



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 93: Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations (<i>concluded</i>)	1

President: Mr. Emilio ARENALES (Guatemala).

In the absence of the President, Sir John CARTER (Guyana), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 93

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

1. Mr. LOPEZ VILLAMIL (Honduras) (*translated from Spanish*): This topic, which has been before the United Nations for a long time, has been subjected to repeated analysis by the representatives of all the countries of the world, and year after year the outcome has been a reaffirmation of the position taken by this Organization with respect to the possible admission of mainland China. The reasons for this situation, which are consistent with the solutions adopted in the past are many, but one of the most important is that there has been no change in attitudes, and consequently, that our approach to the problems always leads to the same results.

2. My delegation would like to consider some of the most obvious aspects, including the international juridical aspect, the institutional aspect in relation to the United Nations Charter, and the political aspect.

3. We will not be among those who deny the historical realities of the present time, namely the existence of two Chinas and of two Governments, as well as the overwhelming importance given to the representation of China in the United Nations by world public opinion. However, the basic facts have continued to be the same for some years.

4. The United Nations was created to be, among other things, a centre of world activity where States, through mutual co-operation, could "harmonize the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends".

5. Article 3 of the Charter unequivocally states:

"The original Members of the United Nations shall be the states which, having participated in the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco, or having previously signed the Declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942, sign the present Charter and ratify it in accordance with Article 110."

6. China is, by lawful right, an original Member State within the framework of the United Nations Charter and nobody can dispute its permanent presence, with its powers and duties, in conformity with the Charter. It is no less than a founding Member of this Organization.

7. First of all, the continuity and the identity of this State should be subjected to legal analysis.

8. For my country—and I think this is true of all the other States which recognize and maintain official relations with the Republic of China—there exists and has existed a concrete and real continuity of China as a Member State of the United Nations, with the result that the representation of this Member State cannot be called in question on grounds either of its lawful origin or of its continuity. The identity of a State has two aspects, concerning which it is possible to adopt different criteria, but when the international aspect is involved, as it is here, the identity of that State is of a representative character. It is in the national or internal aspect where, owing to a number of different circumstances, its identity may vary, and the problem of this identity may be either real or fictitious, as a result of domestic policies or of international pressure. In the course of history there have been many examples in all continents of different solutions given to the problem of national identity or, if one prefers, geographical identity, which may vary according to frontiers, depending on whether or not they are recognized by other States.

9. We have already, on another occasion, advanced certain considerations on this subject which we should like to recall now. As one author says, a State loses its personality when it ceases to exist, which occurs upon the disappearance of one of its three constituent elements: its people, its territory or its independent juridical structure. My delegation believes that none of these three elements has ceased to exist in the case of the Republic of China, which country has a larger population than the majority of States represented in this Organization, including my own country. Nor has the power of the State ceased to exist, since that power is very clearly expressed both within the internal order and in a number of international actions, including some taken within this Organization.

10. A State ceases to exist—says one writer on international law—without any act of its own volition, when another State destroys its powers either through conquest or subjugation which may lead to its annexation by the other State.

11. This recognition given by my country to the Republic of China, like its recognition of the other Members of this Organization, is the permanent expression of diplomatic relations and is the bond which links my country in its

international relations with the other States Members, both within and outside this Organization.

12. It has been argued that a Government representing a country with more than 700 million inhabitants has been left outside the United Nations, and it has also been said that this nation is the heir to a glorious civilization. Moreover, it is said that this Government has clearly set forth its position in favour of the peaceful settlement of disputes and other problems which may exist or may arise between independent States.

13. No Article of the Charter speaks of the restoration of the rights of States on political grounds, since this would imply interference in the internal affairs of each State or with the grounds upon which Members conduct their international relations as they think best.

14. Writers on international law point out, as does the text of the Charter, that the legitimacy of a State, namely, the legality of its birth, cannot be subjected to scrutiny by other States. In form, recognition is either express or the result of conclusive acts. We speak of *de facto* recognition when it is given provisionally, without commitment, in contrast to *de jure* recognition, which is permanent and irrevocable. It is also a prerequisite that the new State or Government should respect the principle of the independence and sovereignty of the other States which make up the international community, the majority of which are Members of this Organization.

15. Such recognition is *de jure* and permanent, and these States have considered that the permanence of these bonds is a lawful act and the expression of their will on the international plane, which should not at any time be subject to examination by the other States which do not maintain relations with the Government of the Republic of China, regardless of the reasons, whether political or purely financial, by which they prefer to be guided in their relations with the Peking Government and which my delegation, for its part, does not intend at any time to examine or analyse.

16. The thesis which we are now presenting is neither capricious nor speculative; it is based on article 5 of the resolutions adopted by the Institute of International Law in 1936, which states:

“*De jure* recognition is irrevocable; its effects do not cease except in the case of the final disappearance of a State”.

17. Now one of the essential elements for establishing bonds between States comes into existence at the same time as the act of recognition. The Republic of China possesses identity as a State, not only as a Member of the United Nations but also, as stated by Marek, as a part of “the identity of its international rights and obligations, as before and after the event which called such identity in question, and solely on the basis of the customary norm *pacta sunt servanda*.”

18. There are quite a few representatives who have considered the question of the admission of Peking or Communist China and have put forward a number of arguments, ranging from the principle of the universality of

States as far as this Organization is concerned, to those which couple this possibility of admission with the expulsion of the Republic of China.

19. As we have already said, we do not intend to deny or to attempt to deny the existence of a Government which, whether stable or not, controls a population of more than 700 million human beings. This is a reality about which there can be no doubt. Neither would we attempt to pass judgement on the existence of the principle of universality, since, as the history of the United Nations has shown, it represents a genuine and inviolable principle, just as does the reality of the 126 States Members of this Organization, regardless of the number of their inhabitants.

20. Article 18, which has so often been invoked by so many delegations, lays down that “decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting”, and this Article clearly states that these important questions include, in addition to others expressly mentioned therein, “the admission of new Members to the United Nations, the suspension of the rights and privileges of membership, the expulsion of Members”, and the like.

21. It would be tedious to repeat the various arguments and positions, but earlier Assemblies provide the clearest precedents for approaching this problem. The Assembly has decided in clear terms that any proposal aimed at changing the representation of China in the United Nations is, as the Charter puts it, an important question.

22. The much-discussed draft resolution which now appears as document A/L.549 and Add.1 asks the Assembly to do something completely contrary to Article 18 of the United Nations Charter. It calls for nothing less than the violation of the Charter itself, since it not only suggests the possibility of the admission of Communist China but also links this request with the expulsion of a State Member to which cannot, under the Charter, be ascribed any circumstances which would justify the Assembly in expelling it. Such an attitude would lead to a rash and sinister measure which, if adopted here, would involve nothing less than the destruction of this Organization. A majority of States would then only have to band together and to apply the same procedure in order to expel any other Member State, and the Charter would no longer be an international structure established to preserve peace and international harmony, but approximate to the constitutions and laws of totalitarian States, where respect for human rights exists only on paper, since the practice in such States amounts to an absolute denial of the achievements claimed for those rights. In opposition to this trend, which is in violation of the Charter, the Assembly has always given a negative reply, and therefore General Assembly resolution 1668 (XVI) still continues to be valid.

23. Another new proposal has recently appeared [A/L.550] which is aimed at attempting to set up, through exploratory measures, a committee which would find “an equitable and practical solution to the question of the representation of China”.

24. There is nothing in the usual practice of the United Nations which is opposed to the formation of committees

for the purpose of studying problems facing the United Nations. This is a normal procedure when it is possible to judge in advance if, through international harmony, the conditions for a mutual consensus can be maintained among States and if bases of agreement can be drawn up. In the present case, however, the conditions are not only non-existent but are definitely unfavourable to any work which might be done by such a committee, not because of the attitude of the United Nations but because of the attitude of the Peking Government itself, which is firmly and unswervingly opposed to any form of co-operation. This is the case of a child whose mother not only does not want it to be born alive but is resolved to force a miscarriage.

25. The representative of Uruguay, the distinguished lawyer Mr. Pedro Berro, had this to say:

“Is the Peking Government prepared to co-operate in establishing the necessary conditions for the work of the Committee which the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.550 wish to set up? The reply is in the negative and the first to be aware of this are the sponsors of the draft themselves.”

26. On the other hand, we ask ourselves the following question: Are the representatives of the countries which advocate the representation of Communist China, which have ties with the Peking Government, which are familiar with it through their own relations and which might give us some idea of a just solution of the problem—are these representatives favourably disposed? We all know that this is far from being the case; they are not even prepared to vote for draft resolution A/L.550, and therefore there are neither any valid reasons nor the necessary atmosphere of understanding for initiating any efforts, which would lead nowhere since there is no desire for success on the part of the party most closely concerned.

27. This is not mere speculation. We are starting from the premise of the reality of a United Nations Charter which must be respected, and of the historical reality of a Government which has at no time expressed a desire to join the United Nations in the normal way, as has been done by the majority of the Members represented here, but which wishes to impose humiliating conditions on this Organization in return for its possible admission, in flagrant violation of the principles of international law. Only recall the bold and insolent statement made by the Peking Minister of Foreign Affairs, Chen Yi, on 29 September 1969, when he said that among his Government's conditions for accepting membership in the United Nations was the expulsion of the Government of Nationalist China; and, moreover, that (a) the United Nations should retract the statement in which it condemned Communist China as an aggressor [*resolution 498 (V)*] because of the Korean War and should declare that this must be regarded as an error; and that (b) the Charter should be revised to provide for the admission of independent countries and the expulsion of puppet countries—these are the words used by the Minister. We here already know what the words “independence” and “sovereignty” mean under communist interpretation. The case of Czechoslovakia is only the most recent example.

28. These statements by Chen Yi show what could be expected from the presence of a régime which proclaims

war as a necessary means of solving political problems and which has the solicitude of the appeasers, who have done so much harm to humanity in this century in complicity with those who proclaim the rule of force. The attitude of the appeasers—such as that of Chamberlain when confronting Hitler at Munich—has not produced any constructive results but has only had effects contrary to the rule of law and to respect for the rights of States.

29. As far as political considerations are concerned, my delegation wishes to state the following: nobody can deny the fact that the China governed by Peking represents no less than a quarter of the world, but historical events after 1949 show that what exists there is a Government of terror; that self-determination is impossible for that great people because of a system imposed on them by blood, fire and starvation; that that Government has nothing in common, in its principles, system or tradition, with the glorious civilization of earlier times; and that that same Peking Government has undertaken by every means of publicity to renounce any link with the past with any other civilization in the world, including socialist civilization itself.

30. Here in the United Nations, the concept of the self-determination of nations is often abused. The right to self-determination is closely related to the concept of sovereignty, which is one, indivisible and inalienable. Consequently, these requirements represent permanent necessities, just as the right of representation of the human individual, in his political condition, is permanent along with other rights enjoyed by both majorities and minorities through co-existence on the internal plane just as there is co-existence on the international plane—since it is impossible to imagine a principle on one plane and deny it on the other. The self-determination of peoples cannot exist once only at a given historical moment, solely for the purpose of proclaiming independence. Self-determination is also the permanent expression of the people for the purpose of giving themselves laws and institutions, without interference by other States.

31. Rule 135 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly provides that any State which desires to become a Member of the United Nations must declare, in a formal instrument, that it accepts the obligations contained in the Charter.

32. This is not a mere formality but a prerequisite for peace. The United Nations was created to discharge a number of historical responsibilities of enormous importance and one of them, the most precious for mankind, is the maintenance of peace. This responsibility, assumed by the world Organization, cannot be subject to the whim of any State, no matter how large it may be or how overpopulated it may seem to be.

33. Only those States can be Members—declares Article 4 of the Charter—which are peace-loving and accept the obligations contained in the Charter and, in the judgement of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.

34. The Peking Government has not allowed its people to exercise their lawful rights and has not even been able to maintain peace and harmony either with the socialist

countries which helped it to become established or with the rest of Asia. Its Government has declared that war is an alternative to politics; it is incapable of complying with the principles laid down in the United Nations Charter.

35. There is no question of condemning the people of China, and this is not the position of my country. All peoples are worthy of respect, because they have good pages and bad pages in their history and the Chinese people have left finer pages in their history than the present one. By not admitting an aggressor Government from the Asian region, this Organization is merely facing a fact, since it is the Chinese people themselves which have been the most abused victims of the sinister designs of that Government.

36. Other peoples of Asia around its borders have also been the victims of that Government. Had it not been for the existence of the United Nations, India, whose peace-loving traditions nobody can doubt, would still be pouring out the blood of its nationals in torrents to defend its territory and its position as an independent State against the aggressive designs of the Peking Government.

37. No conventional lie can hide this historical fact, which is still with us. No sophistry or silence on the part of various Members of this Organization can prove to the world and to this Assembly that the conquest of Tibet by force is an act intended to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes between independent States.

38. We shall not fail to repeat what we have said elsewhere: the United Nations was created as an act planned during the Second World War, to be a living and effective organization in the post-war period, taking into account the evils caused by social systems opposed to the free movement of human beings. Later, in spite of this Organization's efforts for peace, in spite of the more precise definitions given to human rights, to the equality of States under international law, to the principle of self-determination—both the original right which gives birth to a State and the permanent right which justifies the normal change of governments by elections, etc.—mass persecutions have continued, the exodus of refugees has continued, the populations of Tibet have fled en masse, just as thousands of Asians have fled en masse.

39. Lenin once said that imperialism is the final stage of capitalism. History has shown that the great capitalist countries have lost their empires. Unfortunately, the history of fifty years of socialism has also shown that imperialism is the first stage of communism, and this is an unhappy fact because not only is there a regression to the nineteenth century but also to the imperialism of Rome and its legions, to the expeditions of Darius and Xerxes, aimed at the total suppression in this century of all ideas of liberty, which is incompatible with the existence of communism, so that the ideas of sovereignty, self-determination, territorial integrity and the legal equality of States have been rendered illusory.

40. For the foregoing reasons, my delegation does not believe that the Peking Government is prepared at this time to give proofs of a conciliatory attitude which would justify this Organization in considering its admission in accordance with the rules of the Charter and United Nations obligations towards other States.

41. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): The question of the representation of China in the United Nations is one which appears regularly on the agenda of each session of the General Assembly. It is not surprising, therefore—and one does not need to be a great scholar to perceive this—that the arguments put forward by delegations are repetitious.

42. The position of the People's Republic of Bulgaria on the question has been clear from the outset: our country has always been in favour of restoring the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China and of expelling from the United Nations the puppet clique of Chiang Kai-shek, which represents only those who set it up in Taiwan and support and maintain it there.

43. Many manoeuvres and arguments—each more unworthy than the last—have been used up to the present to keep the People's Republic of China outside the United Nations and to prevent it from occupying its rightful place in our Organization. One of the favourite manoeuvres in recent years has been to present and put to the vote draft resolutions declaring that the question of the representation of China is an important question within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter, so as to make it possible to invoke the necessity of applying the two-thirds majority rule. The opponents of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations are using this subterfuge in order to prevent a solution of the problem. However, this is a dangerous game, both for the Organization itself and for its Members, including those who make use of these arguments.

44. The question of the representation of China in the United Nations is, of course, an important one, since China is one of the great Powers of our world, a country with an immense territory and with a population of more than 750 million inhabitants, almost one quarter of the population of the earth.

45. At the same time, it is a simple question and a purely procedural one, as China is one of the founding Members of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, being one of the five great Powers. Therefore, the only issue here is one of verifying credentials and not, as some speakers have tried to make us believe, of the admission of a new Member. The discussion, therefore, has no other purpose than to check the credentials of the delegation which appears in the name of China and which claims to represent it in the United Nations.

46. This task is made simpler by the fact that we are discussing the representation of a country which is easily identifiable and which has the characteristics already mentioned: a great Power with a population of more than 750 million inhabitants, with a territory of about 10 million square kilometres and a permanent member of the Security Council. We must not lose sight of the fact that what is at stake is the representation of a country having these characteristics and not the characteristics mentioned in the statement made by the representative of the United States of America, Mr. Wiggins, when he said that what is involved is a delegation representing some 13 million inhabitants. What is involved is the representation of China and not the representation of 13 million inhabitants.

47. On the other hand, if one considers the arguments put forward by the United States delegation in its statement in the General Assembly, it is clear that this delegation cannot deny that the question under discussion—that of the representation of China in the United Nations—is only a question of procedure. “What is at stake in this procedural issue”, said Mr. Wiggins, “is not the question of the representation of China alone, but also a broader issue . . .”. And Mr. Wiggins concluded that the question was one of “our procedures” [1713th meeting, para. 34].

48. However, paragraph 2 of Article 18 of the Charter enumerates all the important questions which must be decided by a two-thirds majority of Members present and voting, while the decisions on other questions, including that of the determination of new categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, are adopted by a simple majority of members present and voting. On the other hand, one must not lose sight of the fact that the representation of States Members of the United Nations is not a new question. It is a procedural question which, whenever the General Assembly has had to deal with it, has been decided by simple majority. At each session, the Credentials Committee has had to pronounce upon the representation of all the States Members, and each time the General Assembly has settled this question by a simple majority of Members present and voting. When Mr. Wiggins admitted that the question of the representation of China is a procedural question, the whole artificial structure erected by the United States delegation in its statement of 12 November 1968 on the questions referred to in paragraph 2 of Article 18 collapsed pitifully. Not a single one of these cases applies in the present instance, and Mr. Wiggins proved this by stressing the fact that this is a matter “of the representation of any State which is a Member of this Organization” [ibid., para. 33].

49. Thus even the arguments of the representative of the United States of America, however extensive they may be, only go to confirm the fact that what is involved is the representation of a State which is a Member of the United Nations, a question which is decided by a simple majority of the Members present and voting.

50. Other delegations have dwelt on the motives and reasons which lead the United States of America to oppose so violently the restoration of the lawful rights of China in the United Nations. However, if it is in the interests of the United States of America to the People's Republic of China outside the United Nations so that it can continue to maintain bases in Taiwan—bases which constitute a constant threat to peace and security in the Far East and throughout the world—this is certainly not in the interests of the States Members. Such a situation might have disastrous consequences, not only for that region but for the whole world. Furthermore, the absence of China from the United Nations detracts from the latter's universality and very often condemns it to impotence.

51. The same result as that sought by the United States draft resolution [A/L.548 and Add.1] is obtained—or else aimed at—by a draft resolution presented by the Italian delegation [A/L.550]. This draft calls for the establishment of a committee to study the various points of view on this question and to report to the next session of the General

Assembly. Such a study of a question as simple as this could only have the effect of postponing—although somewhat more gracefully—the restoration of the lawful rights of China in the United Nations. That is why, indeed, the United States has declared itself in favour of this draft resolution, which merely supports its point of view. On the other hand, such an approach would give those who are in favour of the theory of the two Chinas the possibility and opportunity to indulge in much oratory. The debates which might follow the adoption of such a proposal would provide an opportunity for the opponents of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China and would serve them as a pretext for developing their theories and thus delay a decision on the question.

52. The People's Republic of Bulgaria has always been opposed to the theory of the two Chinas. There is only one China, and that is the People's Republic of China. Furthermore, we are opposed to any procrastination in a matter so important as that of enabling China to participate in the work of the United Nations. For this reason, our delegation will vote against the draft resolution presented by the Italian delegation.

53. The proper procedure to follow in solving the question of the representation of China in the United Nations is that laid down in the Charter. What must be done is to restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in our Organization, to recognize the representative of its Government as the only lawful representative of China in the United Nations and immediately to expel the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the seats which they unlawfully occupy in this Organization and in all the bodies affiliated with it. Only in this way, in a question such as this, can the States Members serve the interests of the United Nations and those of international peace and security.

54. Mr. BOUATTOURA (Algeria) (*translated from French*): As this is our first statement since the return of our President, Mr. Arenales, we take this opportunity at the outset to tell him how glad we are that he is now restored to health and can guide our efforts—as we are convinced he will—towards successful results.

55. As has been pointed out here, the important debates—those dealing with disarmament, *apartheid*, the Middle East, in short those problems that are most closely connected with the maintenance and safeguarding of peace among nations—have been monopolizing our attention in a chronic and painful manner, have been exacerbating international relations, wearying public opinion and frustrating men of goodwill. That is all the more reason for being unable to understand how those whose most categorical assertions are regularly called into question can still unreservedly and unhesitatingly resort to devices which are palliatives rather than remedies.

56. Algeria does not intend to reaffirm today its own well-known position; we shall confine ourselves to a brief examination of some of the main arguments developed during the debate against the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. It has been argued that this was not a question of restoring the rights of a Government which does not enjoy any. There is

scarcely any need to emphasize that the Assembly, in including this item on its agenda, has dealt with this argument as it deserves.

57. Let us add that the United Nations has never conferred—and cannot confer—the status of Member on Governments, but has reserved that prerogative for States. As was rightly pointed out [1714th meeting] by the representative of Australia, the problem is that of the representation of China in the United Nations. In other words, who can and should represent China? Once again, the problem is not one of ascertaining whether China should be excluded or admitted; the question remains one of ascertaining who should issue its credentials to the Chinese delegation and which delegation it is the Organization's duty to recognize. Some have invited us to recognize "realities" of the region, that is, in fact, to recognize two entities. As was very correctly pointed out here by Mr. Kabanda of Rwanda, if there is one essential point on which the Assembly is unanimous, it is that "the Chinese State . . . is a Member of the United Nations, a founding Member, one of the five privileged members of the Security Council" [1718th meeting, para. 5]. As he pointed out further on, it is not, as a matter of fact, a question of admitting a new Member. This fundamental element, which was reaffirmed in the statement that we have just quoted, could not be rejected even by those who oppose the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

58. There is no longer any doubt that the reference to Article 18 of the Charter was introduced for the purpose of obstructing the one logical, practical and equitable solution which ought to have been adopted. In order to justify this reference to Article 18, the view was expressed that the matter involved simultaneously both the expulsion and the admission of a Member, that it was a question concerning the maintenance of international peace and security, and, lastly, that a change in the status of a permanent member of the Security Council was in question.

59. One may well wonder who wants to exclude whom and who wants to admit whom. Is it a question of excluding China? Is it a question of admitting China? It is surely enough to look at the desks in the General Assembly and at the table in the Security Council to realize that China is indeed a Member of the Organization. Quite obviously, there is no question of excluding it, and even less of admitting it.

60. As for the maintenance of international peace and security, it will suffice for me to point out that if it proved possible to put an end to the first war in Viet-Nam, that was partly due to the fact that China was a party to the settlement of the conflict. If the Korean War was stopped, that was due to the fact that to some extent China was also a party to the settlement of the conflict. If guarantees for nuclear security have not yet been accepted, it is partly due to the fact that China is not a party in working them out. If it has hitherto not been possible to establish equilibrium in Asia, and therefore in the world, this is partly due to the fact that China is not a party to the necessary settlement.

61. Is it really a question of changing the status of a permanent member? Not at all, since one of two things

must be true: either one really believes that the representatives of the authorities established in Taiwan lawfully represent the China which is a permanent member of the Security Council, and in this case it would be high time for them to fulfil their proper responsibilities, for example by giving, in the same way as the other permanent members, guarantees concerning nuclear security on behalf of China; or else one must bow to the evidence and draw all the normal conclusions that flow from the absence of such representativeness and begin by restoring the rights of the People's Republic of China.

62. The draft resolutions sponsored by the United States [A/L.548 and Add.1] and by Italy and a few other countries [A/L.550] cannot escape the test of some degree of logic and rigour. If it is admitted that there is a Chinese State that is a founding Member of the Organization and a permanent member of the Security Council, then it is necessary to accept the only lawful credentials, those of the People's Republic of China, which alone is able to assume all the responsibilities of a permanent member. If one insists on thrusting the representatives of the authorities installed in Taiwan into China's seat, then one continues to create all the conditions conducive to permanent international disorder and disequilibrium. Some, of course, would like to retain the illusion of the two Chinas, while others would maintain that of one China and one Taiwan. It is well-known, however, that such a fiction cannot become a reality, since in the first place and in any case it would not be possible to avoid raising the elementary question, who represents China? Quite clearly, there cannot be two Chinas, just as there cannot be two Italys or two Japans. There cannot be one China and one Taiwan, just as there cannot be one American State and one Fire Island, or one United Kingdom and one Scilly Isles.

63. Certain charges, based on its intentions rather than on its actions, have been brought against the People's Republic of China concerning, among other things, its right to liberate Taiwan. If, as everyone freely acknowledges, Taiwan is Chinese, it would be perfectly normal for Chinese territory, including Taiwan, to be unified. What has been lawful for all revolutions which have taken over all of a nation's territory is also lawful for China. We cannot see how those who accuse the People's Republic of China "of invading Taiwan" can simultaneously give their alliance and signify their support of those who are pursuing the senseless dream of invading the Chinese mainland. You have been told here that China is calling for a necessary transformation of the United Nations, that China has declared that the Security Council has failed in its task with regard to international peace and security. Better still, quotations have been cited to accuse China of having proclaimed that the United Nations must correct its errors and undertake far-reaching reorganization and reform, that it must admit all its past errors and remedy them and lastly that the United Nations Charter must be re-examined and revised by both large and small countries.

64. Points of view may diverge, but who can deny that reforms and transformations are necessary? Evaluations may be different, but who has not felt a certain frustration, a certain discouragement, at our Organization's failure to solve such vital problems as those of Palestine, the Middle East, Rhodesia, southern Africa and nuclear security? With

respect to these matters, the Secretary-General himself has called for a new examination of conscience; he has sounded the tocsin. Must we then believe that those who profess the same fears, who show the same anxiety as the Secretary-General—who is the real conscience of the international community—have to find themselves denied the right to participate in the work of our Organization?

65. Moreover, it is impossible not to feel somewhat uneasy when one hears the delegations of certain great Powers make nervous references to the discord and disorder that might be brought about by the return of China to our midst. This same nervousness characterizes these same delegations whenever essential questions have to be discussed. This was again evident a few days ago when we were dealing with *apartheid*. It is these same delegations, with their conservative ways of thinking, that blame the rise of the colonial peoples, as well as the rise of China, for the introduction of these elements of discord and disorder. Those who permit such an accusation to be levelled against China ought to realize that they themselves are open to the same accusations, which are equally unfounded in their case.

66. Some have come here without any inhibitions or apparent embarrassment and insisted that China's rights in the United Nations should not be restored, first, because she would pursue a policy of aggression and, secondly, because she would hold to a militant position. Certain specific cases and certain situations have been cited in that connexion, but it is sufficient to point out what is happening in Korea, in Viet-Nam, or more broadly speaking, throughout the world, to realize that if China adheres to her revolutionary attitudes—which she has an absolute right to do—she can in no case be accused of aggression, especially by those who refuse to grant her the right to be lawfully represented in our Organization.

67. How is it possible to accuse a country of aggression when it is an established fact that it is not participating in any specific conflict? How is it possible to allow this accusation of aggression to be made by those same countries which, on behalf of artificial alliances, are participating in a war of intervention with the obvious purpose of violating international agreements and crushing national aspirations?

68. As a variation on this same theme, we have been told that China is not a peace-loving country and is therefore not qualified to participate in the work of the Organization. What peace are we talking about? Are we talking about the *pax Americana* or the *pax Britannica*? If we are talking about the colonial peace, the Zionist peace and *apartheid*, then obviously China, like a great number of States Members, has no love for that peace. On the other hand, if we are talking about a peace based on national independence, sovereign equality and mutual respect for national interests, then we have some reason to believe that China adheres to this conception of peace.

69. It is not extrapolations built up on the basis of a few quotations that are going to alter this twofold reality that all the world must face, namely, that co-existence is an established fact and that revolution is perpetual by its very nature. As has been proved by the peoples of Asia, Africa

and Latin America, revolutionary war is one of the ways through which conditions of international peace are created. As colonial, neo-colonial and imperial experience has shown, an imposed peace is one of the ways through which conditions of international strife are created.

70. Before concluding, it might perhaps be useful to point out certain facts which, because of the nature of our debates and their abstract character, seem to be ignored, namely, that the representatives of the authorities established in Taiwan are no longer in fact considered either as representing China or as being invested with the prerogatives belonging to the representatives of a permanent member of the Security Council.

71. In spite of a certain dense fog, it is already possible to perceive that a diligent search is going on for the terms of an arrangement that would inevitably affect first Asia and then our Organization. This is due to the fact that the nations concerned want an Asia which is not dominated by any Power and which also is not threatened with domination by any Power.

72. One could not put it better than to say of the nations of Asia that "what they fear are outside threats, or armed attack or, more likely, subversion" [714th meeting, para. 210]. These are the words of our distinguished colleague, Mr. Shaw, the representative of Australia. No, Asia does not want to be dominated by the United States or by any other Power. No, Asia does not want to be threatened by the United States or by any other Power. Yes, outside threats, which are essentially American threats, are what Asia fears most. The day when those threats, the day when that domination, have disappeared for ever will be the day when Asia will regain peace and harmony. From this point of view the failure of the attempt at domination, the failure of threats to Viet-Nam, are a source of optimism and reassurance.

73. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): The General Assembly has once again under consideration the question of the representation of China. This question has returned to the agenda year after year, owing partly to the importance ascribed to it by those States which claim to speak on behalf of the totalitarian communist régime on mainland China and which seek to expel, without any justifiable reason, the Republic of China from the Organization which it helped to found on behalf of the Chinese nation. Those self-appointed spokesmen have taken upon themselves the unenviable task of trying to convince enlightened world opinion of the peaceful and neighbourly intentions of a long-time and obdurate practitioner of Maoism. They are compelled by circumstances best known to themselves to turn a deaf ear to the innumerable and categorical pronouncements of Chinese Communist leaders, as well as to ignore recent history. Their depiction of mainland China as an essentially peaceful nation whose actions have been exaggerated and misunderstood is, unfortunately, completely at odds with the facts. Thus they have rendered themselves vulnerable to self-delusion or worse. If their action were of no real import or grave consequence for other nations, or indeed for the whole United Nations, then they would be at liberty to pursue it at their own risk and to their own detriment. But since the question impinges on the security and well-being of many

States, including my country, Thailand, as well as the orderly and progressive development of the world Organization—perhaps its very existence—it is imperative that such action should not go unchallenged.

74. It has not been possible for Thailand and other nations which live in close proximity to mainland China to ignore its existence. We are indeed fully conscious of the People's Republic of China as a living reality. The political realities prevailing in that area not only are too obvious but are also keenly felt by us. Since its establishment, mainland China has relentlessly and conscientiously sought to impose its hegemony on neighbouring countries by various means, including naked armed aggression, insidious aggression under the label of "wars of national liberation", subversion and infiltration. Its major export is revolution. It is single-mindedly dedicated to the overthrow of legitimate authorities of neighbouring States without exception. Among the more recent victims of Chinese Communist aggression are numbered not a few countries which have been friendly to a fault in their dealings with Communist China.

75. It gives my delegation neither pleasure nor pride to relate that India, Indonesia, Burma and Cambodia have since tasted the bitter fruit of experience. India still faces the threat of renewed open aggression across its northern frontiers and has to contend with Chinese Communist subversive activities in Nagaland. Indonesia has learned of new preparations, under the auspices of Peking, to overthrow its legitimate Government after certain perpetrators of the abortive Communist putsch have reviewed the situation with Chinese Communist authorities in Peking. In a typical broadcast by Radio Peking, acting for the Burmese Communist Party Central Committee, on 18 March 1968, "all oppressed people" throughout Burma were urged to "unite to overthrow the paper tiger—the Ne Win military government". Even Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia, in the face of growing Communist Chinese activities in his country has admitted in his press statement of 13 September last year that "I did not expect China to strike a blow at the Cambodia of Sihanouk and provide such thorough support for the local Communists against our régime and our people." Moreover, Chinese Communist leadership has in effect declared a guerrilla war on Thailand and committed provocations against the legitimate authorities of Malaysia, Nepal, the Philippines, Ceylon and many other countries both near and far.

76. Other victims of Chinese Communist aggression have not fared so well. The Republic of Viet-Nam and the Kingdom of Laos are deep in the throes of costly and destructive struggles to defend and preserve their existence as free and independent nations from the onslaughts of the North Viet-Nam Communists who are aided and abetted by Communist China. Regarding the war in Viet-Nam, Radio Moscow in no uncertain terms on 22 May 1968 attested to the fact that "China does not desire talks concerning Viet-Nam; China wants war... Yes, dear friends, Mao Tse-tung desires that bloodshed in Viet-Nam be prolonged". Regarding Laos, it may be recalled that Communist China, a signatory to the Geneva Agreement of 1962, broke the said Agreement even before the ink was dry. Another example is the systematic and brutal persecution conducted against the people of Tibet by the Peking régime. Revered

places of worship in Tibet have practically all been destroyed and converted into headquarters for suppressive operations.

77. Finally, the Korean experience should have taught the world, and particularly this Organization, a lesson as it was the first time, and up to now the only time, that this world body by a General Assembly resolution [498 (V)] and in no unequivocal terms found that "the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, by giving aid and assistance to those who were already committing aggression against the United Nations forces there has itself engaged in aggression in Korea."

78. Communist China has indeed participated in almost all the major crises in Asia and the Pacific. It is no use talking about the need for its participation. What is needed is its non-participation, its non-interference in the domestic affairs of other States and its constructive co-operation in our common endeavours to make the world a better and safer place to live in.

79. In the light of the foregoing, it is pertinent to ask whether the Chinese Communists accept the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations and are both willing and able to carry out those obligations. Statements have been made before this Assembly to the effect that the presence of Communist China in the United Nations "is a dire necessity for the strengthening of the authority and prestige of the Organization". One may indeed question whether the opposite is not more true. The Thai delegation entertains serious doubts about the willingness or the ability of mainland China to fulfill the basic requirements as prescribed by Article 4 (1) of the Charter. It is entirely a matter of conjecture not only whether Communist China would be willing to accept charter obligations or to carry them out faithfully, if at all, but also whether Communist China would wish to join the Organization which it has denounced and reviled and whose noble principles and purposes it has abused and defiled both by word and by deed. Incidentally, none of the advocates of Communist Chinese representation in the United Nations has been able to give us any indication as to whether it actually wishes to be in the United Nations.

80. What prospect will there be for peace and security with the presence in the United Nations of a ruthless instigator of wars of conquest and expansion? One shudders to think what would have been the outcome of many issues, peace-keeping and otherwise, confronting the United Nations if Communist China had been in the Security Council and the General Assembly. Do we really need to have Communist China in the United Nations to prove to the world community that the Security Council can be made to be completely impotent and totally ineffective?

81. In the non-political fields, one also wonders how international co-operation in solving many outstanding problems and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all would be facilitated by the presence of a régime which wilfully launched the "cultural revolution" to obliterate the age-old heritage and cultural monuments of its own people. Even the greater part of the socialist group has found it

impossible to co-operate with Communist China, and it is not difficult for us to appreciate the reasons.

82. Furthermore, how would the inclusion of a Power which disparages and decries any effort to attain the desired regulation of armament or complete disarmament be expected to inspire greater confidence among States Members of the Organization about achieving concrete results in this vital area of its responsibilities? As long ago as 1957, at the Moscow Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties, Mao Tse-tung, according to *Kommunist No. 8*, May 1968, "advocated the Anti-Marxist idea that world imperialism could be defeated only as the result of a war involving missiles and nuclear weapons". Such continues to be the frame of mind of the present leaders in Peking. Communist China continues, as we are all aware, to heap scorn on the nuclear test ban Treaty¹ and to affront and defy world public opinion in respect of nuclear tests. It also blatantly and summarily rejected the Secretary-General's invitation to participate in the Non-Nuclear-Weapons States Conference held in Geneva recently.²

83. It has been asserted or suggested that representation by the Communist Chinese régime, if permitted, in our Organization would turn the tiger into a lamb, a recalcitrant outlaw into a respectable and responsible member of the international community. If such a transformation could be assured, the Thai delegation for one would feel that brighter prospects of peace, security and freedom for small countries now being threatened by the bellicose dogma and expansionist policy of Communist China could well justify its proposed participation in the affairs of the United Nations. But, unfortunately, the record of events and their present trends do not allow for such optimism, and any assumption to the contrary is merely wishful thinking and is entirely divorced from reality. Since the start of the "cultural revolution" Communist China has isolated itself even further from the rest of the world. It champions armed violence and xenophobic hatred. In the *People's Daily* of 30 November 1967 it was stated flatly that "The Chinese have no desire to become Members of the United Nations".

84. The aim of universality, however desirable in itself, is not of paramount importance to the United Nations. Neither the size of the country nor its nuclear capability is the final determinant of its representation in the world Organization. They may be pertinent considerations but they have to be considered in the light of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

85. In marked contrast, the benign presence of the Republic of China in our Organization has ensured that at least 13 million people in Taiwan who have managed to escape the crushing yoke of Communist oppression continue to have a stable, legitimate and lawful representation of their interests and aspirations in the world body, and an opportunity to contribute to its growth for the good of mankind in consonance with the aims and objectives of the Charter. Those who plead that others should accept the existence of Communist China should bring themselves to accept the existence of Taiwan, which is under the efficient

administration of the Government of the Republic of China. The Thai delegation shares the opinion of countless observers from all over the world in its profound admiration for the successes and accomplishments of the Republic of China in the economic and other fields of human endeavour. For instance, Hugh Trevor-Roper, Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford University, wrote in the London *Sunday Times* on 4 February 1968 that Taiwan

"... is not an old garrison: It is a new society, solid, prosperous and self-confident. In that social laboratory the displaced Nationalist Government of China has solved, by rational, liberal methods, the problems which had defied it on the mainland, and it has solved them in a way which makes the Communist solutions seem not only obscurantist but, in some ways, ineffective".

86. Furthermore, the Thai delegation is gratified to note the peaceful and progressive inclinations of the Republic of China and its support for regional co-operative efforts, which are clearly a reflection of the traditional Asian spirit of tolerance and sense of communal belonging ingrained in the thinking of its wise and able leaders. It may be said without qualification that the representation, participation and co-operation of the Republic of China in the Organization have served to enhance its prestige and viability to the benefit of us all.

87. From the course of the general debate on the item before us during the course of a week, it should have become evident to all that the question is one that carries portents for the future development—if not the survival—of our Organization and cannot but have a profound effect on the important issues of peace, freedom and human progress. The stakes involved are of momentous significance and the outcome of weighty consequence. There is no doubt in the minds of the fourteen co-sponsors of draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1, including Thailand, that this item poses an important question of the first magnitude and must accordingly allow as close to a unanimous exercise of option by Member States as possible. The Thai delegation is confident that when the matter is put to a vote and the roll call is taken, better judgement will carry the day, and the decision passed will be based on a reasoned and realistic appreciation of facts and not on the opportunism of temporary accommodation. My delegation urges the General Assembly to affirm once again that its previous decision "that any proposal to change the representation of China is an important question", under the terms of Article 18 of the Charter, remains valid.

88. The second draft resolution, which was introduced by Albania and other co-sponsors, appears in document A/L.549 and Add.1. Apart from its tendentious and bellicose language, it calls for the expulsion of the representation of the Republic of China from the United Nations and its replacement by representatives of Peking. In addition to the reasons I have outlined, it must also be recalled that the Republic of China is a founding Member of the United Nations and has been accorded the right by the wording of the Charter to be a permanent member of the Security Council. It follows that right cannot be summarily dismissed by a handful of the United Nations membership. Expulsion of an original and permanent member cannot be taken so lightly. All the more so when arguments advanced for such a drastic and unjust course of

¹ Moscow Treaty signed 5 August 1963.

² Held 29 August to 28 September 1968.

action are so contrary to the provisions of the Charter and in direct conflict with the prevailing facts and circumstances.

89. Draft resolution A/L.550, submitted by the delegation of Italy and others, has been debated fairly thoroughly by a number of delegations. One obvious outcome of the debate is that the draft resolution has, unwittingly or otherwise, unified the two sides of the main China question. On that basis the draft resolution does not stand a chance of moving the question off dead centre as its proponents claim it will. The Thai delegation, therefore, sees no merit in the draft resolution from either the procedural or the substantive point of view and will accordingly vote against it, as it has done on previous occasions.

90. The solution to various world problems does not, my delegation submits, lie in the representation or participation of Communist China in the United Nations. Rather, it lies in Communist China's willingness to recognize the realities of life in Asia, the Pacific and other regions of the world—that no nation, however small, however fragile its independence may be, is prepared to be dominated and controlled by the Chinese overlord. Their national aspirations are to be free from domination and control by outside forces, from whatever quarter, and not to be subservient to anybody. At the same time, there is a growing trend among them towards regional consciousness and regional solidarity, and towards participation in constructive undertakings on the basis of equal partnership and mutuality of interests.

91. Communist China has no role in the United Nations or in the international community so long as it persists in resorting to "wars of national liberation" as its cardinal policy. If and when mainland China, irrespective of its political ideology, renounces its warlike policies and ceases its direction and support of dissident movements to overthrow the legitimate authorities of such countries as India, Burma, Malaysia, Laos, Cambodia, Viet-Nam, Indonesia, Korea and Thailand, China's role as a great nation inheriting the ancient and well-respected civilization of Asia will inevitably be restored to it. But so long as mainland China stubbornly refuses to give due recognition to such facts of life, it will continue to have no place in the United Nations; it will have no place in the community of civilized nations nor, for that matter, in the conscience of mankind.

92. Mr. ALARCÓN DE QUESADA (Cuba) (*translated from Spanish*): The General Assembly is about to conclude what has become an annual debate on the problem of the representation of China. If these discussions have had any tangible, practical result, it has been to make the opposing positions completely clear.

93. No one today can question the real nature of the matter under discussion, or ignore the reasons for which no just solution consistent with the interests of the Organization has yet been found. Some delegations are, however, still trying to introduce elements of confusion in our deliberations and to juggle with the precise interpretation of facts which have formed part of the history of the United Nations for two decades. For this reason, I should like to give a brief summary of the main factors which feature in this question.

94. China is a single State, a founding Member of this Organization to which the Charter signed at San Francisco indeed granted the status of a permanent member of the Security Council. It is completely absurd, therefore, to discuss its admission to the United Nations—which, moreover, nobody has proposed to do.

95. To speak of the admission or expulsion of a Member in connexion with this problem can only be interpreted as an attempt to obscure the truth and to mislead the unwary. Furthermore, the question is too long-standing for anyone to try to adulterate it with belated sophistry. Specifically, for the last nineteen years, this Assembly has been called upon to decide who are the legitimate representatives of this State. It is merely a question of confirming the consequence of facts which occurred almost two decades ago and which are now finally a part of history.

96. In 1949, a revolutionary movement triumphed in China, and this undoubtedly constitutes one of the most important events of modern times. During the past century, the immense territory of China had whetted the voracious appetite of imperialism, and its large population had passed through all the stages of exploitation, poverty and political oppression as a consequence of the double yoke imposed by foreign colonialists and their feudal servants.

97. The working masses of China waged a long and heroic struggle against their oppressors, who inch by inch were routed in every corner of that country's mainland territory. The power of the people was thereby established and China began its upward march towards socialism.

98. The progress achieved by the Chinese workers in the last nineteen years is well known and requires no further comments here. It is sufficient to state that the old China, beset by hunger, poverty and backwardness, has disappeared once and for all, giving way to a new society, without exploiters or exploited, where modern industry, science and technology are a powerful reality. The victory of the people's revolution in China has become an important link in that process of national emancipation which, since the end of the Second World War, has been constantly developing in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

99. It is for this reason that the Chinese revolution has incurred the wrath of the North American imperialists. During the period of the civil war, the Washington Government openly intervened in Chinese affairs, tried by every possible means to maintain the crumbling régime of Chiang Kai-shek and finally occupied the Chinese province of Taiwan, where it has provided refuge to that régime up to the present day.

100. Ever since that time the American Seventh Fleet has been usurping this inalienable part of Chinese territory, in flagrant violation of all the principles of international law. If a group of anti-national and anti-Chinese renegades still remains in Taiwan, this is due exclusively to North American intervention. To claim that such a fiction constitutes a sovereign State is to concede to the Yankee Fleet the power of bestowing the external attributes of sovereignty. To attempt to give this group of traitors the status of representatives before the international community is an insult to all independent States which do not owe their existence to the guns of some foreign Power.

101. The Yankee occupation of Taiwan is an international crime, a violation of Chinese sovereignty and an attack on the rights of all peoples. Such a crime cannot create rights of any kind. The arbitrary, illegal and unjustifiable situation has existed for nearly two decades as an expression of the aggressive and interventionist policy of the imperialist Government of the United States. The prolonged existence of the crime does not change its nature.

102. For this reason my delegation wishes, once again, categorically to reject the so-called theory of the two Chinas in any of its forms. Any attempt to accord rights to the refugee clique in Taiwan, any scheme aimed at reaching an illusory accommodation with the alleged Republic of China, would in our judgement be politically reprehensible, morally unjust and historically irrational.

103. There is only one China and since 1949 it can only be represented by the People's Republic. It alone is entitled to the seat of which it has been deprived for nineteen years, including its permanent place in the Security Council. It is a single entity to which the island of Taiwan also belongs.

104. What has been happening since that time in this Organization is the unusual spectacle of a group of individuals who, while lacking any legitimate mandate, have participated in our work as if they represented a founding Member of the Organization, whose real representatives are prevented from occupying their rightful place.

105. If this absurd situation has persisted for such a long time, it has been because of the pressure brought to bear by the North American Government. For twelve years, from 1949 to 1961, the North American delegation prevented this Assembly from even discussing the problem of the representation of China. Those were the times when they still harboured the illusion of invading the mainland territory from Taiwan and subjecting it to the scheming counter-revolutionary régime. Those were also the times when a large part of mankind, still under the colonial yoke, was unable to participate in these deliberations.

106. However, times began to change and finally, at the sixteenth session, the question was included on the agenda of the General Assembly. It was then that the North American delegation worked out a new anti-China scheme: the arbitrary requirement of a two-thirds majority in any vote taken to solve this problem. That is to say that, surprisingly enough, an issue which it had previously not considered deserving of discussion became an "important question". The essential purpose of this manoeuvre is no other than to make use of the voting machinery, on which the North Americans are still counting, in order to impose an unlawful and arbitrary decision which has nothing to do with what is set forth in Article 18 of the Charter.

107. A decision on the North American draft resolution [A/L.548/Add.1] implies a prejudgement of the substance of the problem and cannot be separated from the attitude adopted toward that problem. No one who claims to want to solve the problem of the proper representation of China, not even those who say they are making an objective approach to the problem, could vote for the North American draft and remain consistent. To adopt such a draft presupposes a distortion of the very nature of the

problem under discussion, which is and always has been a mere matter of credentials; in reality, it would be tantamount to supporting the policy of aggression followed by the North American Government against China.

108. This year once again a draft resolution (A/L.550), sponsored by five countries, has been submitted which would set up a committee to study and explore the possibilities of settling the problem of the representation of China. Such a decision is in no way procedural and reflects the adoption of a definite position on the problem of substance. The formation of a study committee would be tantamount to disregarding the indisputable right of the People's Republic of China to occupy its seat. None of the Governments which have here undertaken to represent the various States Members has had to undergo this intolerable procedure in order to accredit its delegation. Such a procedure would constitute a violation of the sovereign rights of the People's Republic of China and an inadmissible transgression against the principle of the equality of all States.

109. Furthermore, how could we explain to public opinion that after such prolonged debates it is necessary to form a special committee to study this question? Some outside observer might perhaps suggest that it would be desirable for us to establish a special committee to study why the discussions here are not achieving the results desired by the peoples. It is well known, moreover, that a similar committee was born and died, painlessly and ingloriously, when this problem was first examined some considerable time ago. It cannot fail to arouse suspicion that the North American delegation, the same which has opposed the discussion of this matter for twelve years, the representatives of a Government which created Chiang Kai-shek and which excluded the People's Republic of China from the United Nations, has announced that it will vote in favour of this draft resolution.

110. There can be no more than one lawful and acceptable solution for the item now being considered by the Assembly. It is that which is advocated by sixteen delegations, including that of Cuba (A/L.549 and Add.1). There is no other way than to restore to the People's Republic of China its full rights in this Organization without further delay. This same measure must go hand in hand with the immediate expulsion of the usurping group, which was liquidated by the Chinese people and buried by history some time ago. This measure has always been, and continues to be, a mere matter of credentials. If, as a consequence of the arbitrary conduct of the United States, this problem has been made into a matter to be decided upon by the Assembly, the latter only has to do so by simple majority.

111. This debate has unequivocally demonstrated the fairness of our proposal. Its juridical and political bases are today indisputable. Certain specious arguments, devoid of substance and completely foreign to the subject before us, have been advanced against the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China.

112. Today, it is clear that there are only two opposing positions in this debate. On the one hand we have the principles of law, the interests of the international com-

munity, and the duty to do justice to a founding Member State of the Organization. On the other we find the interests of North American imperialism, its policy of playing the policeman against all popular movements and its attempts to use the United Nations as a tool for its plans of world domination.

113. The North American delegation is trying to dictate rules to this Assembly. In his statement, the representative of the United States ventured to set himself up as a judge regarding the policy of the People's Republic of China and to rule whether or not that policy is in keeping with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

114. The Assembly is entitled to ask: What right does the North American delegation have to speak in the name of the Charter signed at San Francisco? The right acquired, perhaps, through its brutal aggression against the Vietnamese people? The right acquired through its criminal attack against Korea in 1950? The right resulting from its interventions in Guatemala, Cuba, the Congo, the Dominican Republic, or the Middle East?

115. The imperialist Government of the United States is pursuing throughout the world a policy of aggression, threats and interference in the affairs of other countries. Through its world-wide repressive policy against revolutionary movements, through its attempts to subjugate all nations, North American imperialism has placed itself outside international law and has become the arch-enemy of all peoples.

116. The attitude of the Washington Government towards the representation of China in the United Nations is part of its world-wide counter-revolutionary policy. In trying to exclude from this Organization the representatives of the revolutionary power which has emerged from the struggles of the Chinese people, and to impose in its place a clique which only represents a past of disgraceful subjection to the foreigner, North American imperialism is denying peoples their inalienable right to displace unjust social régimes and to assume the form of a national government best suited to their legitimate interests. This attempt obviously contravenes the principle of self-determination of nations and constitutes a serious threat to the peoples of the third world, who are eager to win complete independence and to transform their social structures.

117. For the foregoing reasons, the Cuban delegation believes that the fair solution of the problem of the representation of China is a matter of principles. For these reasons, we have co-sponsored draft resolution A/L.549 and Add.1. For the same reasons, we shall also vote against the drafts contained in document A/L.548 and Add.1 and in document A/L.550.

118. The PRESIDENT: There are no further speakers in the debate. I shall now call on representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting.

119. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia) (*translated from French*): On 11 November, when I spoke [1711th meeting] on the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and in all the organs connected with this international organiza-

tion, the draft resolution A/L.550 submitted by Belgium, Chile, Iceland, Italy and Luxembourg had not yet been circulated.

120. In spite of all the sincere friendship which I feel for the sponsors of this draft, I must say that the explanations given by their representative from this rostrum are not convincing.

121. Draft resolution A/L.550 proposes the establishment of a committee

“... with the mandate of exploring and studying the situation in all its aspects in order to make the appropriate recommendations to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session 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 of the United Nations”.

122. All Members of the Organization will no doubt recall that the Chinese question has now been examined in our Organization for almost twenty years. All aspects of the problem have already been considered, and if it has proved impossible to solve this question, this is due solely to the systematic opposition and the unrealistic position of the Government of the United States, and not to the complex character of the question itself.

123. In this connexion, I should like to quote the following passages from a book written and published this very year by the former Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations, George W. Ball:

“Today, in defiance of the flow of history, we remain committed to the fanciful proposition that the Nationalist government of China is in fact the government of the seven hundred and fifty million people of that ancient land. But our fidelity is undiminished. We have gone to great pains to maintain the position of Nationalist China not only as a member of the United Nations, but as the occupant of one of the five permanent seats on the Security Council—a seat established under the United Nations Charter on the assumption, now palpably incorrect, that China was one of the five great world powers, and hence capable of joining with the other four in enforcing world peace.

“It is, I think, undignified for the United States, holding as it does a unique position of prestige and responsibility, to employ its political muscle to perpetuate a myth in which no other nation believes, and we have paid in hard political coin for our sponsorship of the Nationalist régime. We have made concessions in foreign aid and less tangible media to governments that did not merit them, simply to gain their vote in the General Assembly, and we have brought pressure on our friends in a manner embarrassing both to them and to us. In short, our position of lonely champion for an unpopular cause has given our Far Eastern policy a slightly crankish appearance. Tied to a myth that has lost whatever romantic flavour it might once have had, we have—at least until lately—been the main enemy of the Red Chinese government in Peking. In addition to opposing its membership in the United Nations we have obdurately refused to accord it official recognition and have main-

tained an iron embargo on all trade with the mainland, at high cost to our balance of payments".³

124. The former Permanent Representative of the United States at the United Nations—who, incidentally, should have been among us today had it not been for an important historic event with which we are all familiar—concluded, in the same book, as follows:

"I should like, therefore, to see the United States adopt an intellectually defensible position that does credit to our maturity and leadership. I have no illusions that that would make the Red Chinese love us or even moderate their abuse. But it would certainly improve our reputation for realism and good sense and we would clearly be better off if we could stop having to play the mendicant to small nations to obtain their vote for the perpetuation of what the whole world recognizes as an outworn fiction."⁴

125. These revelations about the disloyal manoeuvres of the United States are no news for us. Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts also made such revelations when he wrote:

"Each year the United States spends precious diplomatic capital to secure votes in the UN to block China's admission."⁵

126. Finally, two years ago, Mr. Clayton Fritchey, former Director of Public Affairs of the Permanent Mission of the United States at the United Nations, after his retirement, made the same revelations in an article published in the *New York Post*.

127. Draft resolution A/L.550 emphasizes that the solution should be appropriate to and in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. However, we know that the Charter proclaims

"...respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples".

And, as was pointed out by the Head of the Belgian delegation in his statement to the General Assembly on 10 October 1968, the General Assembly, in December 1965, by 109 votes to none, adopted a resolution [2131 (XX)] on the inadmissibility of intervention in the internal affairs of States, which clearly stated that:

"...all peoples have an inalienable right to complete freedom, the exercise of their sovereignty ...".

This resolution added that:

"...armed intervention is synonymous with aggression ...".

In accordance with this the Assembly declared that:

"No State has the right to intervene directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State" [1689th meeting, para. 18].

³ G. Ball, *The Discipline of Power* (Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1968), pp. 181-182.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pages 224-225.

⁵ E. M. Kennedy, *Decisions for a Decade* (Garden City, New York, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968), page 165.

128. If the United Nations wishes to remain true to itself, and to its principles and purposes, it must immediately restore the entirely lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and in all the organs connected with this international Organization; and it must expel all the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek who are unlawfully occupying the seats of the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

129. It is not a "punishment"—to use the very term employed by the representative of the United States on 12 November 1968 from this rostrum [1713th meeting]—but merely because this Chiang Kai-shek régime, which was overthrown and driven out by the Chinese people, no longer represents China and the Chinese people, and only maintains itself with difficulty in the Chinese province of Taiwan thanks to the support of the American Army.

130. Mr. George W. Ball, in his book, has written the following about the absurdity of the American policy of persisting in claiming that Chiang Kai-shek's régime represents China:

"The myth has grown so threadbare as to be embarrassing. No one any longer believes that the Generalissimo and his Taiwanese army will ever return to the mainland or that they would be wildly welcomed by the Chinese people if they did; yet each refusal to put aside this myth paralyzes any initiatives that might bring about a more realistic position towards Peking."⁶

131. In his statement on 12 November 1968, the representative of the United States reproached the People's Republic of China for claiming

"...the right to conquer and abolish that Republic, [i.e. the régime of Chiang Kai-shek] by armed force ..."
[1713th meeting, para. 32].

I should like to remind the representative of the United States that it was by armed force that the thirteen united American States rid themselves of the British colonialism of that time and gained their independence, and that it was also by armed force that the North defeated the South in the Civil War. That being so, why reproach the Chinese people for using armed force to settle their internal affairs and re-unify their territory? If any country is to be condemned, it is certainly the United States, which arrogated to itself the right to interfere in the internal affairs of China, which arrogated to itself the right to intervene militarily in the Chinese civil war.

132. In the White Paper entitled *United States Relations with China*, published in 1949 by the State Department, all the documents reveal this illegal United States armed intervention in the Chinese civil war. I should like to stress the fact that the expression "Chinese civil war" is used in this White Paper, as well as the expressions "corrupt", "incompetent", "unpopular, repressive government", to designate the Chiang Kai-shek administration. The White Paper of the State Department also noted the following:

"The Formosan Chinese welcomed the capitulation of the Japanese authorities before the Chinese with immense enthusiasm on 25 October 1945. After fifty years under Japanese control ... they rejoiced at their return to China, which they had idealized as their motherland ...".

⁶ *Op.cit.*, p. 221.

133. Alas! That immense enthusiasm was of short duration. Indeed, after its precipitate flight from the Chinese mainland and its expulsion by the Chinese people, the Chiang Kai-shek administration took refuge in the Chinese province of Taiwan under the protection of the American Army. The Chinese of the Chinese province of Taiwan spontaneously rebelled against that rotten, corrupt and illegal administration of Chiang Kai-shek. Repression was not long in coming. It was brutal and bloody.

134. In his book, the former Permanent Representative of the United States at the United Nations wrote the following on this subject:

“The number of Taiwanese killed will never be known with precision but it probably totalled at least ten thousand out of a population of eight million. Many thousands were thrown into jail where some still remain.”⁷

135. For all the reasons which I already gave in my statement of 11 November 1968 and in the one I am making today, my delegation asks all the delegations of countries which are really independent and devoted to peace and justice to reject draft resolution A/L.550, as well as the American draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1. Instead my delegation asks them to give their support to draft resolution A/L.549 and Add.1, which is sponsored by the non-aligned countries of Africa and Asia.

136. In his statement on 12 November 1968, the United States representative said the following:

“As the General Assembly again takes up the question of the representation of China, its members must have the melancholy sensation of pupils subjected to repeated instruction on a simple proposition that they have long comprehended” [1713th meeting, para. 29].

137. Since the members of the General Assembly, certainly including the United States, have long comprehended these simple propositions, I wonder what reasons led the United States representative to say that he would vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.550, which is aimed at the establishment of a committee to study them.

138. This attitude on the part of the United States, which at first glance seems tortuous and contradictory, and to which attention should be drawn, is explained when one reads the letter of 18 November 1968 [A/7335] which the Permanent Representative of Belgium has addressed to the President of the General Assembly. This letter came to my attention only a few moments ago.

139. It is now clear and beyond dispute that what is proposed in draft resolution A/L.550, sponsored by Belgium and four other countries, is only a repetition of that gunboat policy which was practised against China in the nineteenth century by the Powers of Western imperialism. That gunboat policy consisted in dividing and humiliating China. I shall not go back on what I already said in my statement of 11 November 1968, during which I denounced this policy of dismemberment of China.

140. Today, to our great indignation, an attempt is being made to have the United Nations accept responsibility for

the policy of dismemberment of China which was first adopted in the nineteenth century by the Powers of Western imperialism. My delegation is convinced that all States Members of the United Nations, especially those which have known the domination of colonialism and imperialism, will energetically oppose that policy of dismemberment of China, since it is contrary to the very purposes and principles of the Charter.

141. Before concluding, I should like to say a few words about the lie uttered from this rostrum on 11 November 1968 by the representative of Chiang Kai-shek, who, in a desperate attempt to deceive the members of the General Assembly, claimed that Samdech Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodia's Head of State, had accused the Government of the People's Republic of China of supplying arms to the Red Khmers.

142. I wish to emphasize that Samdech Norodom Sihanouk has never, at any time, accused the Government of the People's Republic of China of supplying arms to the Red Khmers. On the contrary, the Chinese Government has supplied arms and military equipment to Cambodia's Head of State, and has thus enabled the Khmer Royal Armed Forces to defend Cambodia's present borders against aggression by the armed forces of the United States, Saigon and Thailand.

143. As for relations between the Kingdom of Cambodia and the People's Republic of China, despite the hopes of North American imperialism and its satellites, these relations are very good at present and are based on the principles of peaceful co-existence, mutual respect and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

144. Lord CARADON (United Kingdom): For the reasons explained in my statement last year I shall abstain in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/L.550 but I shall once again vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/L.549 and Add.1 and also in favour of the draft resolution in document A/L.548 and Add.1.

145. For many years past I and my predecessors have spoken and voted in favour of the contention that it is right and necessary that the Chinese People's Republic should be seated in this Assembly. In his statement in the general debate on 14 October [1693rd meeting] the British Foreign Secretary once again emphasized our wish to see the United Nations a universal organization including the People's Republic of China. We have constantly advocated that it can benefit neither the United Nations nor the people of China to perpetuate the exclusion of the representatives of the Government of that immense country from the international community. We have urged that all our efforts should be directed not to keeping them out but to persuading them to come in—to come in to share in our search for international understanding, international co-operation and international authority.

146. Our own relations with the People's Republic of China have not been easy. I referred to this last year. There have continued to be serious obstacles in the path of better relations. The treatment of British subjects in China has formed a particularly unhappy feature in our relations. More than a dozen British subjects are known or believed to

⁷ Op.cit., p. 178.

be in detention in China. Access to these people, or information about them, has been refused. However, this deplorable situation does not alter our belief that the People's Republic of China should take its place in the United Nations.

147. In his statement to which I have already referred, my Foreign Secretary has drawn attention to the way in which the continued absence of the People's Republic of China hampers and limits the work of our Organization. We believe that this is an issue of fundamental importance to the United Nations itself and to every Member of the United Nations. It is for that reason that we have for long urged that the Assembly should, by the necessary majority required by the Charter, decide finally and without further delay in favour of the seating of the representatives of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations.

148. Mr. NG (Singapore): My delegation did not participate in the general debate on agenda item 93, because we had already stated our position very clearly in our general statement to this Assembly. However, we should like to explain briefly how we intend to vote on the three draft resolutions, so that no one can possibly misconstrue our position. My delegation has consistently maintained that China's seat in the United Nations belongs to the People's Republic of China. Nothing that has been said in the general debate this year has deflected us from that view.

149. Draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1 seeks to affirm previous decisions of this Assembly that any proposal to change the representation of China is an important question. The argument that it is an important question is not without appeal. China is, after all, the most populous State in the world; it is the only nuclear Power in Asia; it has a long-established and rich culture; and its presence in the United Nations would surely affect the work of the Organization in a very significant way. Therefore it is easy to conclude that because China is such an important State any proposal to change its representation in the United Nations is an important question. My delegation submits that that conclusion is fallacious. The flaw in the argument lies in assuming that the legal status of the question varies with the importance of the country concerned. If the proposal to change the representation of a small country in the United Nations is not an important question, it follows logically from the principle of equality of all States, big and small, before the law that the same question affecting the biggest country in the world is also not an important question in the context of Article 18 of the United Nations Charter. For that reason we shall vote against draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1.

150. Draft resolution A/L.550 seeks to set up a committee to study the question of the representation of China, a question which the co-sponsors of that draft resolution describe as complex. However, it is not the complexity of the question that has prevented the United Nations from ending this long-standing inequity to the People's Republic of China. What is required, therefore, is not a committee to study the question but a change in the attitude of some Member States. Although my delegation appreciates the good intention of the co-sponsors of this draft resolution in desiring to overcome the present impasse, we are unable to support their draft resolution.

151. My delegation would have liked to be able to support draft resolution A/L.549 and Add.1, for we support the restoration of all rights to the People's Republic of China and we recognize the representatives of its Government as the only lawful representatives of China in the United Nations. However, we are unable to do so, because the second part of the operative paragraph of that draft resolution seeks to decide another issue prematurely. We believe that it is necessary to clear the first hurdle before attempting to clear the second. For that reason we shall abstain on draft resolution A/L.549 and Add.1.

152. Mr. BOUDO (Albania) (*translated from French*): In its statement of 12 November 1968 [1713th meeting], my delegation very briefly set forth its position on draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1, presented by the United States, and on the proposal again put forward at this session by the Italian delegation [A/L.550]. We emphasized, among other things, that these two proposals were unjustifiable, contrary to the Charter and to the practice hitherto followed by the General Assembly, and that both of them, in different ways, were aimed at once more preventing the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

153. We can now unhesitatingly conclude that the debate which is drawing to a close, and which has lasted for more than a week, has once again revealed the soundness of our position and the justice of the cause which we defend.

154. The repetition of fallacious claims, of old and fabricated arguments, by the sponsors of the above-mentioned draft resolutions and by those who support them, constitute an obvious proof of the complete lack of foundation of their proposals and of the unspoken and unworthy intentions concealed behind them. The overwhelming majority of the representatives who have participated in this debate, including some of those who, for reasons which it is not difficult to understand, do not support the draft resolution submitted by sixteen countries, including Albania [A/L.549 and Add.1], have shown that, in fact, there is no real problem about the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, that this problem has been artificially created and perpetuated by the United States of America, which feels that restoring to China its rightful seat in this Organization would be harmful to its imperialistic and aggressive policy and would constitute a major obstacle to its use of the United Nations for the purpose of furthering this same policy.

155. The draft resolution of the United States of America is contrary to the Charter and to the practice hitherto followed by the Organization in a number of cases concerning States in which there have been changes of government or régime.

156. The restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations definitely does not fall under paragraph 2 of Article 18 of the Charter, since this is neither a question of the admission of a new Member nor of the expulsion of a Member State. It is merely a question of seating in the United Nations the genuine representatives of a State which is already a Member, and even a founding Member, of the Organization. It is therefore merely a matter of credentials, which should be decided by a simple majority of the General Assembly.

157. There is only one China in the world and one Chinese State: it is the People's Republic of China. It is the Chinese State which was a party to the Charter signed at San Francisco. It is this State, which has a population representing one fourth of mankind, which was granted the privilege of being a permanent member of the Security Council, and not a corrupt clique which was overthrown and rejected for ever by the Chinese people nineteen years ago and which today has taken refuge in the Chinese province of Taiwan, under the protection of the American armed forces which occupy the island. It is the Government of the People's Republic of China, and that Government alone, which is entitled to exercise the lawful rights of China in our Organization. We have shown at previous sessions that it is impossible to invoke paragraph 3 of article 18 of the Charter in the case of the question we are discussing, as this paragraph deals with the determination of new categories, and not with the examination of new cases.

158. The attempt of the American imperialists to impose a two-thirds majority for a decision concerning the validity of the credentials of the representatives of China, whereas in the case of other States a simple majority is accepted, is a discriminatory, inadmissible and intolerable procedure. States Members which are devoted to the Charter and to the principle of the equality of States owe it to themselves to reject this fraudulent United States proposal.

159. As regards the proposal by Italy to set up a study committee on the question of the representation of China in the United Nations, we have already briefly set forth our point of view on this subject, and we are now able to ascertain that many delegations fully share our view. Several representatives have, in fact, rightly asked: What is the good of such a committee? What would be the real value of the explorations and studies envisaged in this draft, and whose purposes would they serve?

160. The question of the restoration of the lawful rights of China in the United Nations is a very simple one. It is crystal-clear and requires no study. If this question has so far not been settled, it is not because of its complex nature, as alleged by the sponsors of this proposal, but merely because of the arbitrary position of the United States of America, dictated by its hostile policy towards the People's Republic of China, which constitutes an insurmountable obstacle to the realization of its senseless plans of world hegemony. As we pointed out in our statement of 12 November 1968, the Italian proposal is a dilatory manoeuvre, aimed at saving the face of American imperialism in its absurd and brutal attitude towards the lawful rights of China in the United Nations and also at serving the American "two Chinas" plot, which is inevitably doomed to failure. Recourse to such subterfuges, either as an unjustifiable procedural strategy which is contrary to the Charter, or as a proposal to set up a body which will only complicate an extremely clear and simple question and postpone its settlement still further, is one more proof of the false and untenable position of the opponents of the restoration of the rights of China in the United Nations.

161. It is obvious to all that if the People's Republic of China has been deprived of its lawful rights in the United Nations for nineteen years, this is due to the arbitrary and illegal position of the United States of America, to its

hostile policy towards the Chinese people and the People's Republic of China and to its persistent use of the Organization as a tool for its policy of war and aggression, aimed at subjugating and enslaving the revolutionary peoples of the world who are fighting for their lawful and inalienable rights, for liberty, independence and progress.

162. Perhaps it would not be out of place to observe that the representative of the United States himself, in his statement of 12 November 1968 [*1713th meeting*], could not refrain from expressing the fear felt by that imperialistic Power at the idea that the People's Republic of China, that great socialist Power whose authority and prestige is so high among all the peoples of the world, might appear here to oppose its aggressive policy and its efforts to impose its will on our Organization.

163. As we have indicated on other occasions, the deplorable situation prevailing in the Organization has been further aggravated in recent years by the fact that the aggressive policy of the United States is shared by the revisionists of the Soviet Union, who are bound to American imperialism by a counter-revolutionary Holy Alliance for world domination in accordance with the joint world strategy of those two great Powers and their plans to divide the world into spheres of influence.

164. As a result, the Organization has been turned into a bargaining forum for the two Powers, to the detriment of the cause of freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples and countries.

165. As for the ignoble slanders of all kinds against the People's Republic of China which the representative of the United States of America and its supporters have again had the impudence to repeat during this debate, many representatives who have come to this rostrum, especially those from the countries of Asia and Africa, have rejected them with scorn on the basis of indisputable facts, and in particular on the basis of their own experience. Above all, they have pointed to the essentially peaceful policy of the People's Republic of China, to the relations of friendship, good neighbourliness and fruitful economic co-operation which their countries maintain with the great socialist country of China, based on principles of equality, non-intervention in internal affairs and mutual respect for territorial sovereignty and integrity. They have stressed with deep satisfaction the continuing and increasing unselfish assistance, both material and technical, which they are receiving from the People's Republic of China for the economic development of their countries.

166. Is that not obvious proof of the judgement passed by the peoples of the world on the imperialistic and aggressive policy of the United States of America, on its hostility and all its slanderous inventions against the People's Republic of China, as well as of the sympathy and respect which the great socialist country of China enjoys among the nations?

167. Everyone is aware of the ignominious and intolerable injustice which has been committed up to the present in the Organization against the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China. It is well-known that it is the United Nations which has suffered from this injustice, and not the People's Republic of China, which is enjoying continuing

prosperity and which is consistently scoring new successes in all fields connected with the socialization of its country.

168. It is obvious to everyone that without the People's Republic of China, that powerful socialist State whose authority and prestige are so high, that unshakeable rampart for the defence of the vital interests of peoples and countries devoted to freedom and peace, none of the important problems of our time can find a satisfactory solution. The overwhelming majority of States Members, even those which do not publicly admit it, recognize the urgent and imperious necessity for the United Nations to let the great socialist country of China make its contribution and offer its valuable assistance, together with other progressive countries, to the restructuring of the Organization on the basis of the purposes and principles of the Charter and to its smooth and efficient operation in the accomplishment of its tasks, in conformity with the profound aspirations of the peoples.

169. The Albanian delegation once again expresses the hope that the peace-loving Member States who constitute the overwhelming majority of the United Nations, aware of the present international situation and of the deplorable state of affairs prevailing in this Organization, will find the necessary courage to give their unreserved support to draft resolution A/L.549 and Add.1, which provides for the only fair solution in conformity with the Charter and with the rules of international law, as well as with the practice hitherto followed in the United Nations in the case of other States.

170. The adoption of this draft resolution by the General Assembly will certainly represent a very important step which will go down in the history of the United Nations and be of vast bearing on the future of the Organization.

171. Mr. AKWEI (Ghana): Speaking in the general debate this year on the question of Chinese representation, the Commissioner for External Affairs of Ghana stated as follows:

“While the Government of Ghana welcomes the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, it is unable to support any move to expel an existing Member of the Organization to achieve that objective. Such a move would defeat our aim of the universality of the United Nations.” [1685th meeting, para. 123.]

Our attitude to the various draft resolutions on this question will be guided by that fundamental consideration.

172. I shall first deal with the proposition that the question of Chinese representation is an important one requiring a two-thirds majority vote, a proposition reflected in draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1, co-sponsored by Australia and others. My delegation cannot accept that proposition because it has no basis either in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly or in the Assembly's practice. To us it is a simple, straightforward matter of the credentials of the delegation of China, a founding Member of our Organization. It is a question not of the credentials of a new State, but of the credentials of a changed Government on the representation of that State.

173. This is not the first time that such a problem has come before the United Nations. There are recognized

precedents by which the question can be easily resolved if there is the disposition to do so. It is a simple procedural matter, and we are not convinced by any specious arguments about the special importance of the question. My delegation cannot, therefore, support draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1, and accordingly will vote against it.

174. Turning now to the substantive draft resolution, contained in document A/L.549 and Add.1, co-sponsored by Albania and others, my delegation finds the clause whereby the Republic of China would be expelled from the United Nations totally unacceptable. As in previous years, we maintain that the People's Republic of China is the effective successor Government of the Republic of China, which joined the United Nations at its inception and that therefore the present Chinese seat belongs to it as a right.

175. The opposition to the seating of the People's Republic of China based on the usual arguments as to the aggressiveness of the People's Republic of China and its hostile attitude towards the United Nations seem to us irrelevant and of little consequence to the issue. The main question is: which Government actually is in control of the land mass of China? It is obviously Peking.

176. By the same token and by the same pragmatic approach, when we ask ourselves which Government is actually in control of Taiwan, we find no other answer than that it is the Chiang Kai-shek Government. That is why we hold the view that in restoring the present Chinese seat to the People's Republic of China, we should not close all other options with respect to the seating in the United Nations of Taiwan, whose existence we cannot deny. That is why my delegation cannot support draft resolution A/L.549 and Add.1, and will therefore abstain from voting on it.

177. While the draft resolution sponsored by the delegation of Italy and some other delegations and contained in document A/L.550 appears to have some merit in its intentions to seek a way out of the present impasse, my delegation believes that it fails to take into account the realities of the question. Indeed, we all know that such a committee, once established, could not even get off the ground. And, in any case, what further information would it uncover on this issue that we do not have now?

178. The question of the representation of China should be faced squarely and realistically and should not be evaded by hiding behind a smokescreen of studies and explorations. There is urgency in bringing into the councils of the world the approximately 800 million Chinese people because of their growing relevance to the solution of the world's problems. The Italian draft resolution, in our view, only seeks to postpone that solution by jettisoning it behind a diplomatic façade of studying the question. My delegation will consequently be unable to support draft resolution A/L.550.

179. Mr. GOYER (Canada) (*translated from French*): Judging by the statements made during this debate, it once again seems unlikely that the General Assembly will make any progress towards a solution of the difficult and important problem of the representation of China in the United Nations. The Canadian delegation regrets this, since we consider it essential that the People's Republic of China

should be able to participate in the work of the United Nations and even that it should be encouraged to do so. As our Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Honourable Mitchell Sharp, said during the general discussion:

"It is not in the long-term interests of world peace and security that the Government in Peking should remain isolated" [1687th meeting, para. 91].

180. As in the past, the Canadian delegation will vote to consider this matter an important question in terms of Article 18 of the Charter. In our opinion, it is undeniable that any step which would involve a change in the representation of one of the five permanent members of the Security Council must be considered an important question, not only in the juridical context of the Charter, but also from the point of view of the general repercussions which such a change would have on the international political scene and in view of its importance for the present and future work of the United Nations.

181. We shall abstain from voting on the substance of the question as expressed in draft resolution A/L.549 and Add.1 as we have for the last two years. In our view, the representation of the People's Republic of China, however desirable and necessary it may be, is a question which should not be tackled without taking into account those who are represented in the Assembly at the present time. Canada's position has already been set forth in detail in this Assembly and I do not think that it is necessary now to repeat the arguments which were advanced then.

182. As for draft resolution A/L.550, which calls for the creation of a committee to consider the question of the representation of China, it does not seem to us advisable to support it this year, contrary to what we have done in previous years. We will therefore abstain. Every time that this proposal has been put to the vote during the past two years, the result of the vote has clearly shown, we believe, that this approach is not acceptable to most States Members. Had it obtained the support of the Assembly before, some progress in the matter might possibly have been made, but it is now obvious that we will have to look for some other approach.

183. Mr. DIACONESCU (Romania) (*translated from French*): On behalf of the Romanian delegation, I should like to make a few comments on draft resolutions A/L.548 and Add.1, submitted by the delegations of the United States of America and thirteen other countries, and A/L.550, which was submitted to us by the delegations of Italy and four other States.

184. In the course of the general debate on the question before us, the Romanian delegation set forth its views [1717th meeting] as to why the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations requires a simple majority and not a two-thirds majority as proposed in draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1.

185. Resolution 1668 (XVI), the validity of which some are again trying to reaffirm this year, was conceived solely as a means of preventing the People's Republic of China from exercising the rights and responsibilities to which it is entitled as a Member of the United Nations. This resolu-

tion, which is represented to us as being in conformity with the Charter, is based, in our opinion, on two erroneous premises. In the first place, the sponsors of this resolution contend that the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is an important question within the meaning of Article 18 on the Charter.

186. In defence of this thesis, they invoke as an argument the fact that this item has several times been included in the General Assembly's agenda in application of rule 15 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, as a question of an important and urgent character. At the same time, resolution 1668 (XVI) is based upon a previous decision of the General Assembly which is open to considerable discussion with respect to its compatibility with the Charter. I have in mind resolution 396 (V) of 14 December 1950, according to which

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

187. With respect to the inconsistency of the first argument, we should like to draw attention to the fact that there is very often a difference between the ordinary meaning of a term and its accepted technical meaning in an international treaty. In this case, it is obvious that there is not the slightest connexion between the meaning of the term "important" in the sense of rule 15 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure and the meaning given it by Article 18 of the Charter.

188. In this connexion, I should like to recall that during the present session, for example, sixteen States of various continents have called for the inclusion in the agenda of the General Assembly of a new item entitled "Celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations" [A/7225 and Add.1]. In conformity with the General Assembly's rules of procedure, new items may only be included under rule 15, which expressly provides that such questions must be of an important and urgent character. In our view, it is hardly necessary to show that the importance attributed to the question of celebrating the anniversary of the United Nations, within the meaning of the rules of procedure, cannot place this item among the categories of questions which, under Article 18 of the Charter, have to be settled by a two-thirds majority.

189. As we have already pointed out during the debate on this subject, neither the United Nations Charter nor the rules of procedure of the General Assembly provide any basis for the assertion that the question of the representation of China in the United Nations is an "important question" within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter and that a decision on it would therefore have to be taken by a two-thirds majority. To contend that the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is an important question within the meaning of Article 18, for the solution of which a two-thirds majority would be necessary, is contrary to the spirit and letter of Article 18. Indeed, paragraph 2 of this article gives an exhaustive list of all the categories of

questions deemed important which can only be settled by a two-thirds majority of Members present and voting. The question now under discussion obviously does not fall within any of these categories.

190. Perhaps the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1 think that the question of the representation of China in the United Nations is covered by paragraph 3 of Article 18, which states:

“Decisions on other questions, including the determination of an additional category of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting”.

191. There is nothing ambiguous in this text. It speaks of new categories of questions; yet one could not assert without departing from truth and logic that the question of the representation of China could in itself constitute a new category. As was brilliantly pointed out during this debate by the representative of Ecuador [1713th meeting], a very sharp distinction must be drawn between categories of questions which depend upon a generic concept and those which relate to a specific concept. In this regard, the problem of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is a “specific question” which itself is part of the broader category of questions of representation.

192. As for the second thesis upon which resolution 1668 (XVI) is based, namely, that whenever each of two or more authorities claims to be the Government entitled to represent a State Member in the United Nations, the question should, to use the words of resolution 396 (V),

“...be considered in the light of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter and the circumstances of each case”,

that thesis is contradicted by the unanimously-recognized principles of international law. This concept suggests that the representative of a State Member can be designated by an authority other than the Government of the State in question. Such a concept is extremely dangerous, since it challenges one of the elementary attributes of State sovereignty.

193. In our opinion, the role of the General Assembly in regard to the representation of States Members is clearly defined: it must ensure that the powers of the representatives do, in fact, emanate from the effective governments of those States. In the present case, since nobody questions that China is a State Member of the United Nations, the only duty of the General Assembly would be to make sure that the representatives who occupy China's place in the United Nations are duly accredited by the real Government of that country, namely, the Government of the People's Republic of China.

194. To approve or invalidate the credentials of representatives of States Members, the General Assembly has in every case, except in that of China, followed the rule of the simple majority. Moreover, it would be really difficult to understand why, for example, the Credentials Committee requires only a simple majority to approve or invalidate the credentials of representatives of States Members, while it would require a two-thirds majority to decide upon the

credentials of persons claiming to represent China in the United Nations.

195. Nineteen years after the victory of the revolution in China, there are very few people, we feel sure, who have any doubts about what is the effective Government of that State. It is the same Government that represents the people of China in Chinese diplomatic relations with many States of Asia, Africa, Europe and Latin America; it is the Government which, in the name of the Chinese people, has assumed obligations and undertaken to carry out trade transactions and agreements with more than a hundred countries of all continents, including those which continue to oppose the restoration of the lawful rights of China in the United Nations; it is the same Government that affixed its signature to the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962 on Indo-China and Laos.

196. In this same context, it should be observed the the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America⁸ provides, among the clauses concerning its entry into force, that its Supplementary Protocol II should be signed and ratified by all Powers possessing nuclear weapons, and consequently also by China. Of course the signatory Parties, in drafting the text of the Treaty, had in mind the real Government of China and not the authorities of Chiang Kai-shek.

197. In accordance with the unanimously recognized rules of international law, there cannot be two standards for the representation of a State in its international relations: one for its relations, its bilateral and multilateral obligations and commitments, the other for the exercise of rights and responsibilities devolving on it as a Member of the United Nations. The criterion for the representation of States is universal and should apply to all the external relations of a State.

198. In trying to find plausible justifications for draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1, some speakers have attempted to associate the question of the representation of China with such issues as the admission of a new Member or the expulsion of one of the States Members, actions which would require a two-thirds majority. To present the question in this fashion is really tantamount to trying to replace the real elements of the problem by artificial ones which have no bearing at all on the present debate. Inasmuch as the overwhelming majority of this Assembly recognizes, either openly or by implication, that there is only one China—that which is a founding Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council—the arguments about admission or expulsion which are invoked in connexion with the representation of that country in the United Nations cannot be taken seriously.

199. In the same way, reference to Article 4 of the Charter is not relevant to the question before us.

200. For all these reasons, the Romanian delegation will vote against draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1.

201. As for the second draft resolution [A/L.550], which suggests the creation of a committee with the mandate “of

⁸ Treaty signed in Mexico City on 14 February 1967, *General Assembly Official Records, Twenty-second Session, Annexes*, agenda item 91, document A/C.1/946.

exploring and studying the question of the representation of China", it cannot make any contribution whatever to the real solution of the question; on the contrary, and apart from the real intentions of the sponsors of this proposal, the creation of such a committee, as we have already said, would only add a new injustice to those which have already been committed against the People's Republic of China in respect of the recognition of its lawful rights in the United Nations. At the same time, it would open the way to further dilatory tactics with respect to a positive solution of this question. In our opinion, such a committee would have no subject for study. The facts clearly prove that for nineteen years, the will of the Chinese people and State in international relations has been expressed by the Government of the People's Republic of China. The Romanian delegation will vote against this draft.

202. The major interests of the United Nations require that an end be put to the injustice and discrimination that have so far been practised against the great Chinese people. That being so, it is urgently necessary that the seat which belongs to China in this Organization, and in all the organs connected with it, should be restored without further delay to the lawful representatives of that State, the Government of the People's Republic of China.

203. Mr. GALLIN-DOUATHE (Central African Republic) (*translated from French*): The question of the representation of China in our Organization has now reached a stage where the General Assembly must fulfil its responsibilities with regard to three proposals reflecting the trends which have emerged during a debate that has been long and impassioned, because of the undeniable importance of the question of changing the representation of China in the United Nations.

204. To make clear the views of the Central African delegation, I propose to examine in succession draft resolutions A/L.550, A/L.549, A/L.548 and Add.1.

205. First of all, concerning draft resolution A/L.550, we should like to pay a tribute to its sponsors. Thanks to their patient efforts, we have before us a proposal which seeks to be impartial. Draft A/L.550 suggests, in effect, a new approach involving the creation of an *ad hoc* committee with the exploratory mission of establishing unofficial contacts with a view to finding an appropriate solution to the question, subject, of course, to the existing situation in the area concerned. One is therefore led to think of the theory of the two Chinas, about which my delegation has already spoken. In any case such a proposal, if it were adopted, would nevertheless not solve all present and future problems. For all the reasons which we have already set forth at length during the general debate on this subject [1717th meeting], the delegation of the Central African Republic does not consider draft resolution A/L.550 as entirely satisfactory. To its great regret, therefore, it will be unable to support it.

206. Draft resolution A/L.549 and Add.1 calls in no uncertain terms for the expulsion of the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek "from the place which they unlawfully occupy at the United Nations and in all the organizations related to it". In point of fact, it has been proved that the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek in question are un-

doubtedly the representatives of the Republic of China. The Republic of China, a Member of the United Nations and a member of the Security Council is fulfilling its obligations satisfactorily and contributing to the maintenance of international peace and security in such a manner that, to the best of our knowledge, the Security Council—and even less the General Assembly—has never had to accuse it of having persistently violated the principles set forth in the Charter—conduct which would make it liable to expulsion from the Organization by the General Assembly on the Security Council's recommendation. The fact is that the General Assembly does not have before it a recommendation under Article 6 of the Charter concerning the Republic of China, a Member of the Organization and a member of the Security Council. In the absence of this essential document, the demand for expulsion contained in draft resolution A/L.549 and Add.1 will not be supported by the delegation of the Central African Republic.

207. As for draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1, two ideas emerge in our opinion from a study of this document.

208. In the first place, it recalls the principle that whenever more than one authority claims to be the Government entitled to represent a State Member in the United Nations and whenever this question gives rise to a dispute in the Organization, it must be considered in the light of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and of the circumstances prevailing in each State. The country which is China by name is a Member of the United Nations. On the strength of that fact, the Peking Government claims to be the Government entitled to represent China, a State Member of the United Nations, although it is perfectly obvious that the Taiwan Government, which for the past twenty-three years has occupied China's seat, also claims to be the Government entitled to continue representing that same China, a State Member, in the United Nations. Clearly, there is more than one authority which claims to be the State Member, China. Hence the controversy with which we are familiar. Accordingly, there can be no doubt that the question must be considered in the light of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and the particular circumstances in each case. Distinguished speakers have already stressed this important aspect of the question.

209. Secondly, there is a notion which we consider to be a consequence of the principle to which we have just referred and according to which, in conformity with Article 18 of the Charter, any proposal to change the representation of China in the United Nations is an important question. There is indeed a proposal to change the representation of China. That is the purpose of draft resolution A/L.549 and Add.1, which is aimed at bringing about the immediate expulsion of the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek. Hence the controversy, especially since more than one authority claims to be the Government which is entitled to represent China. It has been clearly shown, therefore, not only that, in the eyes of some States Members, the question of the representation of China in the United Nations involves a change in its representation, but that it continues to give rise to disputes, which undeniably makes it an important question if one refers to the previous decisions taken by the General Assembly. In other words, the delegation of the Central African Republic will unreservedly support draft

resolution A/L.548 and Add.1, which merely points out that the question of a change in the representation of China in the United Nations is still an important one, as has frequently been reaffirmed in the previous, relevant decisions of the General Assembly.

210. In conclusion, the delegation of the Central African Republic considers that the question submitted to us is an important question which calls for the application of Article 18 of the Charter. It will reject draft resolutions A/L.549 and Add.1 and A/L.550, which do not represent the point of view of the Central African Government. On the other hand, the delegation of the Central African Republic will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1.

211. Mr. SCHUURMANS (Belgium) (*translated from French*): When speaking on 13 November 1968 [1716th meeting] during the debate which has just been concluded, I announced that Belgium could not vote for draft resolution A/L.549 and Add.1, introduced by Albania and some other countries.

212. If my delegation feels that it has to revert more explicitly today to the reasons behind this attitude, it is in order to leave no doubt about the significance of the vote which we shall soon have to cast. This vote should not in any way be interpreted as reflecting opposition to the presence of the People's Republic of China among us. It simply expresses our refusal to admit that the entrance of the representatives of the Peking Government should necessarily lead to the expulsion of the representatives of Taiwan. To try to solve the problem of the representation of China in the United Nations by merely substituting the representatives of the People's Republic of China for those of Taiwan is for us inadmissible.

213. As Belgium's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Pierre Harmel, referred in this very hall on 10 October to "our hope that the voluntary or imposed isolation of Mainland China would cease" [1689th meeting, paragraph 41]. We desire this in order to achieve the objective of universality in our Organization; we desire it because we cannot conceal from ourselves the fact that the present situation is inhibiting the efforts which our Organization must undertake on behalf of peace. Although my Government maintains friendly relations with the Taiwan Government, it nevertheless considers it necessary for the authorities of Peking to be associated with any action undertaken to solve the great problems which may arise in Asia, or those involving matters of world interest, such as disarmament, for example.

214. Belgium also believes, however, that while it is desirable to ensure the presence of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, we cannot sacrifice the rights of Taiwan in our Organization, since Taiwan has always loyally respected the principles of the Charter.

215. U AUNG MYAT KYAW (Burma): My delegation did not participate in the general debate on this item, because our attitude on the question of the representation of China in the United Nations has already been spelled out clearly on numerous occasions in the past. Only recently, on 2 October, the Foreign Minister of Burma took the oppor-

tunity to reiterate my delegation's position before this Assembly [1678th meeting].

216. Of the three draft resolutions before the General Assembly, the fourteen-Power draft resolution in document A/L.548 and Add.1 seeks to reaffirm that any proposal to change the representation of China is an important question requiring a two-thirds majority under the terms of Article 18 of the Charter. The sixteen-Power draft resolution in document A/L.549 and Add.1 seeks to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only lawful representatives of China to the United Nations. Finally, the five-Power draft resolution in document A/L.550 seeks to establish an *ad hoc* committee to explore and study the question in all its aspects.

217. In the view of my delegation, the question under consideration is not whether to admit or not to admit China to membership of the United Nations. There is no doubt that China is a founding Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council. The question, therefore, is who is entitled to occupy China's seat in the United Nations. The answer to that obviously is: only that Government which is in a position to employ the resources and direct the people of the State in fulfilment of the obligations of membership. No special committee is required to explore or study the question of representation of China as, in our view, there is only one China and only one legitimate Government representing the Chinese people with jurisdiction over its territory, and that Government is the Government of the People's Republic of China.

218. The issue involved, therefore, is a simple question of credentials, and my delegation, which has consistently supported every move to seat the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China as the lawful representatives of China in the United Nations, will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.549 and Add.1 and vote against the other two draft resolutions.

219. Mr. MIDDELBURG (Netherlands): The position which my Government takes with relation to the conflicting claims to the Chinese seat has remained unchanged over the past years. My delegation has nothing to add to the interventions made in this Assembly in previous years. The explanation of the votes which my delegation will cast on the different proposals now before the Assembly can therefore be brief.

220. Many delegations claim that the efficient functioning of the Organization is hampered by the absence of the Chinese People's Republic from our midst. The vehemence with which this opinion is defended by those delegations and contested by others is a clear indication of the importance attached to the entire question by a vast majority of Member States. For my delegation, any proposal aimed at bringing about a change in the actual situation must of necessity be considered an important question, requiring a majority of two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

221. My Government maintains diplomatic relations with the Government in Peking, which it recognized from its

inception. Although ties of the same nature do not exist with the Government in Taiwan, we see no reason why the Republic of China should pay the price of expulsion in order that the People's Republic of China might be admitted. My delegation cannot support any decision to deprive the Republic of China of a seat in the United Nations.

222. For a number of years the proposal has been made to establish a committee that would be entrusted with a complete study of the entire question. We continue to believe that this method might well contribute to a final solution, and my delegation will therefore support the proposal to that effect.

223. Mr. WIGGINS (United States of America): In a statement made to the Assembly one week ago today at the outset of the present debate on the question of Chinese representation, my delegation addressed itself briefly to the draft resolution in document A/L.550, co-sponsored by Belgium, Chile, Iceland, Italy and Luxembourg. We noted the basis on which we planned to support that draft resolution: that it is a purely procedural proposal for the establishment of a committee to study various views on the question of Chinese representation, and that the proposal does not in any way prejudge the outcome of the proposed study.

224. That position was, of course, a reaffirmation of the position my Government took when the study committee proposal⁹ was first presented to the Assembly two years ago, in language virtually identical to this year's proposal. At that time our support of the proposal was based on an understanding that it did not in any way prejudge the results of the study to be made. That understanding, confirmed by consultations with the sponsors of the proposal that year, and supported by their statements in the debate, was noted in the statement the United States representative made to the Assembly on 21 November 1966 [1471st meeting].

225. This year, as in the past, policy views touching on the substance of China's representation have been expressed by many delegations: by some which have joined in co-sponsoring draft resolution A/L.550; by some which oppose that proposal; and by some, including my own, which have voted for it. It is clear from such statements, both recent and past, that the policy views held by all those who have co-sponsored or supported this proposal are neither uniform nor identical; that all such delegations are not at one in the ideas, recommendations or proposals which they as individual sovereign Governments might expect or hope would result from the study envisaged.

226. Members of the Assembly, however, are not being asked to pass judgement or to take sides on the policies, hopes or expectations of individual Governments; we are being asked to take a position on a proposal which rests on one point which is common to all concerned: that there is nothing in the terms of the proposal which prejudices either the nature or the outcome of the study called for. This point was stated succinctly and without ambiguity by the representative of Iceland on 12 November, when he said: "That simple resolution asking for the setting up of a

committee to study the matter does in no way prejudice the case in question" [1714th meeting, para. 214]. It is on that basis that my delegation will again vote in favour of the study committee proposal.

227. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan): The delegation of Japan will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1, of which we are a co-sponsor, and will vote against draft resolution A/L.549 and Add.1. During my intervention on 11 November [1712th meeting] I stated clearly the reasons for supporting the former and for disapproving the latter.

228. On the other hand, the delegation of Japan will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.550, which calls for the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee for the purpose of studying the question of Chinese representation. We shall do so because we believe strongly that this question is a very important one, requiring very careful and thorough study from all points of view. However, I should like to make it very clear that our vote in favour of this proposal does not mean that the Japanese delegation has reached any prior judgement on this question along the lines set forth in the letter dated 18 November 1968 from the Permanent Representative of Belgium to the United Nations to the President of the General Assembly, contained in document A/7335. On the contrary, our vote in favour will be cast without any prejudgement of any kind as to the results of consideration of this item by the proposed *ad hoc* committee.

229. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly has now concluded its debate on agenda item 93 and has also heard all those representatives who wished to explain their votes before the voting.

230. The Assembly has before it three draft resolutions: firstly, draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1, submitted by Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Gabon, Italy, Japan, Madagascar, New Zealand, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Thailand, Togo and the United States; secondly, draft resolution A/L.549 and Add.1, submitted by Albania, Algeria, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Pakistan, Romania, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Syria, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Zambia; thirdly, draft resolution A/L.550, submitted by Belgium, Chile, Iceland, Italy and Luxembourg. After all the votes have been taken I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes on any of the proposals after the voting.

231. The Assembly will now proceed to vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/L.548 and Add.1. A roll call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Burundi, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Laos,

⁹ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 90, document A/L.500.

Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil.

Against: Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iraq, Kenya, Kuwait, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Singapore, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma.

Abstaining: Ecuador, Morocco, Portugal, Austria, Barbados.

The draft resolution was adopted by 73 votes to 47, with 5 abstentions [resolution 2389 (XXIII)].

232. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/L.549 and Add.1. A roll call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Malta, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Somalia, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Sweden, Syria, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Ceylon, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iraq, Kenya, Mali.

Against: Malta, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Gabon, Gambia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Jordan, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia.

Abstaining: Mauritius, Netherlands, Nigeria, Portugal, Senegal, Singapore, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Austria, Canada, Cyprus, Ecuador, Equatorial Guinea, Ghana,

Guyana, Iceland, Iran, Jamaica, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Libya, Maldives Islands.

The draft resolution was rejected by 58 votes to 44, with 23 abstentions.

233. The PRESIDENT: Before putting the next draft resolution to the vote, I call on the representative of Cambodia on a point of order.

234. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia) (*translated from French*): I have asked to speak in order to raise a point of order. In spite of the opposition of the Cambodian delegation and that of all countries which are truly independent and devoted to justice, countries which ask that the purposes and principles of the Charter be respected, the General Assembly has adopted the American draft resolution [A/L.548 and Add.1], which calls for a two-thirds majority for any proposal tending to alter the representation of China.

235. Contrary to certain erroneous interpretations, the draft resolution [A/L.550] submitted by the five Powers does not contain a merely procedural proposal for the creation of some committee or other. The terms of reference of the committee which has been proposed to us call for it to formulate recommendations for a settlement of the question of the representation of China in the United Nations. Since the General Assembly has already adopted the American draft resolution calling for a two-thirds majority vote, the Cambodian delegation formally requests that the same procedure be applied to the draft resolution [A/L.550] submitted by the five Powers.

236. In so doing, the Cambodian delegation is not departing from the position which it has always adopted and will continue to adopt, namely, that the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and in all the organs connected with it does not fall under Article 18 of the Charter and, consequently, does not require a two-thirds majority.

237. Mr. VINCI (Italy): I have asked to speak in order to oppose, on behalf of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution A/L.550, the motion which has just been put forward by the representative of Cambodia. That motion, if I understand it correctly, aims at defining draft resolution A/L.550 as an important resolution within the meaning of Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter and therefore requiring the application of the two-thirds majority rule. We strongly reject that assumption as going against the Charter and preventing the General Assembly using its normal procedural powers. Besides, we see no connexion between draft resolution A/L.550 and draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1 which has just been adopted.

238. In this respect, may I draw the attention of the General Assembly to what I said on 11 November [1711th meeting] in introducing draft resolution A/L.550. I pointed out on that occasion that the five-Power draft resolution was clearly of a procedural nature, in so far as a vote cast in its favour would not in any way prejudice the attitude of any Member on the substance of the problem. That point was made quite clear also by the other co-sponsors of the

draft resolution. I would reaffirm, therefore, that the objectives of our draft resolution do not come under any of the points listed in Article 18, paragraph 2, of the Charter. It is not, in fact, the purpose of this draft resolution to put forward any proposal to change the representation of China. There is nothing in the text that touches the substance of this matter. We have stated this time and again and no one can reasonably maintain an opposite view. Of course, any delegation is free to indicate which solution it would like to see the committee propose in the future to the General Assembly, but these views do not commit the committee in any way whatsoever beforehand. The purpose of our draft resolution—and I emphasize this point—is to establish a committee with a mandate to explore and study in all its aspects the question of the representation of China and then to report to the General Assembly at its twenty-fourth session.

239. This is a decision which, in our opinion, clearly falls under Article 22 of the Charter, which states that “the General Assembly may establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions”.

240. Personally I have not the slightest doubt that my learned colleagues are fully aware of the General Assembly practice, as reported in the *Repertory of United Nations Practice*, which indicates clearly that all decisions under Article 22 of the Charter have been taken consistently by a simple majority of the Members present and voting. The reasons for this rule are quite obvious. Establishing a committee, whatever the implications, is not a major or irrevocable decision. Hence it is only fair that if a simple majority of Members are in favour of establishing a committee they should be allowed to get a decision of the Assembly to that effect. The rights of the minority, which the delegation of Italy has always firmly defended, will be fully guaranteed when, at the twenty-fourth session, the General Assembly is called upon to act on the report of the *ad hoc* committee, should the report contain, as we anticipate, recommendations of a substantive nature.

241. Therefore, in opposing the motion submitted by the representative of Cambodia, I appeal earnestly to my colleagues to vote against it in accordance with the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter. To do otherwise—in other words, acting against some principles and main rules governing the orderly work and the procedural functions of this body—cannot be considered lightly, since it would go beyond the case in point. I would respectfully request therefore that, when the motion made by the representative of Cambodia is put to the vote, a roll-call vote be taken in accordance with rule 89 of the rules of procedure.

242. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): The Zambian delegation takes the floor at this stage formally to support the motion of the representative of Cambodia. The General Assembly has just adopted draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1, despite the opposition of all those countries that are seeking, and rightly so, to restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. Our reason is simple and obvious. If the General Assembly, on the other hand, had not adopted draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1, which my delegation and many others have categorically rejected, it would have been unquestionable

that only a simple majority would have been sufficient for the adoption of the Italian draft resolution [A/L.550].

243. The General Assembly has classified the representation of the People's Republic of China as an important question requiring a two-thirds majority. As a direct consequence, we feel, the Italian draft resolution should be subjected to the same treatment, severe as it may seem. In calling for the application of the two-thirds majority to the Italian proposal, we do not in any way deviate from our firmly held position that the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations does not fall under Article 18 of the Charter and, therefore, does not require a two-thirds majority. I am sure that the Assembly will find it possible to support our position on the matter.

244. Mr. HANEEF KHAN (Pakistan): The delegation of Pakistan firmly supports the motion made by the representative of Cambodia. As we have said at previous sessions, there is no difference between a proposal for the solution of a question and a proposal for the modalities of arriving at the solution. Therefore, since the Assembly has adopted draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1, draft resolution A/L.550 will require a two-thirds majority for its adoption. This is without prejudice to our position on the requirement of a simple majority for the solution of the question of Chinese representation.

245. I would refer to paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/L.550 and I would stress that it seeks to establish a committee, to be appointed by the General Assembly, to study the situation in order to make recommendations to the General Assembly for a “practical solution to the question of the representation of China in the United Nations”. If a two-thirds majority was, as decided by the General Assembly, required for draft resolution A/L.549 and Add.1, then a two-thirds majority is also required for this draft resolution.

246. Mr. REYES VICUÑA (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): The delegation of Chile fully supports the legal arguments put forward by the representative of Italy, and therefore opposes the proposal made by the delegation of Cambodia that a two-thirds majority be required in voting on draft resolution A/L.550 as an important question. And we do this, basically, because Article 22 of the Charter makes it absolutely clear that the General Assembly is fully authorized to appoint bodies like the one now proposed, in particular advisory committees whose task would be, as in this case, to explore and study a specific subject so that the General Assembly itself can subsequently reach a decision on the matter in question.

247. This case is not like the previous one in that the vote itself would decide whether a certain country is to be admitted to the United Nations and another to be expelled. The draft submitted by us proposes the establishment of a committee which, in turn, would suggest to the General Assembly a resolution which it may freely adopt later. When the time comes to vote on it, this latter recommendation will be one which could be voted on by two-thirds majority if there is anyone in the Assembly who considers this desirable, but not the one concerning the creation of this committee, which is a committee of a purely technical

nature which will recommend that the Assembly approve a draft resolution.

248. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the proposal of the representative of Cambodia that the draft resolution contained in document A/L.550 requires a two-thirds majority for adoption. A roll call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Afghanistan, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Australia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Hungary, India, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Southern Yemen, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Uganda, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela.

Abstaining: Austria, Barbados, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Guyana, Honduras, Iran, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Malaysia, Maldives Islands, Mauritius, Morocco, Poland, Portugal, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The proposal was adopted by 63 votes to 32, with 29 abstentions.

249. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/L.550. A roll call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

The Philippines, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Sierra Leone, Spain, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Barbados, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Laos, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Maldives Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand.

Against: Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Singapore, South Africa, Southern Yemen, Sudan, Sweden,

Syria, Thailand, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Australia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Democratic Republic of), Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Paraguay.

Abstaining: Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Swaziland, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Canada, Costa Rica, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Greece, Guyana, Iran, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Morocco, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Peru.

The draft resolution was rejected by 67 votes to 30, with 27 abstentions.

250. The PRESIDENT: I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the voting.

251. Mr. LYCOURGOS (Cyprus): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/L.550. The question of the representation of China has annually been discussed at the General Assembly since 1951, with the same results and without any progress towards a solution.

252. In the face of that deadlocked situation, which over the years has postponed indefinitely any solution of this important problem affecting the principle of the universality of the United Nations, my delegation, in 1961 at the sixteenth session of the General Assembly, in a pragmatic approach to the problem made necessary by the impasse resulting from the situation in Taiwan, suggested as a possible way out the setting up of a committee of the General Assembly to study the problem in its various aspects and to report to the General Assembly at its following session. The Chairman of our delegation, Ambassador Rossides, made the suggestion in the General Assembly on 13 December 1961, saying:

“... a careful and pragmatic consideration of the problem would lead us to the conclusion that the question of the representation of the peoples of China in the present situation is a matter which would require some preparation through negotiation... it would perhaps be advisable to consider the possibility of setting up a committee or another body to deal with the question as a matter of urgency, with a view to putting forward concrete proposals for a solution and reporting to the General Assembly at its seventeenth session... We consider, furthermore, that this approach could prove useful and might also possibly obviate proposed procedural measures which, by requiring a two-thirds majority in all relevant resolutions in the present or in the future, might result in greater delay of the solution of this problem.” [1077th meeting, para. 185.]

253. The following year, at the seventeenth session of the General Assembly. [1161st meeting], our delegation

reiterated that suggestion. Consistent with our declared position in 1961, we voted today in favour of draft resolution A/L.550. Although in the intervening seventeen years the world has moved and the prospects for such a study may not be quite the same as they were in the year 1961, we nevertheless adhere to the principle of the study which we then proposed.

254. Mr. PLAKA (Albania) (*translated from French*): The Albanian delegation wishes to make it quite clear that it voted in favour of the Cambodian proposal concerning the application of the two-thirds majority rule to the Italian draft resolution [A/L.550] because it founded its views on the principle that a procedural resolution adopted at any session of the General Assembly on a proposal dealing with a question under discussion must be applied at the same session to all other proposals affecting the substance of the same question. Once draft resolution A/L.548 and Add.1,

which has just been adopted, was applied to draft resolution A/L.549 and Add.1, it extended *ipso facto* to draft resolution A/L.550, which deals with the substance of the same question.

255. However, the Albanian delegation wishes to emphasize that this does not in any way affect our well-known position on the subject, namely, that the application of Article 18 of the Charter to the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, which merely involves a question of credentials, is unlawful and inadmissible.

256. The PRESIDENT: That concludes our consideration of agenda item 93.

The meeting rose at 7.40 p.m.