

# United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1251st  
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 22 October 1963,  
at 12 noon

**NEW YORK**

## CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Address by Mr. Tito, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia . . . . .</i>	1
<i>Agenda item 80:</i>	
<i>Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations (concluded) . . . . .</i>	4

*President: Mr. Carlos SOSA RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela).*

### Address by Mr. Tito, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia

1. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I now call on His Excellency, Marshal Josip Broz Tito, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, to address the Assembly.

2. Mr. TITO (President of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia)<sup>1/</sup>: It gives me great pleasure to address this Assembly for the second time and to have the opportunity to speak from the rostrum of this Organization, which was born from the painful experience of the greatest war in history and reflected the profound strivings of peoples and nations for ever to banish war and force from their mutual relations.

3. The head of the Yugoslav delegation to the present session of the General Assembly has already explained [1211th meeting] the views of the Yugoslav delegation on the various question on your agenda. I would, therefore, like to confine myself to some problems which I consider to be of special significance in the present phase of the development of international relations. In acquainting you with some of my thinking on current world trends, I am guided solely by the desire to assist towards a better understanding of the problems with which we are faced and of the more recent trends at work in the world today.

4. I am very happy to note that we are meeting, this time, in an international atmosphere that has improved considerably as a result of the efforts of the forces of peace and of the triumph of common sense. New possibilities are thus created for the United Nations in its endeavours further to promote international understanding and co-operation. We are, of course, labouring under no illusion that we can solve, within a brief period of time, all those complex international problems which have accumulated over the decades, and more especially at the time when the cold war was the most intense. It is however essential, in our opinion, that the Assembly should now do all that is possible further to strengthen the course of mutual

understanding that has been initiated in the field of international relations.

5. In recent years there have been serious crises in international relations, such as had never, one might say, confronted humanity in the past, as far as the consequences which they might have entailed. Although these crises were not always solved in the most satisfactory manner, because they left their mark on international relations, we nevertheless succeeded, due particularly to the United Nations and also to the realistic approach of some of the responsible leaders of the great Powers, in avoiding the greatest danger—the danger of the world being engulfed in a general nuclear catastrophe.

6. There is a growing awareness throughout the world that war has become an absurdity in these days of gigantic technical achievements and that it should be banished for ever from international relations, as well as the policy of negotiation from positions of strength. Underlying this new development is the fact that all people have become conscious of the vast possibilities and prospects which would open up before the whole of mankind if peace were consolidated. It is of particular significance that the leading statesmen of the great nuclear Powers are giving increasing recognition to the principle of peaceful co-operation, irrespective of differences in social systems. This trend is reflected in the conclusion of the Moscow Treaty on the banning of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, which more than a hundred countries have now signed. This first step towards peaceful understanding was welcomed throughout the world with tremendous joy and relief. The closer we approach to the day of the total triumph of the notion that war must be excluded as a means for settling disputes, the more absurd will any form of arms race also become. Indeed, disarmament will come as a necessary and logical consequence.

7. With the interests of the common man in mind, I frequently ask myself why people should go to war with one another. What are the problems that might induce them to do so, and what could war bring to anyone under present-day conditions? In our atomic age there is a constant danger of even limited and isolated conflicts spreading and leading to thermo-nuclear war.

8. It would seem to me that the time is no longer when economic or material benefits might have been achieved by war, by the conquest of foreign territories, or the like. What is most dangerous at the present time and might also imperil the further course towards peaceful understanding, is the arms race, which still continues. While entailing a fantastic expenditure of resources, the arms race cannot possibly provide a means for ensuring either one's own or general security; it in fact constitutes a completely useless and dangerous form of production which benefits only insignificant groups of people with a vested interest

<sup>1/</sup> President Tito spoke in Serbo-Croatian. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

therein. This is, quite obviously, a tremendous burden for any economy because the possibility of increased employment, of greater investments, of a growth in the purchasing power of citizens and of a general rise in the standard of living, depends precisely upon a cessation of the arms race.

9. There is a theory according to which the force of arms is the sole guarantee of peace. However, if this theory in the final analysis implies war and devastation, it obviously rests on an untenable basis. What purpose can intimidation serve, since we know full well that if the weapons thus brandished were actually used they would, like a boomerang, also hit and destroy the side that engaged in the threats? Today's so-called balance of fear is losing more and more any sense or justification, because the potentialities of devastation of existing weapons are such that victory in the event of a conflict would, even if it were possible, have the same material, social and political consequences as total defeat.

10. The entire course of events since the Second World War, and the cold war period in particular, have shown that, in relations between States, force, the threat of war and war itself were unable to provide a lasting solution to a single international problem, but that they have invariably, wherever they were resorted to, given rise to new and more arduous problems. The cold war and the arms race have hampered, and often dangerously blocked, the process of decolonization and of the general emancipation especially of the new and smaller countries, while they had a no less adverse effect upon the positive trends and changes in other areas of the world. It is obvious, however, that there can be no further delay in bringing the process of decolonization to a close. This is one of the basic and most urgent prerequisites for the consolidation of international relations as a whole.

11. People cannot be prevented by outside force from setting up the social order they desire if they are firmly determined to do so and it is their historical and social need. They cannot be prevented from doing so successfully—but only temporarily impeded—and this is obviously not worth going to war about. The only solution that I can see, and I am convinced that many other people in the world think the same, is to apprehend and recognize the realities of our time; the existence of different social systems and the need to establish, between peoples and countries with different social systems, relations based on the principles of peaceful coexistence. What I have in mind are international relations which, without dramatizing differences, would make possible useful co-operation and contacts in all areas where there exist common interests. This is the abiding course upon which socialist Yugoslavia is engaged and it features prominently in our new Constitution.

12. One of the most significant characteristics of our era undoubtedly resides in the fact that the capitalist and the socialist social system exist side by side. It should, however, be borne in mind that what is involved here are essentially social and political contradictions, in the broader sense of the term, and not conflicts between States, although under certain conditions and under the influence of various circumstances, and more especially of subjective factors, these contradictions acquire many of the elements of an opposition between States or between groupings of States. However, in order correctly to understand the policy of coexistence, it is essential to distinguish

between ideological relations and contradictions, on the one hand, and relations between States and peoples, on the other. Contradictions and differences of opinion exist within the individual States themselves, and it is a matter pertaining to their internal development. Such differences should be settled without any outside interference. They will, of course, be settled in various ways according to the specific conditions prevailing in the different countries. Otherwise, the struggle would be transferred to the international arena and would assume the form of inter-State differences, thus leading to an aggravation of international relations. It is a well-known fact that political and ideological differences and contradictions have existed through the centuries. They reflected the fact that human society is moving forward. The momentous scientific and technical achievements of mankind have a more decisive bearing than ever before upon such a movement, and this includes the advance, in the most various forms, towards more progressive social relations and systems.

13. There are also many disputes and unsettled questions of frontiers, national minorities and so forth. These numerous bilateral problems of lesser or greater importance place a considerable strain upon international relations. An improvement of the international situation and the settlement of major international problems would, however, also bring about more favourable conditions for the peaceful solutions of such questions.

14. Of particular importance is a consistent compliance with the policy of non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. What I am thinking of here, of course, is not only interference involving the use of armed force and direct pressure, as these are swiftly exposed at the present time and encounter general and resolute condemnation in the world. Pressure and interference still continue under various pretexts and in various guises, whereby the economic and other difficulties of some of the independent countries are exploited and all sorts of "ideological", political and other forms of justification invoked. The smaller, the developing and the newly independent countries are especially exposed to such forms of interference, because they have not yet been able to build their economic strength and to achieve political stability. What I have in mind here are not only the remnants of colonialism which should be urgently eliminated, but also the manifestations of neo-colonialism. I therefore attach great value to the suggestion recently put forward by the President of Mexico, Mr. Adolfo Lopez Mateos, that the United Nations should take the initiative towards the conclusion of an agreement of all States on non-interference and non-intervention.

15. As I have already mentioned, after many extremely difficult years, an awareness is beginning to prevail of the necessity not only to renounce policies and methods which lead to war, but to discard the cold war itself, because it is only thus that a more determined step towards the strengthening of peace can be taken.

16. The Moscow agreement and the other steps that have recently been taken are vivid evidence of the existing trends towards the overcoming of the division which has hitherto split the world into military and political groupings. I may say that we have, for our part, always considered that such a division of the world, whatever its historical explanation might be,

is neither unavoidable nor permanent. It was precisely therein that lay the vast historical significance of the policy of non-alignment and of the activity of the non-aligned countries, which through their peace-loving policy acted, among other things, to prevent the complete division of the world into hostile groupings. Under the new conditions, their activity acquires a broader basis and an increased significance.

17. Under the present improved conditions, when the forces of peace have been vitally strengthened, we see that policies are gauged today above all according to their relationship to contemporary processes and changes, that is to say, to peaceful coexistence. People and countries in the world today take their stand more and more in relation to this fundamental question, and less and less according to their formal adherence to one side or the other in the cold war, which is slowly but gradually abating and to which an end should be put as soon as possible.

18. We welcome these positive changes and the growth of the forces which desire an end of the cold war. We also pay tribute to the prominent statesmen who have contributed to this. We, for our part, are prepared fully to contribute to facilitating this process and to ensuring its continuation.

19. In this new phase in the evolution of international relations, the conditions under which the policy of non-alignment had come into being are also changing. We had even in the past emphasized that this policy did not imply a passive attitude towards international events, still less an attempt to establish any kind of a third bloc. Nor have the non-aligned countries arrogated unto themselves the role of sole protectors of peace. In view of the changed international situation, it may be said that the term non-alignment has in a way been superseded by the new and positive evolution of international relations.

20. The question of non-alignment is posed today in a far broader sense, in view of the growing number of States and peoples that are participating in the active struggle for peace. The polarization of the forces of peace, on the one hand, and of the forces of cold war on the other, is taking place at an accelerated pace, practically in all the countries of the world, with the forces of peace in ascendancy. Non-alignment is thus changing, both in quantitative and in qualitative terms, and is transforming itself into a general movement for peace and for the finding of peaceful and constructive means for the settlement of various problems among nations. Active "non-alignment" is thus becoming an increasingly broad and active participation in the struggle for the triumph of the principles of the United Nations Charter, as was so powerfully expressed by the Heads of State or Government of twenty-five countries at the Belgrade Conference in September 1961. These principles are endorsed by the overwhelming majority of nations. That is understandable, because we all bear a responsibility for the fate of the international community. The participation of all peace-loving forces in this process should be constructive and realistic and be inspired by a desire to find a solution to existing problems.

21. We stand at an historical cross-roads, branching out towards new and more constructive and more humane international relations. This should make it possible for mankind to live without fear—for its fate to develop and to harness towards peaceful ends all the human mind has so far achieved. The atomic age calls for a radical change in our outlook on interna-

tional relations and on the solution of the problems of the present-day world.

22. Voices are still heard that say such expectations are naïve—the voices of those who feel the cold war to be in their interest and of those who are still unable to grasp that lack of faith and faintheartedness also serve the purpose, the beliefs in the primacy of force. I cannot agree to their contention for the following simple but profoundly genuine reasons. Mankind has moved forward because the masses of the people and the individuals looked forward, because they did not reconcile themselves to their hardships and misfortunes.

23. We too, in Yugoslavia, must have appeared naïve to many when in 1941 we came to grips with the awesome Hitlerite machine which was then at the height of its power. The further course of events showed that it was those who did not believe in the possibility of successful resistance who were the "naïve" ones. I could cite a number of other examples from our recent common experience. I shall merely mention this year's test-ban agreement, which many, only a few years or months ago, probably felt to be unattainable. It is therefore not correct to identify, as is only too frequently done, political realism with the capacity of observing only that which is static, inert, negative and, in fact, transient. Realism, on the contrary, requires a comprehensive view and an understanding of phenomena and processes—and this means of those factors which impede the movement forward—but, even more so, of those which stimulate and compel that movement.

24. There is an urgent need, at the same time, boldly to blaze new trails in the development of international economic relations. In spite of the impressive results attained in the economic growth of certain countries and the cultural and scientific achievements of humanity, it is becoming increasingly obvious that the highly developed countries themselves may well reach a state of stagnation in their economic growth or find themselves unable to achieve the optimum result in their development. The achievement of economic equality, and the securing of conditions for the untrammelled progress of all countries and peoples, constitute the material basis of coexistence and its essential social and economic substance. The policy of coexistence, in fact, presupposes the development of such broad and unfettered international co-operation in the economic field.

25. At the present time, the highly developed countries, with about one-fifth of the world's population, account for over two-thirds of the world's total production. There thus exists, in the economically underdeveloped parts of the world, a tremendous and as yet untapped human and natural potential. The more rapid development of those areas and their fuller participation in world production and exchange would open up unheard-of possibilities of economic co-operation in the world, from which both the underdeveloped and the developed countries would derive a direct benefit. There is, we consider, a general international obligation as well as an interest to assist the underdeveloped and the developing countries speedily to develop their potential material resources and their economic forces. In our view and in the light of our experience, such assistance should not be directed solely towards a solution of the food problem or towards removing budgetary and balance-of-payment difficulties, but should mean an effective contribution

to the economic development of these countries and to their increased participation in international economic co-operation. By assisting the development of the under-developed countries, co-operation on a basis of equality and mutual benefit will be made possible. In its co-operation with a number of developing countries, Yugoslavia, within the limits of its possibilities, is guided by precisely those principles. This has proved to be of benefit to both sides. We do not therefore view such aid as an act of altruism or philanthropy, because it is to the clear advantage of the countries extending the assistance as well. It is of the greatest importance, in pursuing a policy of economic development in the world, to eliminate from the economic sphere the remnants of the cold war, which appear in the form of embargoes or other discriminatory measures. I note with satisfaction that there are already encouraging signs in this regard. We consider that an adequate adaptation of existing economic institutions will also be necessary, as well as the creation of new ones for the financing of under-developed areas of the world. We expect the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to have a great impact on the solution of this question.

26. In the basic premises of the United Nations, among whose main founders were States with different social systems and at different levels of development, and in the Charter of the United Nations, we already find embodied the main concepts of coexistence. The time has now come, when circumstances are more propitious, for the United Nations to take both the main initiative and the responsibility for translating these principles of coexistence into reality. The demand for such relations in the world today is not based exclusively or primarily on considerations of any given policy or on the argumentation of any given ideology. No country or group of countries should consider itself either solely called upon, or entitled, to interpret the strivings towards peace, nor should any country or group of countries stand in the way of those strivings for the sake of their narrow interests, whatever they may be.

27. We would like to see the United Nations play a growing role in bringing peoples together and become an instrument of their co-operation and of their endeavours to strengthen world peace. If our Organization is to be in a position fully to meet its growing responsibilities and to accomplish its historical mission under the new conditions now prevailing, it is essential that it achieve complete universality and that its structure be adapted to the changes that have been taking place in the world. It would be of particular importance for the further improvement of international relations, and for the strengthening of peace in the world, for the United Nations—as the most representative gathering of equal and sovereign nations and as the most prominent forum through which world public opinion expresses itself—further to elaborate and to codify the principles of coexistence. Although I am, of course, aware that the basic concepts are contained in the Charter of the United Nations and that the matter is already under consideration in the Legal Committee of the General Assembly, I consider this to be a fundamental political question. I therefore feel that the United Nations should devote particular attention to the consideration of this question on a high level and in a manner which would most appropriately reflect its importance. This would give even more powerful

expression to the lofty ideals and goals of our age: the policy of peace and prohibition of the use of force; the principles of non-interference; the right of peoples to self-determination and their right to develop along lines of their own choosing; the principle of international responsibility for the accelerated economic development of the under-developed and developing countries, and so forth. What we are seeking is such a consecration of the policy of peaceful and active coexistence as would not merely signify the absence of the danger of war and of war itself, but would also mean an end to relations based on the right of the stronger, whether it be in the political, the economic or in any other sphere of human life.

28. We are profoundly convinced that, in our time, the application of the principles of coexistence is both practicable and realistic. We not only view this as the most satisfactory form of regulating relations among States and nations; we also consider that, by putting these principles into practice, the noblest and most humane ideals of mankind and its most valuable achievements would be given a fuller measure of expression. We are convinced that, when such conditions prevail in the life of the community of nations, all human values will be more fully realized and the human personality will be able to express itself more freely.

29. In conclusion, I feel it to be my duty to convey to you from here, on behalf of the peoples of Yugoslavia, our profound gratitude for the sincere expression of human sympathy and for the generous assistance we received in connexion with the disastrous earthquake which recently destroyed Skopje, the capital city of our Socialist Republic of Macedonia. We are particularly appreciative of the noble initiative which was taken here in the United Nations. We feel this broad display of international solidarity also reflected the desire of the overwhelming majority of peoples throughout the world to prevent the far greater catastrophe which a nuclear war would bring upon mankind. At the same time, this display of solidarity expressed, in its own way, the strivings towards new, more humane relations in the world, of relations wherein the welfare of each and every nation would be in the interest of the world community as a whole.

30. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank His Excellency, the President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, for the important statement he has just made.

*The meeting was suspended at 12.30 p.m. and resumed at 12.45 p.m.*

#### AGENDA ITEM 80

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

31. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I have three speakers on my list for explanations of vote. I will give them the floor in the order in which they asked to speak.

32. Sir Patrick DEAN (United Kingdom): In the course of the debate on the representation of China in the United Nations, and notably yesterday morning, my delegation listened to some highly intemperate speeches in support of the draft resolution voted on yesterday [A/L.427 and Add.1]—speeches which seemed to us to bear little relation to the question at issue.



33. I should like to make it clear that we dissociate ourselves from such statements, and in particular from those parts which made an unwarranted attack on the United States of America.

34. Despite such statements, my delegation voted yesterday in favour of the draft resolution. We did so because the view of the United Kingdom Government is that the Government of the People's Republic of China is the Government of China and because, by virtue of this fact, we believe that the People's Republic of China should be seated in the United Nations as the representative of the State of China.

35. I should like to remind this Assembly that—as has been made clear on previous occasions—in the view of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, sovereignty over the island of Formosa remains undetermined. It follows from this that the question of who should represent Formosa in this Organization is also undetermined. The vote which my delegation cast in favour of inviting representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China to occupy China's place in the United Nations does not prejudice the position of Her Majesty's Government on this point.

36. Finally—and again this is a point to which United Kingdom representatives have referred previously—I should like to enter a reservation regarding certain of the provisions of the draft resolution. It is the view of the United Kingdom delegation that such a resolution of the General Assembly can be binding only on itself and its subsidiary organs. So far as other organs of the United Nations are concerned, the General Assembly can, in our view, only make recommendations.

37. Mr. COMAY (Israel): At the sixteenth session of the General Assembly [1080th meeting] my delegation abstained from the vote on the draft resolution which had then been submitted by the Soviet Union, and we voted affirmatively on that portion of a proposed amendment 2/ which read:

**"The General Assembly,**

**"Decides ... that the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China be seated in the United Nations and all its organs."**

38. At the seventeenth session, we abstained from the vote on the draft resolution then presented and stated in explanation of our vote:

"... I am instructed to make clear that the position adopted by the Israel Government on this issue at the (sixteenth) session remains unchanged and that my delegation would have voted affirmatively again if an amendment had been submitted in accordance with that for which we voted at the (sixteenth) session." [1162nd meeting, para. 34.]

39. At the present session my delegation has once again abstained from the vote on the draft resolution [A/L.427 and Add.1] submitted by Albania and Cambodia, and I would put it on record that the position of my Government remains the same as that adopted at the sixteenth and seventeenth sessions.

40. Mr. AALGAARD (Norway): In the voting yesterday [1248th meeting] my delegation voted in accordance with its general view on the question of Chinese representation for the draft resolution submitted by Albania

and Cambodia [A/L.427 and Add.1]. If there had been, as we had hoped, a paragraph by paragraph vote on the draft resolution, my delegation would have abstained on the first operative paragraph.

41. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The representative of India has the floor in order to exercise his right of reply.

42. Mr. CHAKRAVARTY (India): I regret the necessity of being forced to exercise my right of reply in regard to a part of the statement made yesterday by the representative of Albania.

43. In his statement he said that the People's Republic of China has not a single soldier on foreign soil, that it was Indian troops which launched a general attack on China and that the Chinese Government's proposals for peaceful settlement were all rejected by India.

44. This is not merely a distortion of facts, but a total perversion of truth. The whole world, East and West, with a few exceptions like Albania, knows well that the People's Republic of China committed naked aggression on India last autumn, and even today that Government continues to occupy some 38,000 square kilometres of our territory.

45. As to the absurd allegation that India has rejected all proposals for peaceful settlement, I need only point out that up until now the People's Republic of China has not accepted the proposals made by six African-Asian non-aligned countries after the Conference held in Colombo in December 1962. We had accepted these Colombo proposals *in toto*. If the People's Republic of China had accepted and implemented these proposals, that would have helped to create the necessary climate for China and India to come together and to settle their differences peacefully.

46. The representative of Albania has repeatedly referred to the Chinese People's Republic's desire for peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems and to its being a party to the five principles of peaceful coexistence. We too had been taken in by the formal adherence to these five principles by China and its protestations of peaceful coexistence. Little did we know then that the People's Republic of China was following a policy of deliberate deception while paying only lip service to these principles and to the cause of peace and brotherhood in Asia and the world. The People's Republic of China has now come out in its true colours by openly declaring, as the representative of Cyprus pointed out yesterday, that it is "against the policy of peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems" and "against the possibility of preventing a world war in the present day" [1248th meeting, para. 185].

47. These statements completely refute the Albanian claim that the People's Republic of China recognized the principles of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems.

48. We understand why Albania had to make these quite uncalled-for and thoroughly unjustified remarks against my country. Normally, my delegation could have ignored these remarks, but since this is the voice of the People's Republic of China speaking by proxy, I must place on record that the statements made by the representative of Albania are completely baseless, without foundation, and entirely fanciful.

2/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Annexes, agenda items 90 and 91, document A/L.375.

49. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The representative of Albania has the floor also in order to exercise his right of reply.

50. Mr. BUDO (Albania) (translated from French): I should like to thank the President for allowing me to exercise my right of reply after what the representative of India has just said about the Albanian delegation.

51. The representative of India has just attacked my delegation, contending that it did not tell the truth about the frontier dispute between China and India, and accusing it of groundless allegations and particularly of distorting and misrepresenting the facts.

52. It is regrettable that the delegation of India should have devoted its efforts during the present session to heaping baseless accusations and grossly slanderous charges on the People's Republic of China without rhyme or reason. It has already done this over and over in the General Assembly and the Committees, and the representative of India just repeated himself again a few moments ago.

53. Yesterday [1248th meeting] the People's Republic of Albania briefly refuted the groundless accusations brought by certain delegations against the People's Republic of China regarding the frontier dispute between China and India. As the delegation of India has returned to the attack today and repeated its slander of the People's Republic of China, the People's Republic of Albania, which suggested that the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations should be placed on the agenda of the present session [A/5498], believes that it is in duty bound to restate the facts of the Chinese-Indian frontier question in greater detail.

54. It is common knowledge that the Government of the People's Republic of China has constantly tried to solve the question of its frontier with India by negotiation, just as it has settled such questions with other neighbouring countries already mentioned by our delegation yesterday. Unfortunately, the Government of India has adopted a different attitude and tried to satisfy its territorial claims by arbitrary and aggressive means incompatible with its obligations under the Charter as a Member of the United Nations. By so doing it provoked a large-scale armed conflict in October 1962.

55. The facts are very clear. In 1950, forcibly violating the customary and traditional line of the Chinese-Indian frontier in the eastern sector, India occupied 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory to the south of the so-called McMahon Line. After 1954, India seized 2,000 square kilometres of territory in the central sector and Parigas in the western sector.

56. In 1959, the Indian Government officially claimed another section of Chinese territory covering 33,000 square kilometres in the western sector. In August and October of the same year, Indian troops provoked two armed incidents on the frontier.

57. After these two frontier incidents provoked by India, the Chinese Government proposed to the Government of India on 7 November 1959 that the armed forces of the two parties should withdraw to 20 kilometres on either side of the effective control line over the whole length of the Chinese-Indian frontier and that patrols should be stopped. The Indian Government rejected that proposal. With a view to avoiding frontier incidents, China unilaterally stopped patrols within twenty kilometres on its frontier.

58. In order to find a peaceful solution to the Chinese-Indian frontier question, the Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China, Chou En-lai, visited New Delhi in April 1960 and held talks with Prime Minister Nehru. However, since India showed no desire to solve the question, the talks did not lead to any positive result. Recently again, according to The New York Times of 14 October 1963, Prime Minister Chou En-lai said that he was ready to go to New Delhi again to try to settle the Chinese-Indian frontier dispute by negotiation. However, according to the same newspaper, the Indian Government opposed such a visit.

59. Taking advantage of the unilateral suspension of frontier patrols on the Chinese side, India has adopted since 1961—and particularly since April 1962—a policy of nibbling away at Chinese territory. In the western sector, it has continued encroachment of Chinese territory and has established forty-three bases for aggression on Chinese territory. The Indian Press hailed this as "a unique triumph for the bold Napoleonic plan". Since June 1962, Indian troops have continued their advance and extended their aggression as far as the eastern sector of the frontier. They have crossed the illegal McMahon Line and invaded the Che Dong region, continually widening the radius of aggression.

60. The Chinese Government has always shown patience. As evidence of its extreme patience, the Chinese Government on three occasions between August and October 1962 proposed settling the frontier question by negotiation; but the Indian Government rejected those proposals and made any negotiations conditional on the prior acceptance by the People's Republic of China of India's territorial claims, which affected vast tracts of Chinese territory. Naturally, no self-respecting Government could accept such demands.

61. In the same period, the Indian side launched an armed attack against the Chinese border guards in the Che Dong region, killing and wounding a large number of them. On 5 October 1962, the Indian Minister of Defence announced the formation under the Eastern Command of a new army corps specially to face China. On 12 October, Prime Minister Nehru stated that he had ordered the Chinese areas to be cleared of the Chinese troops there. On 17 October, Indian troops began a violent artillery bombardment of Chinese positions, attacking simultaneously in the eastern and western sectors of the frontier. Lastly, on 20 October, the Indian troops, acting on the orders of Prime Minister Nehru, launched a general large-scale attack. It was only after suffering heavy losses under the furious and repeated attacks of the Indian troops that the Chinese border guards found themselves forced to return heavy fire in order to defend themselves.

62. All these facts demonstrate the true state of affairs. However—and this is an incontestable proof of the peaceable attitude of the Government of the People's Republic of China and its desire to settle the Chinese-Indian frontier question by peaceful means—once the attack had been repulsed, the Chinese Government, instead of exploiting the military advantage it had gained, took major steps on its own initiative to restore the peace. On 22 November 1962, the Chinese border guards unilaterally ceased fire along the whole length of the frontier; they gradually withdrew in all sectors of the frontier to twenty kilometres inside Chinese territory from the effective control line of 7 November 1959. The Chinese Government

evacuated the disputed regions in accordance with the provisions of the cease-fire, without setting up checkpoints there, although those areas are incontestably Chinese territory. It repatriated all Indian prisoners of war and returned to India the arms and military equipment taken from the Indian troops during the fighting.

63. We note with regret that the Indian side has no intention of finding a peaceful solution to this frontier question with the Chinese side, but is seeking deliberately to create tension between the two neighbouring countries, worsen relations between them and make desperate preparations for a new military conflict with China.

64. On 14 August 1963, the Indian Minister of Defence, Mr. Chavan, stated that the strength of the Indian armed forces should be raised from 800,000 to 2 million men. This year, military expenditure amounts to more than 8,000 million rupees, or more than one third of the total budget.

65. India has become more closely identified with United States imperialism in the campaign against China. Under an agreement signed on 14 November 1962 between India and the United States, a large United States military delegation is stationed permanently in India. On 4 June 1963, the Presidents of India and the United States published a joint communiqué to the effect that the two countries shared a common concern for their mutual defence, to face up to China. In India of 9 July, India and the United States signed an agreement to relay "Voice of America" programmes in India. On 22 July, India and the United States simultaneously announced the conclusion of an air defence pact between India, the United States and the United Kingdom, which has in fact placed India under the Western "umbrella" and turned it into a United States base.

66. On 16 October 1963, The New York Times published a report from New Delhi that an advance group of the Royal Air Force was arriving that same day at an airport near Calcutta for joint manoeuvres of the Indian, United States and United Kingdom air forces. The newspaper reports that "the Indians are reticent to discuss the exercises in keeping with the country's tradition of 'non-alignment'".

67. After all these and many other facts, can anyone seriously still claim, as the Government of India does, that it is following a policy of neutrality? Far from it.

*Mr. Alvarez Vidaurre (El Salvador), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

68. The allegations we have just heard against the People's Republic of China bear no relation to the truth and serve only to step up a concerted anti-Chinese campaign of which many echoes have been audible in this chamber during the present session.

69. This is not the first time that the Indian Government has levelled such accusations made up out of whole cloth. Early in the summer of 1963, the Indian propaganda machine even claimed that a large-scale Chinese attack had been prepared for 5 August, that China had concentrated thousands of aircraft in Tibet and had held wide-spread air exercises and launched ground-to-air missiles. On 20 August, the government spokesman of the People's Republic of China dealt with all these deliberately propagated rumours as they deserved.

70. It is interesting to note that this is already the third time that the Indian Government has spread made-up statements about the alleged concentrations of Chinese troops on the frontier. The first two occasions coincided with visits to Washington of representatives of the Indian Government—Ambassador Patasik last month and a minister, Mr. Krishnamasani, in May—to ask for United States aid. The third occasion coincided, among other things, with the "air defence pact" concluded with the United States and the United Kingdom and with the agreement allowing the United States to build a powerful "Voice of America" station in India, which is tantamount to publicly abandoning the policy of non-alignment.

71. It is not China but India which is massing troops and arms on its frontiers with China and other neighbouring countries.

72. As far as the so-called violations of Indian territory and air space by China are concerned, I shall confine myself to quoting the following passage from a note addressed by the Chinese Government to the Indian Government on 9 October 1963:

"The Indian Government has already moved its armed patrols up to the Chinese-Indian border along its entire length. Between 22 November 1962 and the end of August 1963, Indian troops intruded more than thirty times into Chinese territory by crossing the present line of control, and Indian aircraft made eighty sorties into Chinese air space. These well-established facts can in no way be denied by accusing China of making 'unfounded allegations' or propaganda, as the Indian note claims"—the reference here is to the Indian note of September 1963.

73. This policy of preparations for war and expansion on India's part is giving serious concern to its neighbours. Thus President Ayub Khan of Pakistan stated at Bahawalpur on 8 October 1963 that western arms aid to India had created serious complications for Pakistan; India had always thought that it could dominate its neighbours through force and war; the Indian rulers should desist from implementing their designs of annexing the territories of the neighbouring countries; otherwise they would be starting a conflagration. On 14 October 1963, the President of Pakistan again stated that it was obvious to any sensible person that India was not threatened by aggression from China.

74. In closing, I should now like to say a few words about the Colombo Conference.<sup>3/</sup> Everyone knows that its aim was to encourage direct negotiation and the peaceful settlement of the frontier dispute between China and India. The aim of the Conference was to serve as an instrument of meditation and not of arbitration; its proposals were merely suggestions submitted to China and India and not a judgement or arbitration that China or India had to accept "en bloc". The Chinese Government advocated that China and India should accept the Colombo proposals in principle as a basis for negotiation that the two countries should immediately begin these negotiations without any prior conditions. That attitude on the part of the Chinese Government is reasonable and fair; it showed China's sincere desire for peace.

75. The Chinese Government showed not only by words but also by deeds that it had accepted the Colombo proposals in principle. By the steps it has taken so far on its own initiative, including the cease-fire,

<sup>3/</sup> The Conference, which was held from 10 to 12 December 1962, was attended by Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ghana, Indonesia and the United Arab Republic.

the withdrawal of its border guards and the evacuation of the disputed areas in accordance with the cease-fire provisions, the Chinese Government has lived up to, and in many respects even exceeded, what was expected of it under the Colombo proposals. Its conciliatory efforts were hailed unanimously by the countries which met at Colombo and by all peace-loving countries.

76. And what attitude did the Indian Government adopt? It obstinately and consistently refused to negotiate. It insisted that direct negotiations could take place only on the condition that the Chinese Government accepted the Colombo proposals "en bloc". That is really tantamount to turning the proposals into a judgement and making Chinese-Indian negotiations impossible. This approach on the Indian Government's part is at variance with the spirit and aims of the Colombo proposals.

77. It should be pointed out, moreover, that India is asking for acceptance of the Colombo proposals "en bloc" while putting its own interpretation on them. Quite naturally China cannot accept this approach of the Indian Government, which is seeking to impose its will on others.

78. The explanations we have just made prove that the assertions about "Chinese warmongering", "Chinese aggression", etc., are libellous untruths and slanders for insidious purposes. Although the Indian Government has not so far made any positive response to the Chinese Government's initiative as regards the cease-fire and the withdrawal of troops, the situation on the Chinese-Indian frontier has already become less tense thanks to the action taken by the Chinese Government.

*The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.*