength is our ability to deter atomic destruction. Since January, 1961, we have increased our nuclear power on the alert two and one half times...

"Against such force the combined destructive power of every battle ever fought by man is like a firecracker thrown against the sun...^{7/}

"There is no place in today's world for weakness...^{8/}

"I would like to make clear to ally and to adversary alike: Let no friend needlessly fear—and no foe vainly hope..."^{9/}

These warlike and war-mongering words require no comment.

34. Nevertheless, despite this material and technical superiority and their barbarous methods of waging war, the United States imperialists are today being held in check by the heroic Viet-Nameese people, which is fighting for its freedom and independence.

35. Despite aggressive and provocative acts committed against it by United States forces, China has always shown patience and self-control. It has had recourse to negotiation to ask the United States to withdraw all its armed forces from the province of Taiwan and the Strait of Taiwan, and for over ten years, first at Geneva and then at Warsaw, it has been holding talks with the United States on this question of principle, on which no concession is possible. That is proof manifest that China has always, as a matter of policy, sought to resolve by peaceful means such disputes as may exist or between independent States.

36. The considerations I have put forward make it plain that it is the duty of the United Nations, as it is in its own interest, to restore to the People's Republic of China without further delay its lawful rights in the United Nations and in all the organizations connected with it. This action should include the immediate expulsion of Chiang Kai-shek's representa-

tives from the seats they unlawfully occupy in the United Nations and in the various organizations connected with it.

37. Solution of this problem can be delayed no longer, for it is a pre-condition both for strengthening the authority of the United Nations and for safeguarding the Charter and the cause which, under the Charter, the United Nations is bound to serve.

38. For these reasons, the Cambodian delegation urges all Members of the United Nations to support the draft resolution [A/L.531] submitted by the non-aligned countries of Asia and Africa and to reject the draft [A/L.532] sponsored by the United States.

39. Mr. WEI Tao-ming (China) (translated from Chinese): Today we are witnessing the spectacle of another campaign—the seventh since 1961 when the so-called question of the representation of China was first inscribed on the agenda—to seat the Chinese Communist régime in the United Nations. The régime that the Assembly is asked to admit is the same régime that has proved itself the enemy of the Chinese people, that has committed numerous acts of aggression against other countries, that has flouted the basic principles and purposes of the United Nations.

40. Much has happened since this question was debated in November of last year. The turmoil and confusion resulting from the so-called proletarian cultural revolution have become more widespread. In foreign policy Peiping has shown increased ideological militancy. There has been a general deterioration in the relations between Peiping and the rest of the world.

41. One of the most disturbing aspects of current developments has been the export of Red Guard tactics to foreign lands. Peiping now claims the right to carry the "cultural revolution" beyond its own borders. This has been spelled out in the most explicit and unmistakable terms in an editorial of its official paper, the *People's Daily*, of 13 August 1967. I quote:

"Working personnel of Socialist China assisting foreign countries are enthusiastic propagandists and courageous defenders of the thought of Mao Tse-tung. Wherever they go, they bring with them the thought of Mao Tse-tung and make it take root and blossom forth throughout the world. In the international struggle, Chinese Red fighters assisting foreign countries, armed with the ever-victorious thought of Mao Tse-tung, are firm in their proletarian stand and have clear-cut class love and hate. Wherever they are, they can at all times see the right direction, distinguish friends from foes, persevere in the truth, uphold principle, dare to go up a mountain of pointed swords and plunge into a sea of fire."

42. Obviously, there is nothing Peiping would not do to encourage and foment unrest in other countries in the name of the so-called thought of Mao Tse-tung. By its own admission, all its diplomatic as well as economic and technical assistance personnel are fifth-columnists charged with the special responsibility of subverting the countries to which they are

^{7/} Lyndon B. Johnson, *My Hope for America*, (New York, Random House, Inc., 1964), pp. 74 and 75.

^{8/} Op. cit., p. 70.

^{9/} Op. cit., p. 69.

accredited. It does not matter whether those countries are communist or non-communist, aligned or non-aligned.

43. The case of Burma is particularly illustrative. Burma, one of the first countries to recognize the Peiping régime and one of the most ardent supporters of the Chinese communist cause both inside and outside the United Nations, has now become the target of Peiping's most menacing threats. Peiping now openly calls for the overthrow of the Ne Win Government, which, in Peiping's view, is "fascist, reactionary and traitorous" simply because Rangoon has refused to allow Chinese communist agents to propagate "Mao Tse-tung's thought". "To propagate Mao Tse-tung's thought", said the People's Daily on 10 July 1967, "is the sacred and inviolable right of Chinese personnel working abroad".

44. How seriously should such threats be taken? In the present circumstances, direct military intervention can perhaps be ruled out. But this does not mean that the threats can be dismissed with complacency. Instead of direct military intervention, Peiping has now directed its efforts against Burma along three lines: full support for the outlawed Burma Communist Party, encouragement of separatist movements along Burma's frontier areas, and promotion of subversive activities in Rangoon and other urban centres. Aggression by proxy, as is shown in the case of Viet-Nam, can be as much of a menace to the independence of a country as open and undisguised military invasion.

45. A régime that promotes war and violence, that claims the right to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries and subvert the independence of neighbouring States, cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called peace-loving. Such a régime has obviously no place in an Organization dedicated to the maintenance of international peace and security, to the peaceful settlement of international disputes, to the development of friendly relations among nations based on law and justice, to the promotion of social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, to the encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

46. But, it has been argued, the existence of the Communist régime on the mainland of China is such an incontrovertible fact that it is absurd to pretend that it is not there. The answer to that question is that no one ignores the existence of the régime. Indeed, it is precisely because its existence is such a dangerous fact that it must be excluded from an organization such as the United Nations.

47. There is another school of thought which attributes Peiping's outrageous international behaviour to its political isolation. It is said that, once admitted to the world Organization and exposed to the civilizing influence of international opinion, the régime will cease to be hostile toward the rest of the world.

48. It seems to my delegation that the validity of this argument is open to question. It is born of illusion and wishful thinking and does not reflect the realities of the situation at all. Mao Tse-tung and his gang have never been known for their amenability to external influence. They regard themselves

as the sole repository of truth. It is difficult to imagine that men with such unshakable faith in the righteousness of their cause can be influenced by anything as volatile as what is called international opinion. Membership in the United Nations will not change their belligerence and hostility; it will only give them an opportunity to carry out their long-standing threat to "reform"—or rather to destroy—the United Nations.

49. The Peiping régime maintains diplomatic relations with over forty countries. I leave it to them to judge what influence they have been able to exert on Peiping's international conduct. It was with the express intention of bringing the régime's isolation to an end that France recognized it in 1964. There is no evidence that France has been more successful in this regard than any other country that has exchanged diplomatic missions with the Chinese Communist régime. Indeed, it may be doubted whether it is possible to maintain any kind of meaningful relations with that régime at all, since its every action is a negation of the principles and practices that have governed normal contacts between Governments.

50. The truth of the matter is that Peiping's political isolation, if it is political isolation, is not the cause of its outrageous international behaviour; on the contrary, it is its outrageous international behaviour that has caused the isolation. Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia must have known what he was talking about when he said that Peiping had lost most of its friends by "walking on the wrong path". In a speech on 13 September 1967, he said further:

"By 4 September 1967 there remained only two—Albania and Cambodia. And now, beginning 4 September, there is only Albania, because it has lost one more—Cambodia."

51. That Prince Sihanouk continues to maintain diplomatic relations with Peiping does not in any way vitiate the validity of his observation that Peiping's belligerence and hostility is the product of its own ideology rather than of pressures and attitudes of the world community.

52. The Prince was not unaware of the threat to his country posed by the Chinese communists. Mao Tse-tung's cultural revolution, he said at a press conference on 18 September, "now holds that even small, tiny areas are worth swallowing". He likened the cultural revolution to "a whale which devours small fishes". Yet the Cambodian representative in this Assembly, in blissful disregard of the true interest of his country, continues to play a leading role in pressing for the seating of Peiping. The course of timidity thus adopted will not save Cambodia from Peiping's aggressive designs. For Cambodia, as for all South-East Asian countries, the road to security does not lie in appeasing the aggressor but in fortifying the will to resist aggression.

53. Apologists of Peiping contend that in this thermo-nuclear age the reduction of international tension must be the first and foremost preoccupation of world statesmen. For this reason, they believe that the Chinese communists, for all their intransigence and bellicosity, must be admitted to the United

Nations—that it is far less dangerous to have them inside the United Nations than outside it; and what is more, that without their presence in the United Nations many of the crucial and urgent problems facing the Organization, including the problem of disarmament, would remain incapable of solution.

54. In the view of my delegation, however, this seemingly plausible argument does not in fact hold water. Those who argue in this manner seem ready to sacrifice the basic principles of the Charter in order to accommodate the Chinese communists. It is inconceivable, it seems to my delegation, that Members of the United Nations who have solemnly pledged themselves to uphold the Charter could, at the same time, urge its abandonment. The Charter is the basic law of the Organization. You cannot tamper with the fundamental law of the Organization without doing irreparable damage to the Organization itself. Those who are ready to discard Charter principles in order to accommodate Peiping are at bottom motivated by the fear of war. But to admit Peiping purely on the basis of fear is to encourage it to move from aggression to aggression until a time when there remains no tolerable alternative to war. The lesson of the Second World War should not be easily forgotten.

55. As to disarmament, Peiping has already made it abundantly clear that there can be no reduction of arms until the victory of communism on a world-wide basis is achieved. In its view, the United Nations "is absolutely incapable of settling the disarmament question or any other major international issues".

56. Obviously, there is no reason to believe that the problems which now confront the United Nations would disappear once Peiping was admitted. But there is every reason to believe that the seating of Peiping in these halls would bring in its train a multitude of new problems which might well undermine the very existence of the United Nations.

57. Advocates of Peiping's admission not infrequently base their position on assumptions which are as fallacious as they are unjustified. One of these assumptions is that the Communist régime on the mainland of China has the support of the masses of the people. Nothing, however, could be further from the truth. The Chinese people have never accepted the communist tyranny and have in fact never ceased to struggle against it. Eighteen years of unlimited terror and regimentation have failed to stamp out the spirit of resistance. Millions have perished in the struggle. Millions have fled the country. The Chinese people are a home-loving people; it is no easy thing for them to leave behind kith and kin, lifelong associations and even human identity, in exchange for the uncertainties of life in exile. Certainly, only fears and revulsions of the intensest kind could account for the decision to escape. By so doing, they are asserting in the strongest terms possible their unalterable hatred for the régime.

58. Over the years my delegation has called attention to the un-Chinese character of the Peiping régime. The so-called "proletarian revolution", with its ruthless destruction of all the cultural values which the Chinese people hold dear, has demonstrated beyond

any shadow of doubt that the régime is un-Chinese in character and un-Chinese in purpose. It is opposed to everything the Chinese people stand for. And, that being so, it is totally unfit to represent the Chinese in the world community.

59. Another assumption, which flows directly from the first and which is taken for granted by those who have an almost superstitious belief in Peiping's ability to keep itself in power, is that the régime is in China to stay and cannot be kept out of the United Nations for an indefinite length of time.

60. Those who base their position on this assumption have apparently forgotten the lesson of recent history, namely, that all totalitarian régimes appear strong and impregnable until they are overthrown. The Chinese Communist régime is no exception.

61. Indeed, the régime is already in deep trouble. The so-called "cultural revolution" is itself a sign of weakness and not of strength. It is the outward manifestation of the régime's inner sense of insecurity, its profound lack of faith in its own future. Knowing that its authority has no sanction in Chinese cultural tradition, it has deemed it necessary to do away with that cultural tradition. But the cultural tradition of the Chinese people has now begun to reassert its influence. It is this tradition, rather than the so-called "thought of Mao Tse-tung", that must ultimately prevail.

62. The régime now finds itself in the grip of a convulsive power struggle. Everywhere the Maoist and the anti-Maoist forces are locked in combat. Law and order have practically ceased to exist. In their determination to strike down "usurpers", "revisionists", and other "monsters", Mao's "revolutionary rebels" have done a pretty good job of destroying the Party and administrative machinery. In the provinces, local leaders have openly defied central authority. Only five out of a total of twenty-six provinces and two out of a dozen or so major cities remain under Peiping's actual control.

63. In the earlier stages of the "cultural revolution", the armed forces remained somewhat aloof. In January this year they were ordered to "get into the act". It was soon discovered, however, that "there are also persons in authority in the Red Army taking the capitalist road". Inasmuch as the rank and file of the troops hail from rural areas, the chaotic conditions prevailing in the countryside are reflected in their declining morale. They cannot be expected to support wholeheartedly a régime which has brought so much misery and suffering to their families.

64. The disintegration has been heightened by two other formidable forces. One is the people's yearning to be free. The other is the breakdown of the economy. Peasants and workers, who have suffered the most under the communist tyranny, are now the vanguard of the anti-Maoist forces. They have joined forces with the anti-Maoist elements within the Communist Party to overthrow Mao Tse-tung and all that he represents. It is ironical, as I said in my statement in the general debate [1580th meeting], that Mao Tse-tung, the theoretician of "People's War" and the proponent of the tactic of encircling the cities

from the countryside, now finds that his chickens have come home to roost. The same "People's War" and the same tactic of encircling the cities from the countryside are now being used for his own downfall.

65. In an attempt to arrest the worsening conditions, the Peiping régime has recently stepped up its campaign of forming what is called a "great revolutionary alliance" of revolutionary cadres, the armed forces and the masses. But this is not likely to save the régime from its ultimate doom. The turmoil has reached such an intensity that the situation cannot be ameliorated even if the Maoists were to revise or to modify their methods.

66. At a time when the hopes of the Chinese people for the recovery of their lost freedom appear the brightest, the United Nations has no right to put its seal of approval upon a régime which has committed so many heinous crimes against them.

67. To the Chinese people there is only one China and one legal Chinese Government, the Government of the Republic of China. They categorically reject any proposal that purports to resolve the question of representation through the so-called two-Chinas formula. Let me state with all the emphasis at my command that the right to determine who should represent China in the United Nations belongs exclusively to the Chinese people. It is not for Members of this Assembly or anybody else to make the decision for them or to propound proposals that are at variance with the wishes and aspirations of the Chinese people.

68. The question of the representation of China involves not merely the rightful position of the Government of the Republic of China in the United Nations; it has far-reaching implications for the future of the Organization itself. No one with the true interests of the Organization at heart can allow the admission of a régime which is clearly disqualified by both the spirit and the letter of the Charter. Any act of appeasement on the part of the United Nations cannot but give new impetus to the aggressor's design for world domination. This is no time to cling to positions which are no longer tenable in circumstances in which Peiping has intensified its subversive activities in all vulnerable parts of the world, particularly against the countries of South-East Asia.

69. Elementary prudence, therefore, requires the General Assembly to take a hard look at the question of Chinese representation. For the sake of the 700 million Chinese people now languishing under communist tyranny, for the sake of international peace and security, and for the sake of the United Nations itself, I appeal to you, fellow representatives, to vote down any proposal aiming at the seating of the Chinese Communist régime.

70. Mr. LOPEZ (Philippines): Today, as in previous sessions, we are called upon to decide two related questions. The first is whether or not we should accept a proposal for the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. And the second is whether or not we should agree that any proposal to change the representation

of China is an important question which, in accordance with paragraph 2, Article 18 of the Charter, requires a two-thirds majority vote for approval.

71. Tradition has established the fact that this is pre-eminently a political question. Since it is a political question, we must observe that the issue has not been correctly posed by the sponsors of the present item. Were the question at issue one simply of restoring a so-called lawful right to the People's Republic of China, the General Assembly would have no option except to accede to the proposal, since to deny it would itself be unlawful and therefore indefensible. But a right, whether lawful or unlawful, can only be restored to one who once possessed the right and then subsequently lost it. Since the People's Republic of China has never before exercised the right to represent China in the United Nations, no claim of restitution can properly be submitted by itself or by others on its behalf. Thus, the wording of the agenda item clearly begs the question. For this reason, if for no other, the proposal submitted by the delegations of Albania and others must be rejected.

72. There is only one valid question that can be put to the General Assembly concerning the People's Republic of China, and it is a hypothetical one. That question is whether the General Assembly would accede to a request or claim of the People's Republic of China to represent China in the United Nations. We have chosen the terms of the conditional proposition with great care. It is based on the assumption that the Government of the People's Republic of China itself would express the desire and claim the right to represent China in the United Nations, and that it would give a clear indication to that effect to the United Nations. So far as we are aware, the Government in Peking has expressed no such desire and made no such claim. On the contrary, its attitude towards the United Nations continues to be one of unmitigated contempt. It has announced that it would not consider joining the United Nations until the Organization has reformed itself in accordance with Peking's stipulations; otherwise, Peking would be obliged to set up what it calls a "revolutionary United Nations" of its own.

73. In these circumstances, and in the absence of a request or a claim by the People's Republic of China to represent China in the United Nations, the question of changing the existing situation does not even arise. The General Assembly should not be expected to respond to a hypothetical question.

74. We are often reminded that we are dealing not with a question of admitting a new Member State but of deciding which of two rival régimes has the right to represent a State that is already a Member of the United Nations. The implication is that the decision to be made is mandatory, not permissive. But such a decision necessarily implies a deliberate act of choice dictated by considerations mainly political in character. These considerations are not concerned with the legitimacy of a government, the nature and scope of its authority, or the stability of its institutions. Each Member State must decide for itself what is best for the United Nations. There can be no question of any automatic entitlement of

any régime to represent a Member State in the United Nations.

75. Since considerations of a political character are decisive, we would repeat the view we expressed at the last session, namely, that there is a season for everything under the sun, and it remains our candid view that the time has not come to review the question of the representation of China in the United Nations. Divided against itself, at odds with most of its neighbours and with much of the rest of the world, the People's Republic of China today is neither willing nor able to carry out the obligations of membership in the United Nations. Indeed, it does not appear to want to have anything to do with the United Nations at all.

76. Do we then expect to bar mainland China forever from participating in the work of the United Nations? The word "forever" does not exist in the lexicon of history. We would recall that it took nearly ten years of patient negotiation to effect the simultaneous admission of about a dozen important States to the United Nations. No one questioned the qualifications or the right of those States to be admitted; there was only question of timing and the evolving climate of opinion among the States concerned and within the United Nations itself. So too the time will surely come when the Chinese people will have a government truly expressive of their ancient traditions of moderation and their vibrant aspirations for a better life, in peace and freedom. They cannot be barred permanently from co-operating with the United Nations either by arbitrary decision of the General Assembly or by the continued irresponsibility of their leaders. But the Chinese people themselves must break down the new Great Wall of fanatical doctrine which their leaders have built around their country. It took the Soviet Union forty-five years to moderate its ideological fervour and to accept the principle of peaceful coexistence. We must be prepared to wait just as long, if necessary, for a similar transformation to take place in the régime that now controls mainland China.

77. China, which used to call itself the Middle Kingdom, stands in the very heart of Asia, as large as life itself. We cannot, even if we wish, make it vanish by magic or by prayer. We know that we, its neighbours, have to live with it and come to terms with it. We are certain that through peaceful co-operation and neighbourly relations we could hasten together the improvement of the quality of life of the teeming millions of Asia, but we deny that China has the right to dictate the terms on which we should live with it, and we must defy any attempt on its part to do so. It is a tragedy fraught with nameless danger for all mankind that Communist China disbelieves violently in the principle of the peaceful coexistence of countries having different political and economic systems. Peking has denounced that principle as a revisionist heresy designed to undermine the doctrines of perpetual revolution and the export of revolution.

78. We must have the fortitude and the patience to wait for the eventual release of the Chinese people from the tensions of their long and bitter revolution. The time will come when the people

of mainland China will have a government that faithfully reflects their wish to co-operate with their neighbours and with the rest of mankind in building a new world of peace, freedom and abundance, under the rule of law. That time is not yet.

79. To the question of whether or not the proposal to change the representation of China requires a two-thirds majority vote for approval, our answer is self-evident. The question involves, on the one hand, a right pertaining to the most populous nation on earth, a permanent member of the Security Council, and, on the other hand, the very future of the United Nations itself. Therefore few questions can be more important than this. Moreover, since the General Assembly, as often as the question has been raised in the past, has decided consistently that it falls under the two-thirds rule, there could be only one logical reason for changing that decision today. That would be that for some obscure and mysterious reason the question had suddenly become less important than it was in previous years. But that would be a patent absurdity.

80. For the reasons we have stated, we shall vote against the draft resolution submitted in the name of Albania and others [A/L.531], and we urge support for the draft resolution tabled by fourteen countries, including the Philippines [A/L.532].

81. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan): The question of the representation of China in the United Nations is one of the most complex and important problems that this Organization has ever faced. It is a problem which has a very serious bearing on the peace and security of the world as a whole and of Asia in particular. Japan is concerned about every aspect of China and above all about the basic situation which gives rise to the very question we are now discussing. Japan is so closely related to China in many ways that we simply cannot ignore the magnitude of the question of Chinese representation.

82. Geographically, a glance at the map of eastern Asia reveals that the Japanese islands are separated from the mainland of China by relatively narrow bodies of water and are quite close to Taiwan. Korea is a near neighbour. South-East and South Asia, as we measure time and distance today, are not so very far away. These simple geographical facts in this day and age of advanced technology and sophisticated nuclear weaponry obviously must be taken into account by us as we consider problems relating to our own peace and security. Nor can we be unmindful of the menaces that exist today with regard to the specific areas I have mentioned.

83. Culturally, I would remind representatives of the long, almost unbroken history of relations between Japan and China extending back through many centuries. As a result of our intimate associations with the Chinese people in past years, the Japanese people cannot help taking a keen interest in their relations with the Chinese people. We look forward to the day—and we hope that it will be in the not too distant future—when it will become possible for all the Chinese people to live in peace and harmony with their neighbours and the rest of the world. It is most certainly the desire of the Japanese

people and Government to live in that way with all our Chinese neighbours.

84. Apart from these factors, I think it is quite obvious that Japan, as a country of East Asia, must take a vital interest in any matter or question which may affect, directly or indirectly, the peace and security of the region in which we live. The China problem as a whole, and one aspect of the China problem, which is the immediate question before the General Assembly, are matters which fall within the category of those which are of vital interest to Japan.

85. My delegation has always maintained that any proposal to change the representation of China in the United Nations is an important question under Article 18 of the Charter, requiring a two-thirds majority for decision, and we have been opposed to any attempt to expel the Republic of China from the United Nations. Today we have not found any valid reasons that would justify a change in that attitude. Our reason is simple: there has been no basic change in the elementary facts which the Assembly must take into account in its examination of this problem. Indeed, we are more than ever convinced, in the light of the current international situation, that the way this issue develops will certainly affect the peace and security of Asia and consequently of the entire world.

86. What are the basic facts that remain unchanged and which must be taken into account? The first is that there are in existence two authorities confronting each other across the Taiwan Straits. One of those authorities is the Government of the Republic of China, in effective control of a population of over 12 million people who enjoy a high standard of living on the Island of Taiwan and its adjacent islands. The other authority is the Government of the People's Republic of China, in control of 700 million people on the China Mainland. Each of those authorities persistently claims to be the sole lawful Government of all the Chinese people. That situation has continued to be the main source of tension since 1949.

87. In such circumstances any attempt to solve the problem of the representation of China in the United Nations merely by expelling one of the two bodies directly concerned from the place it has legitimately occupied in this Organization and replacing it by the other would inevitably risk upsetting the balance of power in East Asia.

88. For the reasons I have set forth, the Japanese Government considers that any proposal to change the representation of China in the United Nations is an important question, in accordance with Article 18 of the Charter. The Japanese delegation has therefore joined with others in co-sponsoring the draft resolution A/L.532. We are confident that a large majority of the Assembly will join with us in supporting that draft when it is put to the vote. We take that position not as a means of excluding the People's Republic of China from the United Nations but simply because there has not been any basic change in the pertinent facts which would cause us to believe that this question was no longer an important one in the sense of the Charter. To

our minds the question of Chinese representation is just as important as such problems as disarmament, apartheid, South West Africa, the Middle East and many others.

89. Another important point to be stressed is the great difference in the attitudes of the Republic of China and the People's Republic of China towards our Organization. The Republic of China not only was one of the original Members of the United Nations but also has faithfully carried out its responsibilities and obligations under the Charter and consistently upheld the authority and prestige of the Organization. Those are well known and indisputable facts, which cannot be denied by anyone. As to the position of the Government of the People's Republic of China with regard to the United Nations there is room for doubt. One cannot help wondering whether that Government is in fact willing to carry out the obligations and responsibilities enjoined by the Charter and whether its membership in the United Nations would be a positive factor in enhancing the prestige and authority of our Organization.

90. Japan stands for an orderly and peaceful evolution towards an international system based upon law and respect for diversity among national societies. It is possible that the day will come when the People's Republic of China may be able to play a more constructive and harmonious role in the international community, but for the moment, because of the uncertain and fluid situation in mainland China and the apparent lack of flexibility in the attitude taken at present by the Government of the People's Republic of China towards other countries and the United Nations, that possibility now seems somewhat remote.

91. The only substantive proposal for a solution to the problem of Chinese representation that has been placed before the Assembly is the draft resolution submitted by Albania and supported by a certain number of other countries [A/L.531]. With due respect, I am obliged to state that the proposed solution to the problem of Chinese representation in that draft resolution is quite unacceptable to my Government. We shall vote against it, and we hope that a large majority of the Assembly will join us in doing likewise. It is altogether unreasonable and unjust to propose that the representatives of the Republic of China—or for that matter the representatives of any other Member State—should be summarily expelled from the United Nations, and in the light of what I said earlier it is quite clear that the adoption of that draft would entail serious consequences for the peace and security of an area, where such serious tension already exists.

92. So much for the way my delegation will vote on draft resolution A/L.531. I wish to stress once again that my delegation maintains the position that a decision on that draft resolution, or on any other draft resolution having the direct aim of changing the representation of China in the United Nations, requires a two-thirds majority by its sheer importance. That is the reason why my delegation has joined with certain other delegations in co-sponsoring draft resolution A/L.532, believing that that draft resolution is wholly consonant with the overriding interest that all of us have in the maintenance of international peace and security. We most earnestly

hope that it will be approved by an overwhelming majority.

93. It only remains for me to say that my Government looks forward to the time when a peaceful and just solution of the question before us may contribute to more harmonious relations among the countries of Asia and of the world.

94. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Tomorrow morning the Assembly will continue its consideration of agenda item 93. It is understood, however, that item 94 (The situation in the Middle East) will continue to have priority and may be taken up at any time.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.