

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-THIRD SESSION

Official Records



**1711th
PLENARY MEETING**

Monday, 11 November 1968,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 93:

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

President: Mr. Emilio ARENALES (Guatemala).

AGENDA ITEM 93

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

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Before calling on the first speaker, I should like to request representatives wishing to speak on the item to enter their names on the list of speakers. I would also request Member States intending to submit additional proposals or amendments to do so as soon as possible.

2. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia) (*translated from French*): For two decades, North American imperialism has succeeded, thanks to its satellites and to the Governments dependent on them, in delaying the inevitable, namely, the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and in all the bodies placed under the aegis of that international Organization. For two decades, North American imperialism has succeeded in frustrating the application of the very principles of the Charter. For two decades, because of North American imperialism, 800 million people, representing one quarter of the total population of the world, have been unlawfully excluded from international life.

3. What is even more deplorable is that this achievement by North American imperialism, the heir of the former Western imperialism has been made possible only by those who, like China, have known what it was to be scorned, humiliated, dominated and exploited by white imperialism.

4. For years, Cambodia, with other Member States which cherish justice and freedom and represent three quarters of the world's population, has consistently denounced this injustice against the Chinese people perpetrated at the instigation of successive United States Governments.

5. The question before the General Assembly today is not whether or not China is to be admitted as a Member of the United Nations, because China is already a founding Member of our Organization and a permanent member of the Security Council.

6. The question before us is rather to decide who represents this nation of 800 million Chinese: is it the Government of the People's Republic of China, which is installed on the Chinese mainland and supported by the Chinese people and which, in a relatively short time, has succeeded in making China one of the greatest world Powers and also one of the nuclear Powers, or is it, as stated by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in his book *The White House Years*,¹ those elements that have been overthrown and expelled by the Chinese people and have taken refuge in the Chinese province of Taiwan under the protection of the United States Seventh fleet and the United States Air Force?

7. In this connexion, I should like to refer to a statement made last year from this rostrum by the distinguished representative of France, whose country is one of the founding Members of the Organization and one of the five permanent members of the Security Council. Mr. Bérard said:

"We consider that the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations must be restored to it. A founder of the United Nations, China is also a permanent member of the Security Council, and as such shares with others primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. That responsibility has been assigned not to a Government, but to a State, whatever its political régime. Facts and reason tell us that this China is the China represented by the Government of the People's Republic." [1606th meeting, para. 32]

8. This year, the United States of America and those who are dependent upon it are again resorting to delaying tactics in an attempt to postpone the restoration to China of its lawful rights in the United Nations by introducing draft resolution A/L.548, under which a two-thirds majority vote is required. But it has never been laid down in Article 3 of the Charter that the question of the representation of China should be decided by a two-thirds majority, because it is merely a matter of examining credentials.

9. A few weeks ago, in the course of his statement in the general debate in the Assembly, the head of the Canadian delegation said that the question of China was not "strictly a question of membership" [1687th meeting, para. 91].

10. The question before the Assembly is not an important one, within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter, and it should be decided by a simple majority.

¹ Dwight D. Eisenhower, *The White House Years: Mandate for Change, 1953-1956* (New York, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1963).

11. Since the creation of the United Nations, several similar cases have already come before us, for several Member States have experienced popular revolutions and political changes and have nevertheless retained their seats in the United Nations. This being so, why should a discriminatory and entirely arbitrary measure be applied in the case of the People's Republic of China?

12. In denouncing once again the use of this discriminatory and arbitrary measure against the People's Republic of China by North American imperialism, the Cambodian delegation urgently appeals to all those Member States which are really independent and cherish justice firmly to reject the United States draft resolution A/L.548. This proposal is a last desperate manoeuvre by North American imperialism to delay the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. It also shows that North American imperialism is afraid to face reality.

13. As Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts has written in his book, *Decisions for a Decade*:

"... the United States was for years unwilling to face up to the existence of a Communist régime in China. ... Our shock at 'losing' China (as though it was somehow 'ours'), was so great, and created such deep wounds and divisions in this country, that all normal discussions froze up."²

In the same book, the Senator from Massachusetts wrote:

"It is only very recently that public figures have begun to question seriously the vitality of our China policy. Only with a 1963 speech by Assistant Secretary of State Roger Hillsman did a government official publicly speak about the fact that the Communist régime was here to stay. Until then, the official American government doctrine was that the Communist régime in China was 'a passing phase'.³

But the Senator from Massachusetts did not reveal the reasons which had led the United States Government to regard the Communist régime as a "passing phase" and thus to ignore the very existence of the People's Republic of China. Yet the reasons are easy to understand.

14. After the defeat of its ally Chiang Kai-shek, his escape to the Chinese province of Taiwan, and the installation of the new régime in mainland China, the United States Government decided to isolate China completely in order to bring about the fall of the new régime and to restore the rotten and corrupt former régime of Chiang Kai-shek, which has moreover been rejected for ever by the Chinese people. However, united around their respected leaders, 800 million Chinese have thwarted every attempt by the United States, including sabotage and subversive operations carried out on the Chinese mainland for the alleged purpose of "strengthening the morale" of Chiang Kai-shek's troops. These operations were disclosed by President Eisenhower in his book *The White House Years*.⁴

² Edward M. Kennedy, *Decisions for a Decade* (New York, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1968), p. 161.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Dwight D. Eisenhower, *The White House Years: Waging Peace, 1956-1961* (New York, Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1965).

15. Another United States manoeuvre was to propose the "two Chinas" solution. Some important United States public figures and organizations have already put forward this so-called solution. For some time, other countries have also been agitating for the separation of the Chinese province of Taiwan from China. I would remind you that Taiwan, like the Pescadores, was torn away from China in 1894, as a result of the war imposed on China by the militarist Japan of those days. The Declaration of the Cairo Conference of December 1943, in which the United States participated, recognized that these Chinese islands must be restored to China, and the Japanese Peace Treaty of 1951, after terminating the illegal Japanese occupation of these Chinese islands, restored them to their legitimate owner, China. Taiwan and the Pescadores are thus an integral part of Chinese territory, both in law and in fact. This is a historical fact recognized by all countries, including the United States of America; if, today, the Chinese province of Taiwan has not yet been restored to its mother country, it is solely because of its occupation by the United States armed forces. It is therefore essential that the United States should restore to China without delay the Chinese province of Taiwan, which it is illegally occupying.

16. The armed intervention by the United States in the Chinese civil war is a most flagrant violation of international law, the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America, and the principles of the United Nations Charter, of which the United States Government is itself a signatory.

17. In his book *The White House Years*, President Eisenhower wrote:

"In January or February of 1953 instructions went out to the Seventh Fleet. Those instructions regarding the defense of Formosa merely reaffirmed orders that had been in force in that fleet since 1950. Those orders are still in force. Therefore, I should assume what would happen is this: any invasion of Formosa would have to run over the Seventh Fleet."⁵

18. Never, since the establishment of the United Nations, has the world seen a Power violate its principles so cynically and proclaim the supremacy of might over right. This cynicism is even more apparent in the Joint Resolution on the Defence of Formosa adopted in 1955 by a joint session of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.⁶ In that resolution, the United States Government, faithful to the spirit of Yalta, laid down the limits of the zones of influence alleged to be "essential to the vital interests of the United States".

19. As I emphasized in my statement in the general debate [1701st meeting], Cambodia and a large number of non-aligned countries do not accept and will never accept the division of the world into zones of influence of the super-Powers, because that division of the world is one of

⁵ *Op. cit.* (vol. 1), p. 463.

⁶ Joint Resolution Authorizing the President to Employ the Armed Forces of the United States for Protecting the Security of Formosa, the Pescadores and Related Positions and Territories of That Area (Public Law 4, 84th Cong.). See U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, *Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of China* (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1955), p. 11.

the causes of the many conflicts which have taken place in the world since the end of the Second World War and will continue to take place if this illegal and inadmissible state of affairs is not brought to an end.

20. It is unfortunately a fact that, voluntarily or involuntarily, the automatic majority of the members of the United Nations legalizes this division of the world into zones of influence of the super-Powers by approving the armed intervention by the United States in the Chinese civil war. By approving such interference by the United States in the internal affairs of China, the automatic majority in the United Nations is not only violating the very principles of the Charter and all the resolutions which this international Organization has adopted but is also paving the way for other arbitrary interventions against other Member States; in other words, by its complicity or its indifference, it is working towards the destruction of the United Nations itself.

21. Taiwan is a Chinese province. Any solution seeking to separate Taiwan from China—the so-called “two Chinas” solution—must be rejected out of hand, for there can be only one China, as there can be only one Chinese people. To claim that it was not so would not only set a dangerous precedent; it would be an act of injustice and a flagrant violation of the very principles of the United Nations Charter, which no independent and sovereign country could tolerate. This is not the first time that an attempt has been made to detach by force a portion of Chinese territory in order to make it into a separate State under foreign domination. Such an act of injustice had already been committed in the time of the League of Nations by a certain imperialistic country. We still remember how that unhappy adventure ended. But today the situation is much more serious and far more dangerous, because the “two Chinas” solution is supported by North American imperialism, which has powerful and numerous means of “persuasion”.

22. It is abnormal and unjust to refuse to restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, just as it is an aberration to continue to claim that the 800 million Chinese are represented in the United Nations by the rotten and corrupt administration which was expelled by the Chinese people and took refuge on the island of Taiwan and which maintains itself in that Chinese province solely through the protection of the United States army. That situation is so scandalous and absurd that recently, according to the United States press, some Powers are said to have expressed the intention of calling for an increase in the number of permanent members of the Security Council. It is surely inconceivable that a Government which was discredited and was expelled by the Chinese people, a Government which up to now has only just managed to survive as a result of the financial assistance and military protection it receives from another State, can be regarded as a permanent member of the Security Council, with the right of veto and responsibility for maintaining international peace and security.

23. The illegality of the Chiang Kai-shek administration and its inability to assume the obligations and responsibilities laid down in the Charter for a permanent member of the Security Council are notorious and undeniable.

Although, according to the United States Government and those who are dependent on it, it is Chiang Kai-shek who represents China in the United Nations, in fact, whether they like it or not, it is the Government of the People's Republic of China, supported by 800 million Chinese, which is the true great Power.

24. This ridiculous pretension that the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek, who have not set foot on the Chinese mainland for nearly twenty years, represent 800 million Chinese, has gone on for too long. It must be brought to an end in order to restore the good name of the United Nations and to give it once again some authority and prestige as a world Organization entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security.

25. Those who join North American imperialism in opposing the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China accuse China of being aggressive. But objective and responsible studies made recently by the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, and also by the Senator from Massachusetts show rather that it is China which has been subjected for more than a century to humiliation, oppression and aggression of every kind by the Western Powers.

26. In his book *The Arrogance of Power*, Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, wrote:

“The Chinese Revolution is more than a rebellion of the new against the old within China, comparable to the rising of the French republicans against the *Ancien régime* or of the Russian communists against the tsarist régime. It is also the rebellion of a proud and ancient civilization against foreign powers—‘barbarians’ to the Chinese—who set upon China in the nineteenth century with a fatal impact on China's economy, institutions and national pride”.⁷

“In the course of the nineteenth century Western soldiers and traders and missionaries were to reduce China to a semi-colonial status, and the shock of this experience was to spawn the Chinese revolution, now still at flood tide”.⁸

“Under the Western impact an empire that had been superior to all others in its world was not only humbled but threatened with extinction. Words like ‘extra-territoriality’ and ‘unequal treaties’ are far too antiseptic, far too bland, to describe China's humiliation by Western imperialism. In human terms, the coming of Western civilization to China in the nineteenth century meant the plundering of China's wealth by foreigners and the reduction of most of the Chinese to a humiliating and inferior status in their own country”.⁹

27. Mr. K. S. Karol, in his book *China: The Other Communism*, records that Robert Guillain, a specialist on

⁷ J. W. Fulbright, *The Arrogance of Power* (New York, Random House, 1966), p. 140.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 142.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 142 and 143.

the Chinese question, wrote the following in his preface to Robert Péliissier's book on recent Chinese history:¹⁰

"Did you really know how the West treated China and the Chinese for more than a century? Did you really know this from direct experience? Doesn't the basic explanation of China's present anger, their suspicious and rebellious moods, lie in more than a century of Western cruelty and rapacity? I do not know if a yellow peril exists, but ask the Chinese what they think of the white peril.

"Millions of Chinese who knew those evil days are still alive today".¹¹

28. I shall not mention here the many unjust wars waged against China and the many unequal treaties imposed on that country by the West since they are known to all serious students of Chinese history. I shall merely point out that China was virtually a colony in the hands of several masters.

29. With his characteristic courage and honesty, Senator Fulbright has confirmed Robert Guillain's point of view by writing:

"The Chinese revolutions of the twentieth century were in great part spawned by the ravages of the West. Finding themselves militarily inferior to the West but unshaken in their faith in the superiority of their own civilization, the Chinese undertook, first through the unsuccessful democratic revolution of Sun Yat-sen, then through the successful communist revolution of Mao Tse-tung, to acquire those Western techniques of science and technology, of political organization and military power, which would make it possible to expel the West from China".¹²

30. It should also be stressed that China was the first victim of aggression by the enemy who later unleashed the Second World War in Asia. All those who have closely followed the history of the Second World War agree that it was the people's armies which were the most active against the aggressors and thus contributed to a large extent to the capitulation of militarist Japan.

31. Referring to a statement by Professor Benjamin I. Schwartz of Harvard University, Senator Fulbright writes:

"...[the Chinese communists were] actively fighting the Japanese while the Kuomintang remained passive, waiting for the Americans to overwhelm Japan."

He goes on to say:

"Greatly assisted by the incompetence and demoralization of the Kuomintang, the Chinese Communists emerged from the Second World War as the proponents of a genuine Chinese nationalism".¹³

32. Senator Fulbright and Senator Kennedy have studied at length the statement made in September 1965 by Marshal Lin Piao, the Minister of Defence of China, a

statement which, according to the Department of State, i.e. in the official United States view—a view which has moreover been reiterated by all United States Government spokesmen—shows that China is engaged on a campaign of unlimited conquest on the model of German aggression in the 1930's. Yet, according to a number of experts also working for certain official services of the United States, the doctrine of the Minister of Defence of China in no way constitutes a plan of aggression.

33. The Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, like the Senator from Massachusetts, gives several examples which unquestionably show that China is in no sense aggressive:

"In Vietnam itself, one must remember, the United States had some three hundred thousand troops as of mid-1966 while the Chinese had only work teams supporting the North Vietnamese".¹⁴

34. Senator Fulbright also points out that States such as the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, which are immediate neighbours of China and rely extensively on Chinese assistance, show little dependence on China in the policy they pursue.

35. For his part, Senator Kennedy noted:

"... China has no troops deployed outside her borders. Indeed, her biggest fear seems to be for the security of her own borders, which she sees as menaced by American military forces".¹⁵

I would also add that China does not maintain a single military base outside its territory.

36. The detractors of China also accuse it of being aggressive because it preaches "universal revolution". They have simply forgotten, however, that in 1776, in its Declaration of Independence, the United States of America had already formulated the then new political doctrine asserting and justifying the right of "revolution" of peoples.

37. As Professor Carl Becker of Cornell University has pointed out in his book *The Declaration of Independence*:

"This philosophy, which affirms the right of a people to establish and to overturn its own government, is formulated in the first part of the second paragraph of the Declaration."¹⁶

38. China spreads its revolutionary ideology, but no foreign country is compelled by force to accept it. Like Cambodia, every country can reject it, without suffering any military or other pressure as a result. In spite of this convincing evidence, the Governments which depend upon North American imperialism continue to state that China is warlike and that the United States is peace-loving. The facts, however, show that the only country threatening international peace and security, particularly in Asia, is the United States of America, which is using the most brutal force to wage a war of genocide against the Viet-Nameese

10. R. Péliissier, *La Chine entre en scène* (Paris, Editions Julliard, 1963).

11 K. S. Karol, *China: The Other Communism* (New York, Hill and Wang, translated from the French by Tom Baigtour), p. 396.

12 *Op. cit.*, p. 148.

13 *Op. cit.*, p. 149.

14 *Op. cit.*, p. 151.

15 *Op. cit.*, pp. 158 and 159.

16 C. Becker, *The Declaration of Independence: A Study in the History of Political Ideas*, (New York, Peter Smith, 1933), p. 8.

people, whose only crime has been to refuse to be the slaves of North American imperialism.

39. Again, it is the United States of America which is threatening China by occupying the Chinese province of Taiwan and by maintaining military and atomic bases around China. From time to time, extremist generals in the Pentagon do not even hesitate to proclaim loudly that there is still time to destroy the cities and atomic installations of China and, to use the words of a general of melancholy fame, to put China back into the stone age.

40. Countless aggressions have been committed by the United States of America throughout the world. North American imperialism, which has become more arrogant and more brutal than ever, is the only contemporary menace.

41. In his book *The Arrogance of Power*, the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate explains the position of the United States Government towards China in the following terms:

“China is not judged to be aggressive because of her actions; she is presumed to be aggressive because she is communist”.¹⁷

He then goes on to denounce the policy of the United States Government by pointing out that:

“The current tendency is toward a more strident and aggressive American foreign policy, which is to say, toward a policy” [*in which the predominant element is*] “the arrogance of those who would make America the world’s policeman.”¹⁸

“Our national vocabulary has changed with our policies. A few years ago we were talking of détente and building bridges, of five-year plans in India and Pakistan, or agricultural co-operatives in the Dominican Republic, and land and tax reform all over Latin America. Today these subjects are still discussed in a half-hearted and desultory way but the focus of power and interest has shifted to the politics of war. Diplomacy has become largely image-making, and instead of emphasizing plans for social change, the policy-planners and political scientists are conjuring up ‘scenarios’ of escalation and nuclear confrontation and ‘models’ of insurgency and counter-insurgency.”¹⁹

42. The evidence of these two respected Senators—one of whom is Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate—is sufficiently eloquent and constitutes a reply to all those who, in order to avoid restoring the lawful rights in the United Nations, accuse that country of being an aggressive Power.

43. During the most recent general debate in the Assembly, many delegations stressed the need to reinstate the People’s Republic of China without delay in its lawful rights in the United Nations and in all the bodies connected with this international Organization, in order to achieve the objective of universality of the United Nations. Such action

should result in the immediate expulsion of the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the seat which they illegally occupy in the United Nations and in all related bodies.

44. A solution to this problem of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People’s Republic of China cannot be delayed any further because, firstly, it is absolutely necessary in order to strengthen the Organization’s authority and prestige and, secondly, it is essential in order to safeguard the Charter of the United Nations and the cause which the Organization is called upon to serve under the Charter.

45. It is obvious that the absence of China, whose population by far exceeds that of any other State Member of the United Nations, render any discussion on questions of vital concern negatory. No solution in the world can be complete so long as China’s role is not universally recognized and understood.

46. As Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, Head of State of Cambodia, stated at this very rostrum a few years ago:

“The United Nations needs the presence of China much more than China needs a seat in the United Nations.”

47. For all those reasons, and on behalf of the fifteen Powers sponsoring draft resolution A/L.549, namely Albania, Algeria, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Pakistan, Romania, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia, I should like to appeal to all States Members of the Organization to support this draft resolution submitted by non-aligned Asian and African countries, and to reject the United States draft resolution in document A/L.548.

48. Mr. WEI Tao-ming (China) (*translated from Chinese*): Mr. President, allow me to say first of all how happy we are to see you back in full vigour to preside over the discussion of the important question which is now before us.

49. In November 1967 the General Assembly, by a decisive margin, rejected various attempts to seat the Chinese Communist régime in the United Nations. Nothing has happened since then to warrant the reconsideration of a question that has over the years been exhaustively examined from every point of view. What the Assembly is now being asked to admit is the same régime that has committed untold crimes against the Chinese people, that has perpetrated numerous acts of aggression against other countries, that has flouted, and continues to flout, the basic principles and purposes of the United Nations.

50. The Chinese Communist régime has never had the moral consent of the Chinese people. It has never been regarded by them as the legally constituted Government of China. The Government I have the honour to represent, on the other hand, is the only Government capable of articulating the wishes and aspirations of the Chinese people, the only Government that truly represents the rich cultural heritage of China. It is a Chinese Government based on Chinese soil dedicated to the task of restoring freedom and constitutional rule to the 700 million people languishing under Communist tyranny on the mainland. It is to this Government that millions of overseas Chinese continue to

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 246.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 247.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 246.

affirm their allegiance. And this is the Government that has represented China in the United Nations since its inception.

51. In the course of the current year the Chinese Communist régime has shown itself to be in the process of disintegration. It has lost effective control over the greater part of the Chinese mainland. The turmoil and confusion resulting from the so-called “great proletarian cultural revolution” have not abated. If anything, they have further deteriorated. In its relations with other countries, the régime continues to pursue a policy of aggressiveness and militancy. Its attitude towards the United Nations remains one of unmitigated hostility and contempt.

52. The sponsors of the present item have year after year presented us with a tissue of distortions, falsifications and specious reasoning calculated to mislead this Assembly. The heading of the item is itself untenable. It prejudices the question at issue in a flagrant manner. And it is impossible to accept the tendentious proposition that there are so-called rights to be “restored” to a régime which is absolutely not entitled to them.

53. The Chinese Communist régime is a negation of all the principles and purposes for which the United Nations stands. It has called into question the very existence of the United Nations as an international organization. It has demanded institutional changes that would transform the Organization into an instrument of its own policy. It has challenged every United Nations effort to maintain international peace and security. It has labelled the United Nations a “tool of imperialism”, an “instrument for bullying smaller nations”, and a “center for political transactions between the Soviet Union and the United States”. Such a régime is obviously unfit for membership of the United Nations.

54. Those who champion the Chinese Communist cause have been in the habit of asserting that Peiping “has always followed a policy aimed at settling by peaceful means all disputes which may exist or arise between independent States”.

55. This is so patently false that the Chinese Communists themselves would have repudiated it with utter contempt. They have never concealed their faith in the efficacy of brutal force. They have exalted violence to the rank of a doctrine. They rule out the possibility of peaceful transformation. They preach the invincibility and world-wide applicability of Maoist revolution.

“The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war”—said Mao Tse-tung—“is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries.”²⁰

Let no one underestimate the impact of this doctrine of violence on the contemporary world. It is felt not only in Asia, Africa and Latin America but also in North America and Western Europe.

56. There is more than fire-eating rhetoric in Mao’s pronouncements. Since 1949 Peiping has participated in a

number of wars, either directly or by proxy. It played a leading part in the Korean War. It attacked India in 1962 and Sikkim in 1965. Its role in the war in Viet-Nam is too well known to need elaboration. All this suggests that Mao’s doctrine of violence is no empty threat; it is a threat that makes a mockery of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

57. After the experience of the Korean War, the Chinese Communists have learned to avoid direct military confrontations with a major Power. To an increasingly large extent, they now seek to achieve their aggressive and expansionist objectives through indirect, irregular and unconventional means. This involves the promotion of insurgency and armed struggle, as well as the training, equipping and directing of guerrillas in a number of countries in the more vulnerable parts of the world. This is as much a peril to the security and survival of the small and militarily weak States as the direct use of naked force. Few are the countries that are without dissident elements which, with aid and encouragement from abroad, are ready to challenge the authority of legally established Governments. These elements may well be exploited to play the role which the Viet Cong have been playing in Viet-Nam.

Mr. Alvarado (Peru), Vice-President, took the Chair.

58. In my statement before the Assembly on 22 October [1703rd meeting], I had occasion to refer to the threat posed by the Chinese Communists to such South-East Asian countries as Burma, Laos, Malaysia, Indonesia and others. In all these countries the Chinese Communists have made use of the local Communist parties and other dissident elements to foment revolts and to create social unrest. In a message, dated 20 June 1968, to its Central Committee, the Malayan Communist Party was called upon to overthrow “the Rahman-Lee Kuan Yew puppet régimes and build a new and truly independent, unified and democratic Malaya”.

59. Guerillas trained by the Chinese Communists and their North Viet-Nameese allies have become increasingly active in both northern and southern Thailand. The objective is to transform Thailand into a second Viet-Nam. Even the neutralist Ne Win Government in Burma has become a target of Chinese Communist subversion. As stated in the *Peking Review* of 30 August 1968, the Peiping-oriented and Peiping-supported Communist Party of Burma is said to have consolidated its “revolutionary base areas” and expanded its “revolutionary armed forces” in such a manner as to make “fierce onslaughts on the tyrannical rule of the reactionary Burmese Government”.

60. The business of trying to befriend Peiping has obviously not been a rewarding one. India’s championship of the Chinese Communist cause has been repaid with implacable hostility. Indonesia has paid, and is still paying, a terrible price for its friendship with Peiping. It remains for Cambodia to discover for itself the fact that the more closely a country is aligned with Peiping the more it is exposed to Chinese Communist infiltration and subversion. Prince Sihanouk has recently been forced to admit publicly that Peiping has been supplying arms and other aid to what he calls the Khmer Reds in his own country.

²⁰ *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung* (Peking, Foreign Languages Press, 1966), pp. 61 and 62.

61. Peiping frankly admits that its diplomatic as well as its economic and technical assistance personnel in foreign countries always, in the words of the *People's Daily*:

“bring with them Mao Tse-tung's thought and make it take root and blossom forth throughout the world”.

This official Chinese Communist paper continued:

“Wherever they are, they can at all times see the right direction, distinguish friends and foes, persevere in truth, uphold principle, dare to go up a mountain of pointed swords and plunge into a sea of fire.”

62. It is thus crystal clear that Peiping has used, and continues to use its diplomatic and other missions abroad to infiltrate and subvert the host countries. It does not seem to matter whether the countries in question are Communist or non-Communist, aligned or non-aligned.

63. A régime that promotes war and insurgency, that preaches force and violence, that claims the right to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, that makes use of its diplomatic missions to subvert the host countries, has obviously no place in an organization dedicated to the maintenance of international peace and security, to the peaceful settlement of international dispute, to the development of friendly relations among nations on the basis of law and justice, to the encouragement of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

64. Chinese Communist behaviour at past multinational conferences belies the possibility that they will act constructively in the United Nations. African and Asian delegations in this Assembly cannot have forgotten what happened in Algiers in 1965. The Chinese Communists had been the most active promoters of what was called the Second Bandung Conference. Yet at the last moment they sabotaged it. They did so because they had found that they had lost the power both to dominate the proceedings and to block its decisions. At other conferences, including inter-Communist-Party congresses, they have consistently refused to abide by majority rule on the ground that:

“where the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism are concerned, the problem of exactly who is right and who is wrong cannot be judged by who has the majority.”

65. Their attitude is: “If you don't do as we tell you we'll not play the game at all.” How can men who refuse to abide by majority rule be expected to co-operate with other Members of the United Nations in the search for solutions to the grave problems confronting mankind?

66. Let me now turn to the problem of disarmament. It is a well-known fact that Peiping has consistently refused to have anything to do with United Nations disarmament and arms control efforts. More than once it has questioned the ability of the United Nations to handle the problem of disarmament. It has vehemently attacked the partial nuclear test-ban Treaty as “a criminal concoction of two nuclear overlords—the United States and the Soviet Union.” That is from the *People's Daily* of 20 June 1966. More recently it has characterized the Treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons as a “big fraud and big plot of the U.S. imperialists and Soviet revisionists in their counter-

revolutionary global collusion” and as “something imposed on the non-nuclear States to bind them hand and foot.” That is from the *People's Daily* of 12 June 1968.

67. The Chinese Communists, in defiance of world opinion and in utter disregard of the true interests of the Chinese people, have since 1964 exploded six or seven nuclear devices. This, according to those who champion the Chinese Communist cause, has made their admission to the United Nations a matter of great urgency. It is only by bringing them into the United Nations, we are told, that they can be induced to adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty.

68. That is an argument which is unacceptable to my delegation or to any delegation with the interests of the United Nations at heart. It is tantamount to saying that the most important condition for membership is no longer to be “peace-loving” but the possession of nuclear weapons. Moreover, there is no reason to believe that Peiping would adhere to the non-proliferation Treaty even if it should be admitted. The *People's Daily* had made this abundantly clear as long ago as 1966 when the treaty was still in the early stages of negotiation. That official organ of the régime said on 20 June of that year that Peiping “will determinedly continue to develop nuclear weapons and will definitely not attend any world disarmament conference at the United Nations or outside it”. On 3 November the same paper denounced United States and Soviet attempts “to perpetuate their nuclear monopoly” through the conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty. The paper added: “We want to answer you with the earth-shaking noise of a nuclear explosion.”

69. Obviously, the grave problems confronting the United Nations will not be alleviated with the admission of Peiping. There is every reason to believe that Chinese Communist membership will bring in its train a multitude of new problems which may well undermine the very existence of the United Nations.

70. Advocates of the Chinese Communist cause not infrequently shed crocodile tears for the 700 million Chinese people on the mainland who, they allege, have been denied proper representation in the world community. My reply to them is that the Chinese people on the mainland want no sympathy from those who are bent on putting the seal of international approval on a régime which has enslaved them.

71. Over the years my delegation has time and again called attention to the un-Chinese character of the Chinese Communist régime. During the past two and a half years that régime, in the name of the so-called “great proletarian cultural revolution,” has left no stone unturned to destroy all the values and cultural traditions which the Chinese people hold dear. Such a régime is obviously unfit to represent the Chinese people in the world community.

72. The power struggle unleashed by the “cultural revolution” has wrecked both the Communist Party and the administrative machinery, ruined the economy, plunged the entire mainland into chaos and anarchy, and brought the régime itself to virtual collapse. The old power structure is gone and the attempt to achieve some form of political

stability has been thwarted by factional strifes both in Peiping and in the provinces. The army, upon which the régime depends for survival, has been torn by factional strife.

73. Armed clashes between the Maoist and anti-Maoist forces have become intensified and more widespread. The Chinese people on the mainland have never accepted the Chinese Communist régime as the legitimate Government of China. They have never ceased to struggle against it. In the wake of the confusion and the turmoil brought about by the so-called "cultural revolution", the masses of the people have begun to reassert themselves. They are determined to recover their lost freedom. There is not the slightest doubt that they will ultimately succeed in overthrowing their oppressors.

74. The task of restoring freedom to the Chinese people is one that can be achieved only by the Chinese people themselves. All we ask of you, fellow representatives, is that the United Nations not give aid and comfort to a bogus régime which, as I have said at the beginning of this statement, has committed untold crimes against the Chinese people, which has perpetrated numerous acts of aggression against other countries, which has flouted, and continues to flout, the basic principles and purposes of the United Nations.

75. Mr. DIALLO (Guinea) (*translated from French*): Mr. President, the Guinean delegation would like, first of all, to request you to convey to Mr. Arenales its satisfaction and pleasure at seeing him resume the Presidential Chair, it is also my delegation's pleasant duty to congratulate him sincerely on his recovery, which it hopes will be both complete and lasting.

76. Over the years, the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations has become a routine question which the General Assembly has referred from one session to another without being able to find a solution compatible with the higher interests of the international community and hence of the United Nations. Yet, the importance of this question is obvious; on it depends the very future of our Organization.

77. It is a fact, which can no longer be seriously contested, that all the requirements laid down by public international law for recognition as a State and Government have long been amply fulfilled by the People's Republic of China. This makes the present situation even more deplorable and shocking, particularly since there are among us representatives of Governments set up through the use of force and of entirely unconstitutional and sometimes even extra-constitutional procedures, Governments which are therefore completely illegal, apart from being quite illegitimate because they do not enjoy the support of their peoples. However, no one has raised the question of the membership of those Governments in our Organization, not even the most determined champions of constitutionality, who are also the most relentless opponents of the People's Republic of China. Why then should a different standard be applied to the People's Republic of China? The reason lies essentially in considerations that are peculiar to certain States, and more particularly to the United States of

America, which believes that it is punishing the People's Republic of China by maintaining it in an unjust situation.

78. These States, however, are making a serious mistake, for no one can punish that great country; it is on the contrary the United Nations which suffers from the present situation. Experience provides daily evidence that the People's Republic of China has no need of the United Nations to live, prosper and become stronger, whereas the United Nations has a daily need of the People's Republic of China in order to be something other than a building where, in the words of President Ahmed Sékou Touré, there is much talk of equality and peace while a part of the world is ostracized.

79. The United Nations cannot settle any of the serious problems before it without the assistance of the People's Republic of China and it is paradoxical that efforts should be made to keep that country out of the United Nations and, at the same time, to force it to subscribe to obligations entered into in this Organization without its participation.

80. The long list of specious and unfounded arguments which are used by the enemies of the People's Republic of China and in which they themselves no longer believe does not withstand examination. First of all, their main objection to the People's Republic of China—and one which they do not state openly but which underlies their unrelenting opposition—is that it has chosen a régime which is not to their liking. But they should return to reality and realize that the choice thus made is a matter for the Chinese people and for them alone. No principle, however lofty, entitles outside forces to interfere on any pretext, with this pre-eminently sovereign right of choice.

81. The enemies of the People's Republic of China are also in the habit of claiming gratuitously—and without being able to quote any specific example in corroboration—that the policies of the People's Republic of China are inspired by a warlike ideology. No one has ever noted the name of this great country in the long and distressing list of aggressions committed throughout the world; on the contrary the instigators of aggression in the countries of the third world are always to be found among those who are the most vocal in making this fanciful charge. As a peaceful State aware of its responsibilities, the People's Republic of China has participated in a number of international conferences convened for the purpose of restoring peace in the world: the 1954 Geneva Conference on the Problem of Restoring Peace in Indo-China and the 1961-1962 Conference for the Settlement of the Laotian Question.

82. The People's Republic of China has always demonstrated cool-headedness in the face of the constant bombing of its border areas by the United States interventionist forces in Viet-Nam. That is certainly not the behaviour of an aggressive and warlike Power.

83. Furthermore, the enemies of the People's Republic of China claim that it seeks to export its revolution and to interfere in the domestic affairs of other States. But no one takes these claims seriously because the Chinese are well aware, and have made this point more clearly than anyone else, that a revolution can be neither exported nor imported. And all those who know the People's Republic of

China and who maintain relations with it can firmly attest that it has never sought, by any act or omission, to impose on them any policy, or any choice, in their national construction or reconstruction efforts. The Guinean Government, for its part, has derived nothing but satisfaction from its bilateral relations with that great State.

84. It is true that usurpers who have hastily set themselves up as governments and have carried out *coups d'état* against popular régimes, in their search for scapegoats to justify their misdeeds, have at times accused the People's Republic of China of all manner of crimes and misdeeds. But they cannot succeed—and for very good reasons—in convincing anyone.

85. It is also claimed that the People's Republic of China does not respect the United Nations. But this is simply begging the question, and if those bringing this accusation were not systematically guilty of bad faith, they would themselves know that it is rather the United Nations which is failing to respect the People's Republic of China and its great people, by making criticisms on a matter in which the Chinese people alone is sovereign and on which its views have been plainly, explicitly and conclusively expressed.

86. It is in the light of those elementary truths that the statements of the Chinese leaders must be considered. It is obvious that any one of us who found himself in such an unfair position would not be loud in praise of the United Nations.

87. The merits of the People's Republic of China no longer need to be demonstrated. Since its great revolution, it has countless achievements to its credit in the political, economic, social and cultural fields as well as in those of science and technology.

88. Is it not already a great victory for China to have succeeded in its efforts to maintain, in conditions promoting dignity, honour, peace and the development of the national personality, a unitary government covering a population of 800 million? Admittedly, some would prefer to have to deal with the old China, a country plagued with internal dissension, famine, poverty and irresponsibility, and dominated by every form of imperialism. The People's Republic of China has done even more: in a single decade, it has brought the so-called "coloured" peoples to the forefront of scientific progress. Indeed, it is the only country to have succeeded in synthesizing benzene. This is a great achievement of the Chinese revolution, the importance of which cannot be over-emphasized.

89. Furthermore, in the same period of time, and contrary to all predictions, the People's Republic of China, relying exclusively on its own genius, has resolutely entered the nuclear and thermo-nuclear age and has thus succeeded in exploding once and for all the imperialist-colonialist theory that science is the prerogative of one race or continent or of a minority of nations. This is another of the major contributions made by this great country to the political and historical evolution of the so-called "coloured" peoples, who are deeply and sincerely grateful to it.

90. As concrete evidence of China's desire for peace, it should be noted that, in mastering the secrets of the atom

and thus broadening the range of human knowledge, China has formally expressed itself in favour of convening a world conference to outlaw nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, this expression of a desire for peace has met with no response from those who have a major responsibility in that field and who claim to be the champions of peace.

91. To take an entirely different matter, the People's Republic of China has succeeded in the same period of time—a single decade—in repaying all its foreign debts and even in granting interest-free loans to sister nations of the third world, without any of the prior political conditions to which these countries have become accustomed. This is a fact which should be emphasized.

92. In spite of the loud and systematically slanted press campaigns, the recent cultural revolution, which marks a higher stage of the Chinese Revolution, will further consolidate the achievements and successes of the People's Republic of China.

93. The Republic of Guinea, since its accession to national independence, has for its part maintained excellent relations in many areas with the People's Republic of China. As I have already said, it has derived unqualified satisfaction from the nature of the friendship linking it with that country and binding together the Chinese and Guinean peoples. In our statement from this rostrum on 9 October 1968 [1688th meeting], we said that the People's Republic of China has consistently stood by us throughout our ten years of international life and, at the time of our greatest difficulties, has supported us with its friendship when it was most needed. It is, together with the other socialist States, among our best friends. We wish once again to assure it here of our deep gratitude for its friendship and courtesy, for its unobtrusive and effective assistance and for the altruism, modesty and undeniable competence of its experts.

94. Better than anyone else, we know that all the absurd accusations levelled against the People's Republic of China are merely malicious slanders. That is why, this year, too, we have co-sponsored a draft resolution [A/L.549] calling for the complete restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. We have done so in full awareness of our responsibilities as a Member State. Together with that restoration, the draft resolution provides for the immediate expulsion of Chiang Kai-shek's men from the seat they illegally occupy in the United Nations and all related bodies.

95. Although Chiang Kai-shek represented China at a certain period in that country's history and, at the time of the establishment of the United Nations, his Government happened to represent the Chinese State, the situation has now fundamentally changed. Not only has Chiang Kai-shek been overthrown by a popular revolution but he has only succeeded in saving himself by fleeing to the island of Formosa, an integral part of the People's Republic of China where, thanks to the assistance of the United States of America, he desperately clings to the illusion that he will regain power.

96. What is offensive to our sense of right, justice and reality and what is particularly shocking is the allegation

that the Chiang Kai-shek government—which has been overthrown and repudiated by the very people on whose behalf it claims to speak—still represents that people. Some even go so far as to give the title of “great Power” to this so-called government which is maintained by means of lavish subsidies by the United States Government for its own private reasons which are largely connected with military logistics. This is, at the very least, a regrettable fiction, the effect of which is to hold a dire threat, take a sword of Damocles, over world peace and security. Is there any need to say that this “great Power”, which is unable to discharge its national obligations since it lives on foreign assistance, is even less able to carry out the obligations inherent in the very concept of a great Power, although it does enjoy all the related prerogatives?

97. This is the illogical and outrageous situation which the peoples of the world we represent cannot understand and which draft resolution A/L.549 seeks to terminate by calling for the immediate expulsion of Chiang Kai-shek's representatives from the United Nations.

98. Some people react sentimentally to this proposal, even going so far as to assert that it would be unfair to expel those representatives. Others, who are certainly more ingenious and influenced by a public opinion which is becoming increasingly aware of international realities and is therefore demanding that the tragic error committed with respect to the People's Republic of China should be rectified, propose a new theory, a new fiction, the two-China solution under which there would be two Chinas: the People's Republic of China and a so-called China of Chiang Kai-shek. For the advocates of this theory, it would, of course, be necessary to restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, but also to maintain the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek in the Organization.

99. This is a pure fiction, in other words, a mere figment of the imagination which bears no relation to reality. As we have said, Chiang Kai-shek no longer represents anyone but himself. It is, therefore, a matter of determining whether the Members of the United Nations are and will continue to be States represented by their Governments or whether henceforth individuals, too, can acquire that status. Furthermore, how would the advocates of this fiction react if it was decided to resurrect from their past some Government abhorred by their people and to claim that that Government would henceforth represent their State in the United Nations?

100. In reality, no State can be represented in this Organization by two Governments. If there is a dispute, it must be settled in favour of the Government designated by its people. And in the case before us there can be no room for doubt.

101. This whole question is therefore essentially a matter of verifying credentials. This has been the general rule, applied since the establishment of our Organization in all cases of change of régime or government, except of course in the case of China. And, in this matter of credentials, the General Assembly always takes a decision by simple majority, in accordance with rule 28 of the rules of procedure.

102. On the strength of completely artificial procedural devices, originating in a veritable legal deception based on an unwarranted interpretation of Article 18 of the Charter, the claim is being made that a two-thirds majority is required in the case of China. This is the proposition embodied in draft resolution A/L.548, which the General Assembly must reject.

103. The falsity of this interpretation becomes evident when it is realized that, up to the 1960s, its inventors had agreed that the question should be decided by a simple majority. They only thought of this interpretation then because they no longer controlled the General Assembly: the era of what has been called the automatic majorities was past and, with the entry onto the international scene of many new States which, because they had suffered all manner of injustices throughout history, were particularly sensitive to it, a fairer approach was bound to develop.

104. It is in any case our hope, our most profound hope, that a more lucid, calm and objective view of the realities of the present world and of the legitimate interests of the international community, which are above the personal interests of any State, will lead the United States of America and its allies to take the only decision possible in this matter, i.e. to restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and simultaneously to expel the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek.

105. Mr. VINCI (Italy): Once again the problem of Chinese representation in the United Nations is on the agenda of the General Assembly; once more the ever-increasing membership of the United Nations is faced with a debate on an issue which is among some of the most important that confront the Organization, yet a constructive and rational solution is hardly in sight.

106. We cannot help sensing around us a feeling of frustration and dissatisfaction, a feeling which is shared, I am convinced, both by those who are, so to speak, in favour of the “status quo” as well as by those who advocate “tout court” the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China. We are sure, in fact, that regardless of the position held by each delegation on this or any other problem, there is one overriding objective which unites us all, namely, the common desire to strengthen the authority, the prestige and the effectiveness of our Organization.

107. It is therefore most disappointing that year after year the United Nations General Assembly should be dragged by force of circumstance into a sterile debate which touches only the surface of the problem, does not open the way for a solution and in fact risks leading us towards greater divisions; in short, a debate that does not serve the cause of the United Nations since it does not help to harmonize the position of Member States—as requested by the Charter—and keeps us far away from the goal of universality instead of bringing us closer to it.

108. Much has been said in the past on this ideal of universality of the United Nations as a necessary corollary of the Charter of San Francisco. If we want all the peoples of the world to be represented, through their Governments, in this Organization and to make their contribution to our common efforts, this is not for mere reasons of prestige. We

want this because we are deeply convinced that the range and effectiveness of the action the United Nations can take to consolidate peace and to promote progress in the world are closely interrelated with the practical realization of the principle of universality.

109. If we rejoice in seeing all the newly independent nations of Africa and Asia present as sovereign countries in our midst, it is not only because we see in their very presence a victory for the ideals of freedom and self-determination. We rejoice also, and perhaps even more, because we can meet here in this forum and work together as equal partners for the solution of the great problems which are the sad heritage of mankind: war, hunger, disease, discrimination, illiteracy.

110. These are the reasons which led us in past years to join our efforts with those of other delegations which shared our belief that the methods so far resorted to on this main issue are not practical and have no future. And together with these same delegations we have put forward a proposal intended to introduce a new approach to the problem of Chinese representation in the United Nations, an approach which, in our view, will enable the General Assembly to break a deadlock which has lasted too long, to put an end to a fruitless confrontation of votes dividing the house and to take a step forward toward the achievement of universality.

111. It is for the same reasons that the Italian delegation has been encouraged to submit this proposal once more to the present session of the General Assembly. Its main idea is to confer upon an *ad hoc* committee a mandate to study and explore the situation in all its aspects and to make appropriate recommendations to the next session of the Assembly for an equitable and practical solution to the question of the representation of China in the United Nations, in keeping with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

112. I have therefore the honour to introduce formally, on behalf of the delegations of Belgium, Chile, Iceland, Luxembourg and Italy, a draft resolution [A/L.550]. The text of the draft is familiar to our colleagues since it is drafted along the lines of previous draft resolutions on the same subject submitted by a number of delegations at the twenty-first²¹ and twenty-second²² sessions. This circumstance makes it unnecessary for me to give a lengthy explanation of this document.

113. May I be allowed, however, Mr. President, to quote from a statement I myself had the honour to make from this rostrum last year to indicate the meaning as well as the purposes of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution in question:

"Our reasoning stems from two premises which, we believe, are undeniable, and leads to a conclusion that, we hope, will be accepted by this Assembly.

"The first premise is that few problems have remained so long with us as the question of Chinese representation.

It has been with us for too many years. The very fact that, for reasons which I shall not attempt to discuss at this date, the people of mainland China are not directly represented in this world Organization, the very fact that the position of the Government of the Republic of China was challenged last year by forty-six delegations, show us the order of its magnitude.

"The second premise is that the method of tackling this problem as proposed by a number of delegations which have asked the General Assembly *sic et simpliciter* to vote in favour of the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China and to expel forthwith from the Organization the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China, is not accepted by the majority. I venture to submit in this regard that, for many delegations here represented, the vote cast against the draft resolution traditionally submitted by Albania and ten other countries [A/L.531], implies something different from what a negative vote usually means. It means, rather than a judgement on the merit of the question, a direct refusal of the method which such a draft resolution embodies. The conclusion that flows from these two premises is the new approach which the delegations of Belgium, Chile, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Italy propose to the General Assembly." [1602nd meeting, paras. 99-101.]

114. We feel that in the search for a United Nations solution advocated by all sides of the house our first common duty is to give to the General Assembly the tools it requires to carry on its task successfully. We believe it cannot be denied that the setting-up of an *ad hoc* committee is one of the legitimate and traditional methods to which the United Nations resorts in order to lay the groundwork for the solution of the most intricate and difficult problems. It is a fully tested method to which we owe most of the progress that has been made by our Organization in various fields, political, economic, social, legal and so on.

115. The Committee which we have in mind will have to gather and list all the essential data of the problem that, in our view, cannot be reduced to mere rival claims to the same seat by two different Governments. The Committee should be empowered to sound out opinions, to make all necessary contacts, and then place before us in a clear, rational and unquestionable manner all data and elements collected, so that the problem of the seating of China—which has so far been of an abstract nature—can be tackled afresh on a sound and constructive basis.

116. We do not believe, however, that the terms of reference of this committee should be spelled out by the Assembly in great detail. We feel, on the contrary, that the committee should be entrusted with a mandate as wide as possible, so as not to curtail its freedom of action.

117. We hope and trust that, if the General Assembly gives its consent to our draft resolution, the members of the *ad hoc* committee—who, we feel, should reflect all the various tendencies existing in this body—will be able to carry out the work bearing chiefly in mind the common objective which binds us all, namely, the strengthening of the authority and effectiveness of the United Nations, which will bring us closer to the ideal of universality of the United

²¹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 90, document A/L.500.

²² Ibid., Twenty-second Session, Annexes, agenda item 93, document A/L.533.

Nations and fill a vacuum which undeniably exists in our Organization.

118. This is the method which the delegations of Belgium, Chile, Iceland, Luxembourg and Italy commend to the judgement of the General Assembly. I would define it as an alternative or, better, as a supplementary method to the one which we have followed all these years. We believe, in fact—and I should like to make this point quite clear—that a vote in favour of our draft resolution would not prejudice the attitude, the positions of principle, of any Member State with regard to the substance of the problem. A vote in favour of the draft resolution would have no relation whatsoever to the vote which any delegation chooses to cast on other draft resolutions before the Assembly. Finally, a vote in favour of the draft resolution would not commit anyone to accept the findings and recommendations which the *ad hoc* committee would be requested to submit to the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly.

119. Allow me, Mr. President, to say that the co-sponsors of this draft resolution do not claim that this is the ideal method; we would in fact be grateful for any suggestion aiming at improving our ideas and enabling them to secure the widest possible support. We cannot, however, conceal the feeling that, had the Assembly adopted last year our draft resolution in its present form, we should have by now most probably—although we feel it is fair to stress the word “probably”—a clearer picture of the situation and more elements of judgement to chart our future course. In any case we should not have lost time.

120. As to the composition of the *ad hoc* committee which the draft resolution would create, our feeling is that it should secure an adequate representation of the various schools of thought, present in the Assembly, on the problem of Chinese representation. Its actual composition should be decided upon through customary consultations with as many Members as possible. On this point, however, the co-sponsors' positions being flexible, they hope that they will have the benefit of constructive suggestions coming from all sections of the Assembly. We shall welcome, therefore, the widest possible consultations before we come to the vote. My delegation as well as the other co-sponsors, to whom we feel indebted for their staunch support and co-operation, remain available for this purpose.

121. In conclusion, the suggestion that the delegation of Italy, joining forces with four other delegations, is submitting to the attention of the General Assembly is not a new one. We are confident that the motives which have prompted our action, in the past and now, are clear and beyond discussion. We respect the opinions of other delegations on this subject; we do not question their motivations. My delegation expects the same understanding attitude.

122. May I, in concluding, reaffirm that we are not inspired by any partisan views or special interests; we do not take sides—if we ever take sides it will only be for the Charter of the United Nations. We are moved, rather, by a deep-felt sense of responsibility and a sincere desire to offer a positive contribution of ideas to the solution of an

outstanding problem of our Organization. We do not know, for the moment, any better way to serve the United Nations to which we all owe our allegiance.

123. We are likewise confident that our proposal will meet with the positive response of the Assembly and that we may this year harmonize our views, as the Charter commands us to do, and conclude our work with a step forward, limited perhaps, but certainly, in our view, in the right direction.

124. Mr. JIMENEZ (Philippines): As in previous years, we are again confronted today with a pre-eminently political question—an issue of an important and vital character, not only because it involves the rightful place of the Republic of China in the United Nations, but also because it places in jeopardy the basic principle of the Charter and the very future of our Organization.

125. In requesting the inclusion in the agenda of the item entitled “Restoration of the Lawful Rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations”, the sponsors have repeated the same old worn-out arguments that the refusal to restore to the People's Republic of China “the seat which belongs to it by right” violates justice and the principle of universality; that in the field of international relations the Government of the People's Republic of China has always followed a policy aimed at settling by peaceful means all disputes which may exist or arise between independent States; that no important international problem can be solved without the participation of Communist China; and that membership of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and all its subsidiary bodies is absolutely and urgently necessary in order to strengthen the authority and prestige of the Organization.

126. We have disposed of all these arguments in past years, and a significant majority of the Members has consistently rejected the proposal to seat Communist China and expel the Republic of China. Thus our Organization, time and again, through its collective will and wisdom, has been able to sift fact from fiction. Now we are again confronted with fictitious claims in the desperate efforts of the sponsors of Communist China to win for it a seat in the United Nations.

127. The question of Chinese representation in the United Nations arose from the fact that, as a result of a civil war or revolutionary change in mainland China, two authorities have been claiming to be the Government entitled to represent China in the United Nations. The question is therefore: should the Republic of China or the People's Republic of China represent China in the United Nations?

128. The sponsors of draft resolution A/L.549 speak of the “restoration of the lawful rights” of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. This is not only absurd, but illogical as well. When we speak of “restoration”, a government must first originally possess a thing, right or privilege and must subsequently have been deprived of it. This hardly applies to the People's Republic of China by any stretch of the imagination, because that régime has never represented China in the United Nations. Why should we speak now of “restoration” when we have nothing to restore to that régime?

129. My delegation had no doubt about the legitimacy of the claim of the Republic of China that it should continue to represent China in the United Nations. The Republic of China was one of the principal architects of the United Nations. Its gallant defence against and victory over the forces of evil and aggression commended it to the founding fathers for inclusion in the magic circle of five Powers to which was entrusted the primary responsibility for safeguarding international peace and security. Through the years it has shown its total commitment to the purposes and principles of the United Nations and has consistently demonstrated its acceptance of the obligations of membership provided for in the Charter. There can be no question, then, that the Republic of China appreciates the privileges of membership and, by its acts, has proved itself worthy of such membership.

130. We have great respect and admiration for the Chinese people, their culture and their social institutions. Being a great people, they are entitled to have as their spokesmen in the United Nations representatives of a régime which has been complying faithfully with the obligations provided in the Charter, which does not use or advocate violence and which champions fundamental human rights and freedoms. It is only the Republic of China which, having fought courageously on the side of democracy, justice and freedom during the Second World War, should represent the Chinese people.

131. On the other hand, what are the credentials offered by the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.549 on behalf of the People's Republic of China? The Peiping régime does not seek admission to the United Nations through the front door as all the other Members of the world Organization have done. Its sponsors have attempted unsuccessfully, and are now again attempting, to open the back door to it. As a matter of fact, we have every reason to believe that the People's Republic of China is not interested in membership of the United Nations. It has consistently adopted an attitude of arrogance and hostility vis-à-vis the United Nations. It has on several occasions slandered the United Nations.

132. The *People's Daily*, Peiping's official press organ, stated on 30 November 1967 that:

"The United Nations has long been discredited as a result of the treachery of United States imperialism and Soviet revisionism. Frankly speaking, the Chinese people are not at all interested in joining the United Nations, a body manipulated by the United States, a place for playing power politics, a stock exchange for the United States and the Soviet Union to strike political bargains."

133. Peiping even has the temerity to lay down conditions for its joining the United Nations. Through its official press it demands that the United Nations should rectify its past errors, reorganize and remodel itself thoroughly and abandon its power politics. If these demands are not met then a new and revolutionary United Nations should be set up. On 28 June 1967 the *People's Daily* declared sanctimoniously that:

"The United Nations has done all sorts of evil things and is incapable of doing anything good precisely because it has become a place where the big Powers make dirty deals with one another".

134. We are told that no important international problem can be solved without the participation of the Peiping régime. What contribution can the Peiping régime offer to our work here for the promotion of peace? How can it help when it ridicules the policy of peace to which our Organization is committed and advocates armed struggle to achieve its own purposes?

135. The little red book entitled *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung* which has become the bible of the so-called great proletarian cultural revolution and which the Red Guards memorize and recite every day, contains the essence of Chinese communism as now officially defined. The following few passages from the red book are a clear negation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter: "war is the highest form of struggle for resolving contradictions"; "war is the continuation of politics"; "revolutionary wars are inevitable in class society"; "the seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution"; "every communist must grasp the truth, 'Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun'."²³ Unless we are prepared to accept the notion of war as an instrument of international policy—and to do so would certainly contravene the very objective of the United Nations—we have no option but to close the doors to the People's Republic of China.

136. These, then, are the credentials offered on behalf of the People's Republic of China—a portfolio of slander and unmitigated contempt for the United Nations, a record of continuing violation of fundamental human rights in Tibet, armed intervention in Korea, aggression in India and subversion in South-East Asia.

137. By its own pronouncements and actions the People's Republic of China has disqualified itself. A régime which openly flouts the basic rules of international law and the norms of diplomatic conduct, which does not believe in the principle of co-existence between countries professing different political and economic systems and which proclaims the doctrine of perpetual revolution has no place in our Organization. Its membership of the Organization would without doubt seriously undermine the latter's authority and prestige. To those who might argue that communist China could be converted overnight into a peace-loving nation we say that the United Nations is not a reformatory school for recalcitrant States.

138. Another argument advanced by those who favour the seating of the People's Republic of China is that its existence should not be ignored. China is located in the heart of Asia and we in Asia know that we have to live with it, but we deny the right of the People's Republic of China to dictate the terms on which we should live with it, and any attempt to do so must be resisted. We in South-East Asia, through our individual and collective strength, must deter or prevent communist China from undertaking any acts of subversion or aggression against its neighbours. Communist China should abandon its present militancy and aggressiveness.

139. Recognition of a State or Government is a political question. States which desire to recognize the Peiping

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 58, 60-62.

régime have the right to do so, but we expect them to understand our problem in our region. Such recognition does not imply that the Peiping régime is automatically qualified to sit in the United Nations. My delegation holds the view that the Charter upholds the principle of selectivity rather than automatic universality and that membership is a privilege with corresponding obligations.

140. My delegation deems it pertinent to recall what the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Philippines said in the plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 15 October 1968, on the question of Chinese representation:

“Nothing has happened on the mainland of China or in the outside world which would justify any change in decisions we have previously taken on the question of the representation of China. On the contrary, the Peking régime, by reason of the excesses of its so-called cultural revolution, its warlike policies towards its neighbours, and its continued oppression and persecution of the people of Tibet, has forfeited any right to represent the Chinese people in the United Nations. That right belongs to the Republic of China as a founding Member of the United Nations.” [1696th meeting, para. 10.]

141. In the light of all the foregoing considerations, wisdom and prudence dictate, once again, rejection of draft resolution A/L.549. What is being asked in the draft resolution is not only a question of credentials or the seating of the representatives of the People's Republic of China but also the expulsion of the representatives of the Republic of China, an acknowledged founding Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council. Article 6 of the Charter provides that it is only when a Member of the United Nations has persistently violated the principles contained in the Charter that it may be expelled from the Organization. The Republic of China has not violated any of those principles: as a matter of fact it has consistently complied with them. On the other hand it is the People's Republic of China which has on several occasions violated those principles, and it only stands to reason that it should be denied the privileges of membership.

142. Having discussed the substantive aspects of the question I wish now to refer to its procedural aspect. Before the Committee there is another draft resolution, A/L.548, which, on behalf of the delegations of Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Gabon, Japan, Madagascar, New Zealand, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Thailand, Togo and the

United States my delegation is privileged to introduce formally.

143. My delegation readily co-sponsored that draft resolution, inasmuch as it coincides with our position that this question should be considered in the light of the purposes and principles of the Charter and that any proposal to change the representation of China is an important question which should be decided by the General Assembly in accordance with paragraph 2, Article 18, of the Charter. To be more specific, the question requires a two-thirds majority vote.

144. The two preambular paragraphs recall the recommendation contained in General Assembly resolution 396 (V) of 14 December 1950 and its decision in General Assembly resolution 1668 (XVI) of 15 December 1961, reaffirmed in General Assembly resolutions 2025 (XX) of 17 November 1965, 2159 (XXI) of 29 November 1966 and 2271 (XXII) of 28 November 1967 as remaining valid. In its operative paragraph the draft resolution would have the Assembly reaffirm that its decision remains valid.

145. From the time that the question of Chinese representation was first raised some eighteen years ago the General Assembly has recognized the vital importance of the question. At its sixteenth session the General Assembly, in its resolution 1668 (XVI), formally declared that, inasmuch as the representation of China is vital and crucial for the future of the Organization, any proposal to change the representation of China is an important question within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter. The decision was reaffirmed by the General Assembly at its twentieth session and its two succeeding sessions. On numerous occasions the inclusion of the question in the agenda has been requested, as an item of an important and urgent character. The issue is fraught with fatal consequences for us all. The question is undoubtedly an important one within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter.

146. There is neither basis nor justification for the General Assembly to disturb its previous decisions. Inasmuch as the General Assembly has in the past consistently considered this question to be an important one, requiring the two-thirds majority vote, the better part of wisdom would be to sustain that decision. The co-sponsors of draft resolution A/L.548 therefore strongly commend it to the General Assembly and hope that it will be given the widest support.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.