

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1069th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 1 December 1961,  
at 3 p.m.

**NEW YORK**

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda items 90 and 91:</i>	
<i>Question of the representation of China in the United Nations (continued) . . . . .</i>	903
<i>Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations (continued) . . . . .</i>	

**President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).**

**AGENDA ITEMS 90 AND 91**

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

1. Mr. STEVENSON (United States of America): The question confronting the Assembly, concerning the representation of China in the United Nations, is of world-wide and historical importance.
2. We live in an age when the ever-expanding family of nations is striving anew to realize the vision of the United Nations Charter: a world community, freed from the overhanging menace of war, acting together in equal dignity and mutual tolerance to create a better life for humanity. This very Assembly, in its majestic diversity, is both the physical symbol and the practical embodiment—however imperfect—of that transcendent vision.
3. In striving toward that vision, what we decide regarding the representation of China will have momentous consequences. For more is at stake than the status of certain delegations. More is at stake than the registering or reflecting of existing facts of power. Indeed, the underlying question is how the great people of China, who by a tragedy of history have been forcibly cut off from their own traditions and even led into war against the community of nations, can be enabled to achieve their own desires to live with themselves and with the rest of the world in peace and tolerance.
4. This question as we all know, has a long history. For twelve years past, ever since the Communist armies conquered the Chinese mainland and the Republic of China relocated its Government in Taipei, the community of nations has been confronted with a whole set of profoundly vexing problems. Most of them have arisen from aggressive military actions by the Chinese Communists—against Korea, against the Government of the Republic of China on its island refuge, against Tibet, and against South and South-East Asia.
5. The problem before us, in its simplest terms, is this. The authorities who have carried out those ag-

gressive actions, who have for twelve years been in continuous and violent defiance of the principles of the United Nations and of the resolutions of the General Assembly and deaf to the restraining pleas of law-abiding Members—these same warlike authorities claim the right to occupy the seat of China here, and demand that we eject from the United Nations the representatives of the Republic of China.

6. The gravity of this problem is heightened in its world-wide political and moral significance by the fact that the place of the Republic of China in the United Nations, since its founding in 1945, has been filled by its representatives with distinction—filled by representatives of a law-abiding Government which, under most difficult circumstances, has done its duty well and faithfully in the United Nations, and against which there is no ground for serious complaint, let alone expulsion.

7. The United States believes, as it has believed from the beginning, that the United Nations would make a tragic and perhaps irreparable mistake if it yielded to the claim of an aggressive and unregenerate "People's Republic of China" to replace the Republic of China in the United Nations. I realize that we have sometimes been charged with "unrealism", and even with "ignoring the existence of 600 million people"—to quote familiar phrases.

8. This seems to us a strange charge indeed. My country's soldiers fought with other soldiers of the United Nations in Korea for nearly three years against a huge invading army from the mainland of China. My country's negotiators have done their best, for nearly ten years, at Panmunjom, at Geneva, at Warsaw, to negotiate with the emissaries of Peking. Almost no country, I dare say, is more aware of the existence of these people than mine.

9. I think that it could be said with more justice that it would be dangerously unrealistic if this Assembly were to bow to the demands of Peking to expel and replace the Republic of China in the United Nations; it would be ignoring the warlike character and the aggressive behaviour of the rulers who dominate 600 million people, who talk of the inevitability of war as an article of faith and refuse to renounce the use of force.

10. To consider this subject in its proper light, we must see it against the background of the era in which we live. It is an era of sweeping revolutionary changes. We cannot clearly see the end. With dramatic swiftness the classic age of empire is drawing to a close. More than one third of the Member States of the United Nations have won their independence since the United Nations itself was founded. Today, together with all other free and aspiring nations, they are working to perfect their independence by developing their economies and training their peoples. Already they play a vital part in the community of nations and in the work of this Organization.

11. Thus, for the first time on this grand scale, we have seen an imperial system end, not in violent convulsions and the succession of still another empire, but in the largely peaceful rise of new independent States—equal members of a world-wide community.

12. So diverse is that community in traditions and attitude, so small and closely knit together is our modern world, so much do we have need of one another—and so frightful are the consequences of war—that all of us whose representatives gather in this General Assembly must more than ever be determined, as the Charter says, "To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours". For there can be no independence any more except in a community—and there can be no community without tolerance.

13. Such is one of the great revolutionary changes of our time: a spectacular revolution of emancipation and hope. But this century has also bred more sinister revolutions born out of reaction to old injustices and out of the chaos of world war. These movements have brought into being a plague of warrior States—the scourge of our age. These régimes have been characterized not by democracy but by dictatorship; they have been concerned not with people but with power; not with the consent of the people but with control of the people; not with tolerance and conciliation but with hatred, falsehood and permanent struggle. They have varied in their names and in their ideologies, but this has been their essential character.

14. Nowhere have these qualities been carried to a greater extreme, or on a grander scale, than on the mainland of China under Communist rule. The régime has attempted through intimidation, through hunger, through ceaseless agitation—and through a so-called commune system which even allied Communist States view with distaste—to reduce a brilliant and a spirited civilization to a culture of military uniformity and iron discipline. Day and night, by poster, by loudspeaker and by public harangue, the people are reminded of their duty to hate the foreign enemy.

15. Into the international sphere the Chinese Communists have carried the same qualities of arrogance, of regimentation and of aggression. More persons hoped, after their invasion of Korea ended, that they would thereupon give up the idea of foreign conquest. Instead they sponsored and supplied the communizing of North Viet-Nam; they resumed their warlike threats against Taiwan; they launched a campaign of armed conquest to end the autonomy of Tibet; and all along their southern borders they have pressed forward into new territory. To this day, in a fashion recalling the earlier authoritarian emperors of China, they pursue all these policies, and in addition seek to use the millions of Chinese residing abroad as agents of their political designs.

16. In fact, these modern Chinese imperialists have gone further than their imperial ancestors ever dreamed of going. There are at this time in Communist China, in training centres for guerrilla warfare, young men from Asia, from Africa and from Latin America being trained in sabotage and guerrilla tactics for eventual use in their own countries. Thus the strategy of what Mao Tse-tung calls "protracted revolutionary war in the rural areas", has become one of the principal world exports—and no longer an "invisible export"—of Communist China.

17. We have exact information about some of these activities. For example, we have the testimony of six young men from the Republic of Cameroon who travelled clandestinely from their country to the mainland of China in 1960. They arrived in China on 9 June; they left on 20 August. During that period they had a ten-week course from French-speaking instructors in a military academy outside Peking. The curriculum of this educational institution, taken from the syllabus that these men brought home, included such items as these—they make interesting reading: the correct use of explosives and grenades; planning a sabotage operation; how to use explosives against houses, rails, bridges, tanks, guns, trucks, tractors, etc; manufacture of explosives from easily obtained materials; manufacture and use of mines and grenades; use of semi-automatic rifles and carbines; theory and practice of guerrilla warfare, ambushes, attacks on communications. And then there were political lectures with such titles as "The people's war", "The Party", "The United Front" and, of course, "The imperialists are only paper tigers".

18. This, incidentally, was the fourth in a series of courses to train Cameroonians to fight for the overthrow, not of European colonial rulers—for their rule had already ended—but of their own sovereign African Government.

19. Such an affinity for aggressive violence, and for subversive interference in other countries, is against all the rules of the civilized world; but it accords with the outlook and objective of the rulers in Peking. It was the supreme leader of Chinese Communism, Mao Tse-tung, who summed up his world outlook in these words: "Everything can be made to grow out of the barrel of a gun". And again, to quote him: "The central duty and the highest form of revolution is armed seizure of political power and the settling of problems by means of war. This Marxist-Leninist principle is universally correct, whether in China or in foreign countries; it is always true."

20. President Tito of Yugoslavia knows to what extremes this dogma of violence has been carried. In a speech to his people in 1958, he quoted the "Chinese leaders" as saying with apparent complacency "that in any possible war...there would still be 300 million left; that is to say, 300 million would get killed and 300 million would be left behind...".

21. In an age when reasonable men throughout the world fear and detest the thought of nuclear war, from the Chinese Communist thinkers there comes the singular boast that, after such a war, "on the debris of a dead imperialism the victorious people would create with extreme rapidity a civilization thousands of times higher than the capitalist system and a truly beautiful future for themselves".

22. In fact, only three months ago it was the same Chinese Communist leaders who officially acclaimed the resumption of atmospheric nuclear tests by the Soviet Union as "a powerful inspiration to all peoples striving for world peace". What a queer idea of world peace!

23. With such a record and with such a philosophy of violence and of fanaticism, no wonder this régime, after twelve years, still has no diplomatic relations with almost two-thirds of the Governments of the world. One cannot help wondering what the representatives of such a predatory régime would contribute in the United Nations to the solution of the many dangerous questions which confront us.

24. I believe these facts are enough to show how markedly Communist China has deviated from the pattern of progress and peace embodied in our Charter and toward which the community of nations is striving. In its present mood it is a massive and brutal threat to man's struggle to better his lot in his own way—and even, perhaps, to man's very survival. Its gigantic power, its reckless ambition and its unconcern for human values, make it the major world problem.

25. Now—what is to be done about this problem? And what in particular can the United Nations do?

26. The problem is, in reality, age-old. How can those who prize tolerance and humility, those whose faith commands them to "love those that hate you", how can they make a just reply to the arrogant, the rapacious and the bitterly intolerant? To answer with equal intolerance would be to betray our own humane values. But to answer with meek submission or with a convenient pretence that wrong is not really wrong—this would betray the institutions on which the future of a peaceful world depend.

27. There are some who acknowledge the illegal and aggressive conduct of the Chinese Communists, but who believe that the United Nations can somehow accommodate this unbridled power, and bring it in some measure under the control—or at least the influence—of the community of nations. They maintain that this can be accomplished by bringing Communist China into participation in the United Nations. By this step—so we are told—the interplay of ideas and interests in the United Nations would sooner or later cause these latter-day empire-builders to abandon their warlike ways and accommodate themselves to the rule of law and the comity of nations.

28. This is a serious view and I intend to discuss it seriously. Certainly we must never abandon hope of winning over even the most stubborn antagonist. But reason born of sober experience obliges us to restrain our wishful thoughts. There are four principal reasons which I think are of overriding importance, and I most earnestly urge the Assembly to consider them with great care, for the whole future of the United Nations may be at stake.

29. My first point is that the step advocated, once taken, is irreversible. We cannot try it and then give it up if it fails to work. Given the extraordinary and forbidding difficulty of expulsion under the Charter, we must assume that, once in our midst, the Peking representatives would stay—for better or for worse.

30. Second, there are ample grounds to suspect that a power given to such bitter words and ruthless actions as those of the Peking régime, far from being reformed by its experience in the United Nations, would be encouraged by its success in gaining admission to exert, all the more forcefully, by threats and manoeuvres, a most disruptive and demoralizing influence on the Organization at this critical moment in its history.

31. Thirdly, its admission, in circumstances in which it continues to violate and to defy the principles of the Charter, could seriously shake public confidence in the United Nations—I can assure you it would do so among the people of the United States—and this alone would significantly weaken the Organization.

32. Elementary prudence requires the General Assembly to reflect that there is no sign or record of any intention to pursue a course of action consistent with

the Charter. Indeed, the signs all point the other way. The Peking authorities have shown nothing but contempt for the United Nations. They go out of their way to deprecate it and to insult its Members. They refuse to abandon the use of force in the Taiwan Straits. They continue to encroach on the territorial integrity of other States. They apparently do not even get along very well with the Soviet Union.

33. Fourth, and with particular emphasis, let me recall to the attention of my fellow representatives the explicit conditions which the Chinese Communists themselves demand to be fulfilled before they will deign to accept a seat in the United Nations. I quote here their Prime Minister, Chou En-lai:

"The United Nations must expel the Chiang Kai-shek clique and restore China's legitimate rights, otherwise it would be impossible for China to have anything to do with the United Nations."

34. Now in this short sentence are two impossible demands. The first is that we should expel from the United Nations the Republic of China. The second, "to restore China's legitimate rights", in this context and in the light of Peking's persistent demands, can have only one meaning: that the United Nations should acquiesce in Communist China's design to conquer Taiwan and the 11 million people who live there, and thereby contribute to the overthrow and the abolition of the independent Government of the Republic of China.

35. The effrontery of these demands is shocking. The Republic of China, which we are asked to expel and whose conquest and overthrow we are asked to approve, is one of the founding Members of the United Nations. Its rights in this Organization extend in an unbroken line from 1945, when the Charter was framed and went into effect, to the present.

36. The Republic of China is a Charter Member of this Organization. The seat of the Republic of China is not empty; it is occupied and should continue to be occupied by the able representatives of the Government of the Republic of China.

37. The fact that control over the Chinese mainland was wrested from the Government of the Republic of China by force of arms, and its area of actual control was thus greatly reduced, does not in the least justify expulsion, or alter the legitimate rights of that Government.

38. The de jure authority of the Government of the Republic of China extends throughout the territory of China. Its effective jurisdiction extends over an area of over 14,000 square miles, an area greater than the territory of Albania, Belgium, Cyprus, El Salvador, Haiti, Israel, Lebanon or Luxembourg—all of them Member States of the United Nations. It extends over 11 million people, that is, over more people than exist in the territory of sixty-five United Nations Members. Its effective control, in other words, extends over more people than does the legal jurisdiction of two-thirds of the Governments represented here. The economic and social standard of living of the people under its jurisdiction is one of the highest in all Asia, and is incomparably higher than the standard prevailing on the mainland. The progressive agrarian policy of the Government of the Republic of China and its progress in political, economic and cultural affairs contrast starkly with the policies of the rulers in Peking under whom the unhappy lot of the mainland people has been little but oppression, communes, famine and cruelty.

39. All those who have served with the representatives of the Republic of China in the United Nations know their integrity and know their loyalty to the Charter, which we all respect, their high standards of conduct, their unflinching dignity and courtesy, their contributions, and their consistent devotion to the principles and the success of our Organization.

40. The notion of expelling the Republic of China is thus absurd and unthinkable. But what are we to say of the other condition sought by Peking—that the United Nations stand aside and let them conquer Taiwan and the 11 million people who live there? In effect, Peking is asking the United Nations to set its seal of approval in advance upon what would be as massive a resort to arms as the world has witnessed since the end of the Second World War. Of course, the United Nations will never stultify itself in such a way.

41. The issue we face is, among other things, this question—whether it is right for the United Nations to drive the Republic of China from this Organization in order to make room for a régime whose aggressive appetite seems to be insatiable. It is whether we intend to abandon the Charter requirement that all United Nations Members be peace-loving and to give our implicit blessing to an aggressive and bloody war against those Chinese who are still free in Taiwan. What an invitation to aggression the Soviet proposal would be—and what a grievous blow to the good name of the United Nations.

42. In these circumstances the United States earnestly believes that it is impossible to speak seriously today of "bringing Communist China into the United Nations". No basis exists in which such a step could be taken. We believe that we must first do just the opposite: we must instead find a way to bring the United Nations—its law and its spirit—back into the whole territory of China.

43. The root of the problem lies, as it has lain from the beginning, in the hostile, callous, and seemingly intractable minds of the Chinese Communist rulers. Let those members who advocate Peking's admission seek to exert upon its rulers whatever benign influence they can, in the hope of persuading them to accept the standards of the community of nations. Let those rulers respond to these appeals; let them give up trying to impose their demands on this Organization; let them cease their aggression, direct and indirect, and their threats of aggression; let them show respect for the rights of others; let them recognize and accept the independence and diversity of culture and institutions among their neighbours.

44. Therefore, let the Assembly declare the transcendent importance of this question of the representation of China. Let us reaffirm the position which the General Assembly took eleven years ago [resolution 396 (V)], that such a question as this "should be considered in the light of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter ...".

45. The issue on which peace and the future of Asia so greatly depend is not simply whether representatives from Peking should take a place in the General Assembly. More profoundly still, it is whether the United Nations, with its universal purposes of peace and tolerance, shall be permitted to take its rightful place in the minds of the people of all of China.

46. Today the rulers in Peking still repeat the iron maxim of Mao Tse-tung: "All political power grows

out of the barrel of a gun." If that maxim had been followed, the United Nations would never have been created, and this world would long since have been blanketed with lethal radio-active ashes. It is an obsolete maxim, and the sooner it is abandoned, the sooner the people of all of China are allowed to resume their traditionally peaceful policies, the better for the world.

47. The United States will vote against the Soviet draft resolution [A/L.360] and give its full support to the continued participation of the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China in the United Nations.

48. No issue remaining before the United Nations this year has such fateful consequences for the future of this Organization. The vital significance which would be attached to any alteration of the current situation needs no explanation. The United States has therefore joined today with the delegations of Australia, Colombia, Italy and Japan in presenting a draft resolution [A/L.372] under which the Assembly would determine that any proposal to change the representation of China would be considered an important question in accordance with the Charter. Indeed, it would be hard to consider such a proposal in any other light, and we trust it will be solidly endorsed by the Assembly.

49. Mr. Nhiek TIOULONG (Cambodia) (translated from French): The Cambodian delegation was very happy to see the question of China's representation in the United Nations placed on the agenda. For many years this question has been kept out of the Assembly's debates, not for reasons of substance but simply because of a procedural manoeuvre. New Zealand's initiative in requesting the inclusion of this item in the agenda [see document A/4873] shows that even States which have so far been opposed to the presence of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations realize that the time has come to abandon the unrealistic policy of blocking from year to year, by means of a purely procedural argument, the discussion and settlement of one of the most important problems in international life.

50. For several years Cambodia has constantly deplored the lack of realism which has led to the annual postponement of debate on this important question. In 1958 Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Head of the State of Cambodia, speaking from this rostrum [754th meeting], made it clear that the absence of the People's Republic of China from the United Nations was most unfortunate and was an obstacle to the settlement of the major international problems. The Cambodian delegation speaks today in order to draw attention once more to this very important question; and we wish to recall the arguments put forward in previous years and once again this year by the Head of the State of Cambodia [1011th meeting]. In doing so, my delegation, which represents a very small neutral and peaceful nation of 5 million inhabitants, has no intention of becoming involved in any kind of dispute between blocs. In the first place, we know that our country is so small that our intervention will carry little weight. Secondly, our neutrality, which implies impartiality, and our sincere friendship for all peoples whose ideology and system of government we respect, make it impossible for us to do so.

51. But as a Member of the United Nations, which we trust and respect, we have a duty to make our own contribution, however modest, to the consideration of this question, which we believe to be one of the most

important for world peace. Because of its geographical situation, moreover, Cambodia is one of the countries most directly concerned in the matter. Since we live on the frontier of the two worlds, at one of their most delicate points of contact, in the middle of a "hot" and "cold" war between rival blocs, we have suffered in many ways, and our country is among the best placed to see the facts of a situation which we, as a people of South-East Asia, have to face.

52. Since its admission to the United Nations, therefore, Cambodia has always been particularly interested in the question of China's representation in the United Nations. Not only is this country our neighbour, but the Kingdom of Cambodia has had peaceful relations with it for more than a thousand years. We know this from documents, of great value for the history of Khmer civilization in the Angkor period, which were left behind by an Ambassador from the Court of China to the King of Cambodia and which describe his stay at Angkor-Vat in the twelfth century. Despite a short interruption caused by foreign domination, these relations were resumed a few years ago when Cambodia decided, in 1956, to recognize the Government of the People's Republic of China. Today there is a Chinese colony of 350,000 active and prosperous people living in Cambodia.

53. All this explains why the problem of China's representation in the United Nations closely affects us, and how real and alive, for us, the Chinese question is. We think that the ostracism of the Government of the People's Republic of China by the United Nations, which has lasted for several years, should end. This ostracism has caused enough bitterness and hostility, and is particularly inexcusable since it is directed against a nation of 700 million inhabitants, a hard-working and industrious people that will very soon be able to make its country into a world Power of the first rank. Another effect of this ostracism is to harden China's attitude; in the recent past, as we still remember, it has caused many crises in the Straits of Formosa and elsewhere. We must at all costs avoid a repetition and aggravation of these crises, if we want to create in the world an atmosphere favourable to negotiations on the most urgent problems of the hour: I refer to disarmament and the suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests.

54. When we speak of the question of China's representation in the United Nations, we cannot forget the arguments put forward by those who have hitherto stubbornly opposed China's admission. Some say that the People's Republic of China has condemned itself by taking arms against the United Nations forces in Korea and that its admission to the Organization could only intensify disputes between East and West. We do not share this opinion. On the contrary, we believe that the People's Republic of China, once admitted to the United Nations, will automatically subscribe to the obligations which the Charter, in its wisdom, imposes on each Member State. The People's Republic of China will acquire not only the rights but the duties of every Member State, large or small. As a Member of the United Nations, China will have to assume all the responsibilities flowing from the United Nations Charter, and will be accountable to other Member States. My delegation considers that this would be one great advantage of China's admission. It is an enormous advantage, particularly if we compare it with the innumerable disadvantages arising from discrimination against China. What are these disadvantages?

55. If the Peking Government, which effectively controls the continent of China, is ignored or even outlawed by the United Nations, it is able and entitled to disregard all our decisions and resolutions. In the context of the vital problems of the moment, this situation involves very serious dangers.

56. Take, for example, the question of disarmament. Who can deny that, if any agreement on disarmament could be concluded, it would be considerably weakened, if not rendered largely ineffective, if the People's Republic of China, with its enormous uncontrolled military potential, were not a party to it? Who—particularly among the Asian countries which are China's neighbours—could feel safe if the People's Republic of China were free to act as it wished, while other world Powers were bound by an agreement on general and complete disarmament?

57. Let us take another instance. In the opinion of the competent authorities, China will soon be able to manufacture the atomic bomb. In that case, what would be the use of an agreement on nuclear and thermonuclear armaments without China's participation in it? How could the testing of nuclear weapons throughout the world be ended if China could continue research and experiments, either on its own behalf or at the request of a friendly Power, using its vast territory as a screen and drawing on the talent and resources of its scientists? I read in a newspaper the other day that a Western leader has said that, on the day when a disarmament agreement was concluded between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union, China could be added as a co-signatory and could thus be required to observe the obligations set forth in the agreement. Such a suggestion, of course, seems completely illogical, since China would be entitled to refuse to assume the obligations of any treaty whose terms and conditions it had been precluded from discussing beforehand. This is the kind of attitude which, by its lack of realism and of cold logic, has helped to prolong the misunderstanding about the question of China's representation. It is time to end this misunderstanding.

58. Based as it undoubtedly is on the support of its people, and with an immense agricultural and industrial potential, the State of China is going to play a prime part in world affairs, whether we like it or not. Within its frontiers the Peking Government exercises control which is real, effective and accepted by the whole people. China's place is here in this Assembly, and we can no longer hold that country at arm's length if we wish to make the Organization into an instrument of peace and universal concord.

59. This brings me to the matter of the universal character which the United Nations ought to have. Some say that the United Nations should be, not a kind of universal super-Parliament, but rather a club of peace-loving countries, to which only nations that fulfil a number of conditions should be admitted. These people have forgotten the fundamental fact that its founders intended the Organization to be essentially universal. We are firmly convinced that the United Nations Charter leaves no room for confusion about the organic problem of the admission of new Members. The very nature of the Organization's mission requires it to be universal. If the United Nations were regarded as a club for peace-loving countries, we should have to lay down rules, not only to prevent the admission of nations considered unworthy of it, but also to exclude countries, already Members, which because of their policy, action or conduct were no longer worthy of membership.

60. Others, on the pretext of past events, have stated that China does not fulfil the conditions required for admission to our club. We think it very dangerous to look into the past of nations, since many countries might be exposed to similar criticism in respect of acts committed by them before their admission to the United Nations. We think it would be wiser to judge nations by the constructive role they can play in the future and by the influence they can exercise in our world, a world which is becoming ever smaller as modern scientific and technical discoveries are perfected. We are certain that China will play a major role in the coming years.

61. Lastly, some of China's adversaries point, in justification of their attitude, to events in Tibet and to the frontier dispute between India and China. Have they forgotten that India itself, which is one of the parties to the frontier dispute and is best placed to assess the situation in Tibet, tells us it is still convinced that China should be admitted to the Organization? We think that if we set the opinion of China's adversaries, which is based on theoretical considerations and sometimes inspired by passion, against the opinion of India, which is a neighbour of China and is as much concerned for peace as we are, India's opinion should prevail.

62. A detailed discussion of China's representation in the United Nations must, of course, produce a variety of reactions. So many political, emotional and moral factors and so many different interests are associated with this problem that it is impossible to avoid bitterness and the assumption of positions of intransigence; but this, unfortunately, is not very realistic. That is why my delegation has tried to deal with the problem as objectively, impartially and fairly as possible.

63. We would observe that it is pointless to refuse to look facts in the face. If we refuse to see and accept the facts, we shall not avoid future difficulties; on the contrary, we shall only postpone and perhaps aggravate them, increasing their number until they become completely unmanageable. In the present case, we think that the course of wisdom lies in not trying to avoid the inevitable.

64. The delegation of Cambodia believes that we cannot hope for world peace unless the greatest Powers, and in the first place the United States, the Soviet Union and China, are able to settle all their common problems by negotiation. All peace-loving nations, great or small, should unite their efforts to promote peaceful meeting between the great Powers, instead of presenting a spectacle of countries divided into opposite camps each ranged behind its own leader, thus contributing to the world's division into contending blocs. Everyone knows that Cambodia, while following a policy of strict neutrality, has always tried, despite innumerable difficulties, not to belong to any bloc, even to what is often called the neutral bloc. We think that the only effect of the division of the world into blocs will be to intensify conflicts, and that the dissolution of these blocs would be one of the best ways of reducing the present tension.

65. I have said that the Cambodian delegation has always supported the candidature of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, because it is convinced that China's absence has more disadvantages than advantages. In a world which continues to be poised on the edge of the abyss, it is not only useless but dangerous to continue to ignore China, with its 700

million citizens, and to believe that the great problems of peace and war can be solved without its help. This is why, with conviction but without passion and with all the impartiality of a neutral country, we have argued every year through our Head of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, in favour of the admission of the People's Republic of China.

66. During the past two years the Organization has opened its doors to nineteen new Members. These admissions are entirely to the credit of the United Nations, and the whole world rejoices to see these brother African and Asian peoples, finally liberated from foreign colonialism, taking their place in the concert of nations. But does not this make China's absence even more remarkable? If a small country of a few million inhabitants, like ours, now sits in the Assembly, we think it is hardly realistic that the nations with the most population in the world should remain outside the Organization.

67. I have said that China's presence is essential if the most important world problems are to be solved. It may be useful if I mention a few specific examples, taken from the recent past.

68. In 1954, when what is known as the Indochinese war reached its climax and the fortunes of the battle were beginning to favour the Viet-Minh forces, an international conference<sup>1/</sup> was hurriedly called with a view to discovering a way of ending this war. Nine countries were invited to the conference: Laos, South Viet-Nam, North Viet-Nam, the United States, France, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China and Cambodia. China came to that conference and took part as of right, together with representatives of the great Western Powers. It made a decisive contribution to the work of the conference which led, as you will remember, to the signing of the Geneva agreements of 1954<sup>2/</sup> ending the Indochinese war.

69. Again in May 1961—when the Laotian crisis became so acute that it threatened to become a general conflict—at the proposal of our Head of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, a new and broader conference was convened at Geneva.<sup>3/</sup> This conference was attended by fourteen countries, including the People's Republic of China. I myself, with the Cambodian delegation, had the great honour of attending both conferences, and I can honestly bear witness to the important part which the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China played at them.

70. Why was it considered necessary to invite the People's Republic of China to these conferences? Simply because it was thought, quite rightly, that China should attend and that no decisions could be taken on these questions without China's participation and consent. At these two international conferences, delegates of the People's Republic of China sat at the conference table with delegates of France, the United Kingdom, the United States and other countries. Thus China has already been admitted to important international conferences attended by the greatest Western Powers. It is incomprehensible that the same great Powers should oppose China's presence in this Assembly, since the United Nations is concerned in the

<sup>1/</sup> Conference on the problem of restoring peace in Indo-China, held at Geneva from 16 June to 21 July 1954.

<sup>2/</sup> Agreements signed on 20 July 1954.

<sup>3/</sup> Conference for the settlement of the Laotian question, which opened on 16 May 1961.

highest degree with questions even more important than the Indochinese war or the present Laotian crisis. My country is convinced that the realism shown by these great Western Powers on two occasions at Geneva should logically bring them at last to agree to the presence of the People's Republic of China in the Organization.

71. I should like to end my speech by recalling the warning given by the Head of the State of Cambodia at the fifteenth session [877th meeting], when he said that the Organization would be forced to admit the People's Republic of China to membership sooner or later. Even if China is not admitted to the United Nations now, it should be invited to participate in any international settlement of the most important problems of the hour—disarmament and the suspension of nuclear tests. Moreover, representatives of the Western Powers themselves have admitted that a treaty on these two questions should include China if it is to have any effect. In the circumstances, surely it is the most elementary wisdom to refrain from pointlessly postponing the date? For if we do postpone it, the time may come when the Organization will be forced, not to admit China, but to beg China to take a place in it. We must not allow that to happen. We all have the duty of keeping the prestige and authority of the United Nations intact.

72. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of Cameroon, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

73. Mr. BINDZI (Cameroon) (translated from French): I should like to exercise my right of reply, under rule 116 of the rules of procedure, in order to comment on certain references to my country made in a speech we have heard this afternoon. There are some precedents which are not always happy ones and have an unfortunate tendency to recur. Thus my delegation is in a position as embarrassing as that in which the delegation of Cuba quite recently placed the delegation of the Dominican Republic in the Security Council in making a complaint against the United States for aggression, in connexion with some United States warships that were lying off the coast of the Dominican Republic, far from the coast of Cuba.<sup>4/</sup>

74. In support of an argument favouring the present representation of China in the United Nations, certain facts relating to my country were considered worthy of mention. Assuredly, the United States has shed the blood of its sons on battlefields at the four corners of the world; and I have no doubt that the interest shown by these explicit references to my country proves that the United States would be ready to shed American blood for Cameroon, in case of need.

75. I do not intend to deny or to confirm the statements made from this rostrum. I have asked my Government for instructions so that I can speak on the matter if necessary, and I think I could do so if I were instructed accordingly. I can only regret that the same concern was not shown for my country when it was unjustly mutilated here in order that part of our territory might be given to a neighbouring country as a gift.

76. Lastly, I hope the United States delegation will always vigorously defend the interests of the Federal Republic of Cameroon, particularly in debates where those interests are really at stake.

77. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I call upon the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

78. Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): I have decided to make use of my right of reply, because the representative of the United States referred to the Soviet Union and its relations with the People's Republic of China and uttered a sentence to the effect that the People's Republic of China cannot live on friendly terms even with the USSR. I leave this remark to the conscience of the United States representative and must tell him straightaway that any attempts by the United States or any other country to bedevil the relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China are doomed, in advance, to total failure.

79. I feel there is no need to go into any details on this subject; but I shall take advantage of this right of reply to show how the representative of the United States Government, in his statement, found himself completely unable to reply to the burning question that now faces the Assembly and the whole world—the question of restoring the lawful rights of the great Chinese people in this Organization.

80. The United States representative made a speech today in which absolutely no arguments were advanced on the substance of the question and no attempt was made to reply to the serious arguments that are being put forward all over the world and were advanced by the representative of the Soviet Union this morning—arguments to which an answer must inevitably be given if we want seriously to settle this question, not in the interests of any individual country but in those of the whole Organization and in the interest of strengthening universal peace.

81. I said this morning [1068th meeting] that there took place in China a popular revolution which set up a new people's authority and a new Government. In your statement, Mr. Representative of the United States, you were unable to deny that. It is a real fact, and it has to be reckoned with.

82. I asserted that the United Nations cannot concern itself with the internal affairs of any country, including China, and that consideration of the domestic problems of the People's Republic of China is therefore not within the competence of the United Nations. What did you reply to that? Nothing. You cannot deny that the United Nations Charter prohibits intervention in the domestic affairs of any Member State of the United Nations. You could not deny this; if you did, you would be directly contradicting the charter and you would be unable to recommend that course to the United Nations.

83. I said this morning that a small group of renegades from the island of Taiwan could not represent the great Chinese people. You were unable to give a reply to that. You cannot deny, after all, that this small group of renegades cannot claim to speak on behalf of great China, a people of 650 millions. You cannot challenge that fact and on this point, of course, you were left completely bankrupt.

84. What did you put forward to counter our view—the view of many countries and, more particularly, of the small country whose representative has just spoken, adducing, very convincingly, new arguments to which you will also find no answer? What did you say? You said that the policy of the Chinese Government, the Government of the People's Republic of China, inside and outside the country, displeased you;

<sup>4/</sup> See Official Records of the Security Council, Sixteenth year, Supplement for October, November and December 1961, document S/4992.

and you tried to slander this policy, both as domestic and as foreign policy.

85. You tried to put forward ridiculous data about the internal situation in China; you tried to criticize the communes in China, etc.; but let me tell the United States representative that every adult person is fully aware that in the United States itself there are domestic problems on which any of us could say a great deal that would not tell in favour of the United States. Everyone here in this hall understands perfectly well that the problem of race relations in the United States, the problems of inter-State relations, and the relations between the Government, the ruling circles and individual sections of the population are not entirely governed by harmony. Everything in the United States could be commented upon. There are many features that could be criticized; but none of us would be so bold as to say that, because of the blemishes in the internal capitalist structure of the United States, that country cannot be a Member of the United Nations and must be excluded from membership of it.

86. We do not say, for we are sensible people. How can reasonable people now suggest not giving the right of representation in the United Nations to a particular country because the domestic régime of that country does not please them—especially in the case of a very great country where the people itself decides these problems? How can you come to the rostrum of the United Nations and, in spite of the Charter, in disregard or in contradiction of the Charter, try to tell us: "You see, we don't like these goings-on, so we don't want to restore the lawful rights of China"? And what was it you criticized in their foreign policy? The aggressive acts of the People's Republic of China; and you cited some ridiculous examples. But we today have given you examples against which you can say nothing. We stated that, as an act of foreign policy, the People's Republic of China had withdrawn its troops from Korea but that you had not withdrawn your own troops from Korea. Does that mean, then, that you should be excluded from the United Nations?

87. We talked about Viet-Nam, Laos and so forth; but you intimidated everyone by saying how terrible it would be if we let People's China come to this rostrum. You wanted to frighten all the small countries by assuring them that they would be in a grievous position if a representative of the Central Government of the People's Republic of China came to this platform. You frightened everyone; yet you failed to scare the little country of Cambodia whose representative has just spoken from this rostrum. Cambodia, which lives side by side with this great country of China and which—small nation though it is—has no fear of aggressive actions by the People's Republic of China, urged you to solve the problem on common-sense lines and not on the basis of your class feeling. It pleaded with you and said that it was not afraid of the Chinese People's Government coming to this platform. You failed to scare a small country which has just stated, clearly and frankly, its views on this question—views that are fair and just and are in line with the interests of the United Nations and world peace.

88. There is one little argument, if I may venture to allude to it, which you tried to put forward as, in fact, a major argument in support of this theory of Chinese aggressiveness. You mentioned the case of some paratroopers or other organizing a revolt in Cameroon.

But, after you spoke, the representative of Cameroon rose and asked you not to make use of the example in question. He said he would give a reply on the point after receiving the necessary instructions from his Government, but it was quite obvious from his remarks that he was asking for Cameroon not to be implicated in your policy "vis-à-vis" of China.

89. Regarding Cameroon, though, you mentioned paratroopers and military personnel of some kind being sent somewhere—no one knows exactly where; even the Cameroonian representative could neither confirm nor refute your information, and in any case he asked you not to refer to the matter. Yet all the world knows that the United States prepared a landing in Cuba, landed paratroopers and several thousand "émigrés" and helped in all the training given to these "émigrés" for an armed invasion of Cuba. Everyone knows that; there was a special discussion about it at the last Assembly. You did not deny it, because it cannot be denied. There are material, bloody traces of your crimes in Cuba. In the upshot, then, if that is the line you take, we should have to demand your exclusion from the United Nations because you organized an invasion of Cuba. We have never raised such a question, however; we, too, are sensible people. We realized that a great country like the United States could not be excluded from the United Nations. It can be severely criticized; it can be asked to change its position, especially if that position involves violation of the United Nations Charter. It would not however be sensible to raise the question of excluding the United States from the United Nations, seeing that the entire world, and of course the United Nations itself, cannot exist without the participation of the largest countries. You propose to withhold the right of representation here in the United Nations from the biggest country in the world, a country with a population of 650 millions, because, apparently, you have discovered somewhere six wretched paratroopers—your intelligence units, probably, discovered them—and on this ground you consider you can raise the question of the impossibility of letting China come to this rostrum.

90. Are these really serious arguments? Can they really be regarded as the basis for a serious policy? I think that everyone here in this hall realizes that they are ridiculous arguments, which have no foundation either in the clauses of the Charter or in common sense. The only thing that clearly emerged from your speech was your fear that you would lose Taiwan as a military base. That, from your speech, was obvious. What is more, it was clear that you were afraid of losing your trusty, reliable agent in all United Nations organs. Yes, you were frightened that you would lose one vote in the Security Council—the vote of your agent, who votes as you decide; that you would lose a vote in the Economic and Social Council, in any other United Nations organ, and in the General Assembly—although the voting voice in the Assembly is, generally, a squeaky one and very few hear it. All the same, you think it would be dangerous if you lost the trusty agent and, most of all, if you lost the military base on Taiwan. That is what you are afraid of. And so, impelled by this fear and this fright, you have come to this rostrum and tried to scare the entire United Nations about the catastrophic consequences that will ensue if we expel the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the Organization and seat, in their place, the true representatives of the great Chinese people.

91. But this is not a policy; it is a pitiable, contemptible game, played in order to protect your own selfish military interests; and an end must be put to it. It must be replaced by a realistic policy that will

safeguard peace, international co-operation and the truly international character of our Organization.

*The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.*