



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Statement by the President	1
Agenda item 97:	
Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations (<i>continued</i>)	1

President: Mr. Edvard HAMBRO (Norway).

Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT: Before we turn to the agenda for this morning, I should like on behalf of all the Members of the Assembly, to extend to the Government and the people of Pakistan all our sympathy at the terrible disaster that has just struck islands and coastal regions of East Pakistan. That disaster has been on the minds of all of us since the first vague reports started to come in on Saturday.

2. The Secretary-General has cabled President Yahya Khan to tell him of his great distress and concern and to assure him that the United Nations and its family of organizations are ready to extend all possible aid.

3. I am sure that every nation represented here will wish to associate itself with that message and also to respond to the concurrent appeal for immediate assistance issued by the League of Red Cross Societies, thereby giving expression to the deeply rooted feeling of human solidarity and compassion as a beacon of light in our troubled world.

AGENDA ITEM 97

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

4. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on the first speaker, I should like to remind Members of the General Assembly that, as decided at the 1904th plenary meeting, the list of speakers will be closed today at 12 o'clock noon.

5. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): I should like first of all, on behalf of the Yugoslav delegation, to associate myself with the expression of deep sympathy to the friendly people and Government of Pakistan on the occasion of the terrible disaster which has taken place in the past few days. Our sympathy and understanding are even greater because, from our own experience, we know how greatly assistance and help from the

* Resumed from the 1904th meeting.

international community are needed on such occasions as a sign of international and human solidarity.

6. I turn now to the item on the agenda. The restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is one of the most pressing problems, not only of our Organization but in present international relations as a whole. The policy of the isolation of the People's Republic of China which some countries have been pursuing for the past two decades, guided primarily by their narrow interests and their desire to preserve their monopolistic position, is negatively influencing world relations, and especially the position and prestige of the United Nations.

7. It is clear today that upon the solution of the question of the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China depends, in great measure, the strengthening of the role of the United Nations and the possibility of its becoming a truly effective instrument in the safeguarding of peace and security, as well as in the realization of other aims enshrined in the Charter to which representatives of almost all Member States which participated in the debate during the twenty-fifth commemorative session pledged themselves.

8. Obviously, it is unrealistic to expect the United Nations to be able to contribute to the solution of the major problems in the international situation and the complex issues emerging in the wake of contemporary developments unless the principle of universality of the United Nations is put into effect, and unless all countries are given the possibility of participating in international relations on an equal footing.

9. The Lusaka Conference of non-aligned States¹ stressed, in particular, the close link between the problems of promoting the efficiency of the United Nations and the solution of the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China. The Conference resolution on the United Nations states:

“The Heads of State or Government declare that for the United Nations to be more effective Member States must recognize and accept the principle of universality in terms of its membership. In this regard they stressed the urgent need of restoring to the People's Republic of China her rightful place in the Organization.”

10. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was among the first countries to establish diplomatic rela-

¹ Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held from 8 to 10 September 1970.

tions with the People's Republic of China in 1949, and since then has been consistently exerting its efforts with a view to having the People's Republic of China take the place in the United Nations to which it is entitled under the Charter of the United Nations.

11. In a desire to render its further contribution to the solution of this urgent problem, Yugoslavia has this year joined the group of sponsors of the draft resolution [A/L.605] requesting the restoring, without delay, of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and the expelling of the representative of Chiang Kai-shek, who is unjustly occupying the seat belonging to the representative of the sovereign people of China.

12. In the opinion of the Yugoslav delegation, the active participation of the People's Republic of China in international life and in the activities of our Organization has become even more imperative now at a time when our Organization, after 25 years of its existence, continues to face and is expected to meet new challenges in all areas of international life. Without the active participation of the People's Republic of China, it is not possible to expect lasting solutions to any one problem upon which the peace and security of mankind depend. After a victorious socialist revolution in 1949, the People's Republic of China has achieved significant results in the economic, social, cultural and military fields. Consequently, the People's Republic of China—which is the largest human community—is also one of the most outstanding factors in the present-day world.

13. It is illusory to believe that our Organization, for example, can achieve substantive progress in the field of disarmament without the co-operation of the People's Republic of China, a country which possesses nuclear and strategic weapons; or, for that matter, in the field of economic development, without taking into account its enormous human and material resources, as well as the needs of one fourth of the population of the world.

14. This reality is obvious and needs not to be proved; it is also borne out by the fact that recently additional States have established diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China, while still others are in the process of doing so. Regrettably, the persistence of some countries to prevent the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and to retain the representative of Chiang Kai-shek is not a result of the inability to perceive the realities of the contemporary world, but a reflection of a dangerous and absurd policy bowing to narrow and short-term interests. It is impermissible for any country, irrespective of its power, strength and importance in international life, arbitrarily to prevent any country—especially when the one in question is such a great country as the People's Republic of China—from assuming its legitimate place in the United Nations, or else to have its acceptance conditioned on former arrangements or concessions. Such a practice is contrary to the spirit of the Charter and, in

fact, endangers the very foundations of the Organization.

15. The People's Republic of China is one of the founding Members of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council. Consequently, the question of its representation in the Organization cannot be treated under Article 18 of the Charter. For reaching a decision on representation, all that is relevant is that China today can be represented only by the Government of the People's Republic of China, and not by a régime which the people of China, in exercising its sovereign right, overthrew 21 years ago—a régime which continues to exist in Taiwan only thanks to the political, economic and military support which it is receiving from the United States of America.

16. Furthermore, it is impermissible, and contrary to the spirit of the Charter, to request the General Assembly to impose on a sovereign nation a formula for its representation in the United Nations. The right of decision on this matter belongs only to the nation in question, and not to anyone else. The people of China has made its decision on this through its revolution in 1949.

17. The protagonists of the policy of preventing the People's Republic of China from assuming its lawful place in the United Nations have taken recourse to the most diverse arguments and counter-arguments in the past. Contemporary developments, however, have rejected those arguments as being absurd and fictitious. This year's debate has demonstrated that now their creators can no longer make full use of them. Even their latest contention that the People's Republic of China is not interested in the United Nations, that it does not desire to join the Organization, has been discarded as well.

18. In the prevailing circumstances, new arguments basically serving the same purpose—having as their aim to continue obstructing the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations—are now being invented. One such argument is the so-called two-China approach. It is not difficult to prove the untenability of that approach. First and foremost, there exists only one China. This is not denied even by the opponents of the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. Secondly, Taiwan is part of China. Thirdly, under the Charter of the United Nations, provision is made for seating only one China; China is a great Power and is a permanent member of the Security Council. Fourthly, the General Assembly does not have the right to reshape the geographic map of any of its Members, nor to create two States out of one. The fact that the Chiang Kai-shek régime was overthrown by the people of China and that it sought refuge on the island of Taiwan under the protection of a foreign Power does not justify the argument that Taiwan should be considered an independent State.

19. Proceeding from this, my delegation rejects the notion that the draft resolution [A/L.605] which we are also sponsoring, requests the expulsion of a

Member State of the Organization. In view of the fact that China is an entity and because there exists only one seat in the United Nations, what we are demanding is to have that seat occupied by true representatives chosen by the people of the People's Republic of China.

20. It is obvious that the two-China formula, instead of helping, is impeding the solution of the problem. In fact, it is aimed at further postponing the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China. The contention that this formula represents a step forward is invalid, like other arguments previously advanced for the same purposes.

21. The position of my delegation regarding the draft resolution [A/L.599 and Add.1] which, this year again, has been submitted by the United States of America, requesting that this question be qualified as "important" in order to require a two-thirds majority, is well known. We hold the view that behind this is a concealed procedural tactic aimed at further delaying the positive solution of the question of the representation in the United Nations of the People's Republic of China and at preventing the arrival at the United Nations of a representative of the Government which speaks for 700 million people. For that reason we are now, as in the past, categorically opposed to this proposal.

22. As one of the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.605 my delegation hopes that the General Assembly will, at this anniversary session, undertake decisive steps in the direction of restoring the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and of dismantling all artificial barriers which already for two decades have stood in the way of a settlement of this problem. At the same time, we are faced with the constant need to further strengthen the role and effective performance of our Organization in international developments and to resolve all issues upon which the maintenance of peace and international security depend. For that very reason, the solution of the problem of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is closely linked with the successful solution of other outstanding issues facing our Organization today.

23. Mr. DIACONESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to associate myself with you, Mr. President, in transmitting to the delegation of Pakistan our most sincere compassion on the occasion of the heavy loss in human life and property which the people of that country have just sustained.

24. The request submitted by eighteen countries from Asia, Europe, Africa and Latin America—among them Romania—in their draft resolution [A/L.605] is closely linked to the efforts designed to increase the role and effectiveness of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security and in promoting friendly relations and co-operation among States.

25. In this draft resolution the General Assembly is called upon to decide to restore its rights to the People's

Republic of China and thus make sure that China, a founding Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, shall be represented in this Organization by its genuine representatives, and that presupposes the expulsion of the emissaries of Chiang Kai-shek from the seat which they illegally occupy.

26. By a positive response to the urgent requirements for the participation of the People's Republic of China in its activities, the United Nations would do no more than strengthen its ability to accomplish the task conferred on it under the Charter, make up for a grave injustice which has been perpetrated for more than two decades in regard to one of its Members, and reaffirm its faithfulness to the principles on which it was founded. The President of the Council of State of Romania, Mr. Nicolae Ceaușescu, recently stated:

“The strengthening of the role of the United Nations in world politics is closely linked, we are convinced, to the attainment of its universality and to a more adequate reflection in the Organization of the realities of the world of today. It is particularly pressing to restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. It is one of the largest States in the world and its role in international life can no longer be ignored by anyone, far less by a forum such as the United Nations. I believe that for all politicians, for all statesmen it should be clear that without the participation of China in the solution of the problems which concern mankind today, it is not possible to find the best solutions. The participation of the People's Republic of China in international life is a requirement for the successful settlement of the major problems of peace and security.”

27. Indeed, when we think of China we have before us the image of a country with more than 700 million inhabitants—that is, almost a quarter of the whole of mankind—which is rapidly advancing in independent economic and social development. After having overthrown the feudal régime in October 1949 the people of China, heirs to an age-old culture and civilization, devoted all its efforts to ensuring a paramount role for China in the concert of nations. After 20 years of sustained efforts, that hard-working, gifted people has succeeded in transforming China from a backward country, subjected to foreign interests, into a powerful, flourishing, socialist State, with a rapidly growing economy. The accomplishments of the People's Republic of China, proof of its technical and scientific potential, have found their most recent and remarkable expression in the successful launching of its first artificial earth satellite.

28. Because of the wealth of its material and human resources, because of its key position and its vast territory on the Asian continent, because of its devotion to the principles of peaceful co-existence between States and because of its support for the struggle of peoples for their independence against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism and against the policies of pressure and *diktat*, the People's Republic of China plays a particularly important role in contem-

porary international life. It is difficult to believe that, without the participation of the People's Republic of China, viable solutions will be found for any of the major international problems, whether it be peace and security in Asia, or elsewhere, disarmament—and in particular nuclear disarmament—or international economic, scientific and technical co-operation. That is why it is our deep conviction that it is absolutely necessary for the United Nations urgently to ensure that China be represented in this Organization, as well as in other international organizations, by its genuine representatives, those of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

29. In their obstinate efforts intended to prevent the participation of the People's Republic of China in United Nations activities, delegations which have stated their opposition to the draft resolution submitted by Algeria, Romania and 16 other countries [A/L.605], have endeavoured to distort the true terms of the problem, displacing them to an unreal ground. Thus, the situation is presented to us as though it were a question of two Chinas; one, the so-called "Republic of China", to be excluded from the United Nations and the other, the People's Republic of China, to be admitted. It is precisely on this contrived image that the authors of the draft resolution in document A/L.599 and Add.1 would base their theory of the two-thirds majority, so as to place a barrier in the way of the participation of the People's Republic of China in the activities of the United Nations.

30. Actually there is only one China and no one challenges this truth. The ancient Republic of China which signed the United Nations Charter in 1945, four years later, after the victory of the great Chinese revolution, became the People's Republic of China, with all the political and legal implications which flow from this. The new socialist Chinese State, through its Government in Peking, became heir to the Chinese State which was a founding Member of the United Nations. The rights which it enjoyed in the United Nations Organization were *ipso facto* transferred to the legal Government of the People's Republic of China.

31. From the point of view of the question which is the subject of this debate, the consequence which follows is the need to replace the representatives of the former régime by those of the new legal Government of China, as has been done in the case of all the other States which, during the 25 years of existence of the United Nations, have changed their systems, their régimes or their names. If this substitution of representatives has not been possible so far, the reason must be sought only in the refusal of certain Powers to recognize that the people of China chose the socialist system, a refusal which unfortunately has been imposed on the United Nations Organization, is contrary to the principles and purposes proclaimed in its Charter.

32. As we have emphasized in the past, the fact that only one China exists has been generally recognized, including by the United States of America in several international acts which were been concluded during

or after the Second World War. This fact was also enshrined in the United Nations Charter, which explicitly lists China as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council.

33. As is clearly underlined in the Cairo Declaration of 1 December 1943, which was signed by the United States of America, Great Britain and China, as well as in the Potsdam Declaration of 26 July 1945, the island of Taiwan is an integral part of the national territory of China.

34. The military occupation of that Chinese province by American troops—which furthermore enables Chiang Kai-shek to maintain himself even today—was carried out in flagrant violation of the territorial integrity of China. Foreign intervention in the internal affairs of China naturally encountered the firmest opposition from the Chinese people who, beyond any doubt, have the right to act and fight for the withdrawal of American troops from the Chinese province of Taiwan and for its restitution to China.

35. Attempts to solve the question of the representation of China in the United Nations on the basis of the so-called two-Chinas theory basically represent nothing but yet another artifice intended to raise new obstacles in the way of the participation of the People's Republic of China in the activities of this Organization. By putting forward such suggestions, their authors certainly realized that the People's Republic of China, like any other State, cannot agree to renounce a part of its territory as the price for the exercise of a right which belongs to it because of its membership in the United Nations. It is a dangerous political line to be associated with such attempts because they are directed against the fundamental principles of the Charter and in particular against the principles of respect for the inalienable right of self-determination of peoples without any foreign intervention and of respect for the territorial integrity of States.

36. That is why the delegation of Romania believes that, in seeking a solution to the problem before us, it is the duty of the General Assembly to follow the course provided for under the Charter, which has invariably been applied in the case of other States which have changed their social and political structures. In other words, the General Assembly must ensure the adequate representation of China in the United Nations by inviting the Government which is authorized to speak on behalf of and express the will of the great Chinese people of 700 million—that is, the Government of the People's Republic of China—to take the seat which has so far been illegally and abusively held by the emissaries of a régime which was rejected by the Chinese people more than two decades ago.

37. In this connexion, I should like to draw attention to the fact that our draft resolution does not propose expulsion from the United Nations of a State Member—China—as is erroneously being affirmed here, but seeks to ensure that that country be equitably represented in this Organization. All that is at issue here is who should validly represent China, not to admit

a new State Member or to exclude a State Member. References to Article 18 of the Charter are in our opinion groundless, since that Article is not relevant to the case. As we have amply demonstrated in the past, this invoking of Article 18 of the Charter in order to request a two-thirds majority for the solution of a question of representation which, in accordance with the rules of procedure, should be decided by a simple majority, is intended to prevent the People's Republic of China from exercising the rights and responsibilities which accrue to it under the Charter in this Organization.

38. Having in mind the groundless premises of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.599 and Add.1 and the injurious purpose it pursues, my delegation feels that the General Assembly should reject it.

39. On the other hand we are profoundly convinced that it is in the primary interests of the United Nations, of international peace and security, to re-establish urgently, without further delay, the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in this Organization, as is requested in draft resolution A/L.605.

40. Before concluding, I should like to emphasize the fallacious nature of the affirmations intended to discredit the policies of the People's Republic of China in international relations. The facts have proved and continued to prove amply that the People's Republic of China constantly carries out a policy of peace and peaceful co-existence with all States, on the basis of the principles of respect for the independence and territorial integrity of States; non-interference in the internal affairs of others; equality; mutual respect and the right of each people to decide its own destiny. China has always advocated the peaceful settlement of international disputes, and respect for commitments entered into in treaties. The best illustration of this policy is furnished, among others, by the exemplary manner in which the People's Republic of China has fulfilled the obligations undertaken by virtue of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 on Indochina and in 1962 on Laos.

41. The People's Republic of China has adopted a position that is in conformity with the principles and purposes of the Charter on major thus international problems. Thus China has shown itself to be in favour of peoples who are fighting against colonialism in all its forms, with a view to exercising their right to self-determination and to an independent and sovereign existence. The Government of that country, which is one of the five nuclear Powers, has more than once declared that it was prepared to undertake efforts together with other States so as to arrive at the complete prohibition and total liquidation of nuclear weapons. That Government has quite recently reiterated once again its position on disarmament, as well as its solemn declaration, according to which China would never under any circumstances be the first to use nuclear weapons.

42. The Government of Romania considers that the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is indispensable not only because of the urgent need to put an end to the

injustice committed with regard to the Chinese people, but also in the interests of this Organization, of peace and international security.

43. The restoration of lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations will be a very important step in strengthening the effectiveness and prestige of the United Nations throughout the world.

44. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): Tanzania is a sponsor of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.605. This draft, which we have submitted with 17 other delegations, seeks to restore immediately all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to expel immediately the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the United Nations, as well as from the organizations related to it. The followers of Chiang Kai-shek have been occupying a seat at the United Nations illegally, and they have managed to do this for the past 21 years, primarily because of the diplomatic, military and economic protection and assistance of a great Power which is also a permanent member of the Security Council.

45. It has been argued in the past few years that a two-thirds majority is required for this proposal within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter. This position appears to have received support from those who have realized that the arguments which were used in the past to justify the continued ostracism of the Chinese people are becoming increasingly untenable and that more and more countries are beginning to see the problem in an objective manner. My delegation has rejected the two-thirds majority contention in the past and it will do so again this year. The stand it has taken is based on the fact that the two-thirds majority contention is advanced as a cover to sabotage the Assembly's ability to arrive at a just decision on this matter, for it is an open secret that those who call for a two-thirds majority are mostly the same ones who lobby feverishly against the Assembly's taking a fair decision on the substantive question. In effect, they call for a two-thirds majority and then they make every effort to ensure that such a majority is never attained. The specious argument on which they base their stand is that, according to Article 18 of the Charter, the question of the expulsion of present members requires a two-thirds majority. My delegation holds the view that this is not a question of suspending or expelling one member from the Organization in favour of another. It is a matter which involves the question of the recognition of the credentials of the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China as against the credentials of those of the so-called representatives of Taiwan who claim to represent the Government of China. On this basis, my delegation submits that the call for a two-thirds majority is frivolous and should be rejected.

46. The change of Government which took place in China on 1 October 1949, and which brought the present leaders to power, was a revolutionary change which brought to an end years of tyranny, domestic feudalism, abject exploitation and colonialism by foreign countries. It is true that the people of China changed their government by a revolution and that the

ideology of the new Government was different from that of the previous Government. But it was, and still is, a Government whose interests serve the interests of the Chinese people. The decision to change its own government was within its sovereign rights. But those who were involved in the exploitation and disgrace of China before 1949 were not happy at the triumph of freedom in that country. These countries adopted a position which, in fact, amounted to saying that the people of China should never have changed their government, that they should have consented to live and suffer under perpetual foreign exploitation and abuse and that they should have continued to endure a corrupt government whose policy was to serve foreign masters. The people of China rose to be free. Last month the People's Republic of China celebrated the twenty-first anniversary of that freedom. These have been twenty-one years of remarkable achievement for those hard-working and talented people. During this period, the Chinese people, led by their great leader, Chairman Mao Tse-tung, have transformed their fatherland from a semi-colonial and semi-feudal State into a strong, self-reliant, progressive and powerful socialist State. The road that China has taken to become the powerful and proud nation that it is today has not been easy. Foes and friends alike who know something about the history of that great country agree on one thing, and that is that the present China is not that old China which suffered from many inexplicable types of humiliation. That was a country where an alliance of imperialist Powers consolidated their position, exploiting the people with merciless greed and plundering their riches. But China today is a different China. No longer are the Chinese people treated with contempt. No nation, however powerful, can possibly expect to coerce China into submission and deprive it of its dignity today. And this is the China which some Members of this Assembly have consistently worked to deprive of its rightful place in the community of nations.

47. Having been itself a victim of oppression and semi-colonial subjugation, the People's Republic of China stands today in the forefront against colonialism and imperialism and for human dignity, equality and justice. Still a developing country itself, China has not hesitated to come to the assistance of many developing countries of the third world. But it has not been easy for China to come out from the condemned position of a so-called sleeping giant to its present crucial role today in the affairs of men and nations of the world.

48. China's continued exclusion from the United Nations not only is detrimental to this Organization's interest, but in the final analysis goes against the interests of even those who have stubbornly sought to isolate it. In supporting the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, my delegation is motivated first and foremost by the justice of the cause. We are further motivated by our awareness that without the participation of the People's Republic of China many of the most outstanding issues bedeviling the world today will remain unresolved. Further, we find the continued deprivation of the lawful rights of the Chinese people to be one of the most absurd anachronisms of our Organization

today. That this anachronistic situation should continue to prevail when the Organization is marking its twenty-fifth anniversary is not only a bitter irony, but indeed a real tragedy for the United Nations.

49. We have followed with interest the trend of the debate on this item this year. We have been encouraged to note that gradually more and more States have come to recognize and accept not only the reality of China but also, and more, the absurdity of any further campaign to ostracize it. These are encouraging developments and they constitute a victory for common sense. But while taking cognizance of this positive development, we have not failed to take note of the ominous trend now being set by some of those who have for the last twenty-one years used all possible means to continue depriving the lawful representatives of the People's Republic of China of their seat at the United Nations.

50. We have noted the degree of vehemence with which the two-Chinas theory is now being advocated. Not surprisingly, the principal exponent of this theory is the very Power which has for the last 21 years done all it could to make our Organization a laughing stock whenever it has addressed itself to this item. Indeed, this is a policy which is now acquiring currency because those who thought that they could reverse the change of government in China in 1949 failed to do so. The two-Chinas policy is therefore a policy which derives its philosophy from the consequences of failure. It is a wrong policy. It is also a dangerous policy, for it amounts to nothing less than a dismemberment of the State of China. Taking into consideration the history of this item in this Assembly, one cannot but conclude that the aim of the advocates of the two-Chinas theory remains the same, namely, the continued denial of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China, and no amount of filibustering will succeed in camouflaging their real design. There is only one China and this fact is not contested, even by the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek.

51. The régime in Taiwan is the last symbol of a policy which wants to reimpose on China the government and system of Chiang Kai-shek. The position and objectives with regard to Taiwan must, therefore, be looked at in the context of the above-mentioned policy as well as in the context of the over-all military strategy of certain Powers in the Pacific area. Taiwan is within the ambit of a strategic military network which constitutes a serious danger as well as a threat to the security of the Chinese people.

52. It has been argued that the so-called Republic of China is a founding Member of the United Nations. In other words, we are being asked to believe that Taiwan is the China which is mentioned in the Charter and that it is Taiwan which is entitled to sit in the General Assembly and other organizations of the United Nations and occupy the permanent seat reserved for China in the Security Council. That is absurd. As has been pointed out over and over again, the China mentioned in the Charter is the State of China of which Taiwan is a province. It is the State

of China with 800 million people which is mentioned in the Charter, not its province, Taiwan, with 13 million peoples. To argue otherwise is to engage in falsification and misrepresentation.

53. Any attempt therefore to impose upon the Chinese people an artificial division of their country should be rejected, and in any case it has been rejected by the Chinese people. It is easy for one to assert that the Charter does not provide for conditional membership of the United Nations. It is easy to argue that the Charter does not stipulate that for the admission of a member X, member Y should be expelled. But that is not the real issue. Indeed, to dabble in such arguments is deliberately to confuse the issues. At best, such an exercise is a sheer misrepresentation of the provisions of the Charter.

54. What is at issue is: which is the lawful government to occupy China's seat in the United Nations? No one here is questioning the fact that the Chinese State is a founder Member of our Organization. In fact, it is because we take cognizance of this fact that the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.605 are simply calling for the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China. Those who would like arbitrarily to give their own interpretation of the Charter provisions may well ponder over one fundamental question—that is: which Article of the Charter provides for the dismemberment of a State as a prerequisite for that State to gain membership of the United Nations? Those who advocate the two-Chinas policy and find it expedient to argue their case on the basis of the Charter are simply advocating a gross infringement of the territorial integrity of a founder Member of our Organization.

55. The time must come when the General Assembly will take a decision to end the disgraceful position which has persisted for the past 21 years. That time is now. At this time, when the Assembly has just celebrated its twenty-fifth year of existence, it must once and for all allow the voice of one fifth of the population of the world to be heard in its deliberations. It is utterly wrong to fall into the trap of trying to appease the political whims of one great Power. China is a nuclear Power and the United Nations can do nothing successfully in the field of disarmament or peace in Asia, or elsewhere, if China is ignored. It must be realized that one out of every five persons in the world is a Chinese, endowed with energy and a fierce will to be independent, self-reliant and ready to defend his liberty at all costs. He is, moreover, heir to a great and ancient civilization and culture which could contribute in a large measure to the cause of peace and social and economic progress, which are the basic principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter. The United Nations cannot hope to have the co-operation of that great nation if this Organization continues to pretend that somehow it does not exist. And yet, by the United Nations following its past misguided policy, China has been ignored. This must be changed, if only for the sake of strengthening the United Nations and restoring to it an air of respectability. In this regard, the responsibility of Member States is grave and serious.

56. Times have changed and all Governments must realize this. It should be realized that many States which used to support the ostracism of China have now begun to question and change their stand. Indeed, it is only the United States among the permanent members of the Security Council which still maintains that somehow Chiang Kai-shek is still governing the peoples of China. It would be sad if Members of this Organization were to allow the provisions of the Charter governing membership and representation to be twisted simply to appease the political and selfish interests of a great Power.

57. We hope, therefore, that at this session Members of this Assembly will live up to their responsibilities and rid the United Nations of the unfortunate situation in which it has found itself for the past 21 years.

58. Mr. EL-SHIBIB (Iraq): Mr. President, with your permission I would take this opportunity to express to the delegation of Pakistan our heartfelt sorrow at the tragic disaster that has befallen the brotherly people of Pakistan. The Iraqi delegation shares the pain and sorrow caused by the terrible disaster and requests that its feelings of sadness and sympathy be kindly conveyed to the Government and people of Pakistan and to the families of the victims.

59. Turning to the subject of our debate, I wish to say that many delegations must have hoped that the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, bearing in mind its historic significance, would see an end to a clear anomaly and great injustice resulting from the continued denial to the People's Republic of China of its rightful place in the United Nations.

60. My delegation had hoped that we should see an end to the baseless arguments, the transparent subterfuges and the brash manoeuvres that for over 20 years have succeeded in excluding the great Chinese people in a discriminatory manner from participating in this family of nations. We had hoped that a sense of justice, a policy of realism and a concern for the vital cause of world peace would at last prevail and convince those States that were instrumental in perpetuating the exclusion of China from this Organization that their policies had only accentuated and exacerbated the situations that threaten international security and that a reversal of those policies is long overdue. Unfortunately, we are once again faced with the same laboured arguments, the same fictional contentions and the same naked subterfuges as have been used in the past and are now exemplified in draft resolution A/L.599 and Add.1, sponsored by the United States and others.

61. The position of my delegation on this issue is well known and has been reiterated over a number of years. We believe that the invocation of Article 18 of the Charter is no more than a cynical manoeuvre that seeks to misuse one article of the Charter in a situation to which that article was never intended to and does not apply—in order to defeat the very purposes and principles of the Charter relating to universality and equality among States.

62. We have been told that the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is an important question and therefore requires a two-thirds majority of the Assembly in order to be resolved. We contend that the question is not only important but vital—not, however, in the sense in which the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.599 and Add.1 want us to see it.

63. China is not a newly founded State which seeks a fresh entry into the United Nations; China is a founding Member of this Organization, a permanent member of the Security Council, and it enjoys, as a great Power, special representation on the other bodies of this Organization.

64. The question, therefore, is not whether to admit China but who represents China. Is it the Government of the People's Republic of China, which represents 800 million Chinese, or the clique of Taiwan, which holds under its yoke 14 million people? Is it the People's Republic of China, which controls the vast Chinese mainland, or is it the remnants of the Kuomintang, occupying the island of Taiwan which is an integral and indivisible part of the Chinese People's Republic? Is it the People's Republic of China, which is a great nuclear Power and a space Power, or the Chiang Kai-shek régime, which imposes itself upon the Chinese people of Taiwan under the umbrella of the guns of the United States Seventh Fleet? In all sincerity, it must be said that no smokescreen, however thick, can hide the obvious answer.

65. Now permit me to move to the substantive issue. My delegation has the honour to be a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.605, which seeks to restore to the People's Republic of China its rightful place in this Organization. By doing so we are defending the very *raison d'être* of this body.

66. This Organization can never claim true representation of the peoples of the world when over a quarter of humanity is excluded from its ranks. It cannot be effective in the field of disarmament when the largest Power in the world is not participating in its activities, nor can it achieve a realistic and effective control of nuclear weapons when a great nuclear Power is not represented in such endeavours. We firmly believe that the strengthening of international security, the achievement of the goals of development and the resolution of conflicts that threaten international peace are vitally linked to the participation of the People's Republic of China through this Organization.

67. Before I come to the conclusion of my statement, allow me to make some observations which I feel are pertinent to this discussion. Since our debate on this question a year ago the Chinese People's Republic has made important strides in the field of international relations. An increasing number of States have established full diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China and are co-operating with it in the various fields. It is no longer the People's Republic of China that is isolated as its enemies wanted it to be, but it is the enemies of the People's Republic of China that

are becoming increasingly isolated from the opinions of their own peoples and the peoples of the world.

68. While the great Chinese people stand firm and united in developing their country and defending the causes of freedom, justice and national independence everywhere, we witness the confusion within the ranks of their detractors. This confusion, which results from the stubborn upholding of policies that no longer carry any conviction, is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that only last Thursday the representative of the United States informed us during the course of this debate that his Government: "is as interested as any in this room to see the People's Republic of China play a constructive role in the family of nations" [1902nd meeting, para. 88], only to have that statement repudiated in effect the next day by the White House Press Secretary, who affirmed his Government's continued opposition to the admission of China to the United Nations.

69. I leave the comment on such a policy to a former Under-Secretary of State and former permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations, Ambassador George Ball, who states in his book *The Discipline of Power*:

"Today the Nationalist government is like something from *Alice in Wonderland*. Its National Assembly purports to be the legislative body for the whole of China. It elects the President and has the power to change the Constitution. Yet it was itself last elected in 1947, and, since 98 per cent of the total Chinese population lives on the mainland, new elections have been postponed until such time as the Nationalists can make a comeback. The Assembly, thus, is unique of its kind, a progressively aging body that suffers constant attrition as more and more of its members die. It is, in a sense, the only tontine parliament in the world, but what prize awaits the last surviving member is not very clear.

“ . . .

"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.

“ .

"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.

. . . ”²

70. In conclusion, I note the remark of a colleague who preceded me in this debate that it is not China that needs the United Nations but rather the United Nations that needs China. While fully concurring with that observation, I would humbly add that by restoring to China its rightful place in the United Nations we shall have a revitalized, strengthened and truly representative Organization that each one of us, no matter how large or small, will need and will seek to preserve.

² George W. Ball, *The Discipline of Power* (Boston, Little Brown and Company, 1968), pp. 178, 181 and 182.

My delegation believes that, though that day is long overdue, it will soon be coming.

71. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Mr. President, may I say how deeply grateful my delegation and I are—and I am sure my Government will be—for the expression of deep sympathy, sorrow and concern voiced by you and by so many other colleagues at the calamity that has befallen the eastern wing of my country? It is a visitation that has come in the wake of a succession of calamities that over the last decade have struck with remorseless regularity, each more grievous than the other, that part of my country which is East Pakistan.

72. The present natural disaster is by far the worst that has struck my country. On Thursday night and continuing through Friday a cyclone struck the coastal belt of East Pakistan, the islands in the delta of the Ganges River and many offshore islands, with winds from 120 to 150 miles an hour. Perhaps even more destructive than those winds have been the tidal waves whipped up by the cyclone, which have drowned the coastal areas and entire islands and have submerged them under 20 to 30 feet of water. The calamity has affected over 10,000 square miles of territory, nearly one fifth the entire area of East Pakistan. Of the 5 million people who live in the stricken area, over 1 million are reported to have been made homeless and destitute.

73. The extent of death and destruction is unimaginable. Official forecasts can at best be preliminary because of inadequate means of communication and the submergence of thousands of square miles of land under water. The officially confirmed figure of the death toll is over 16,000 men, women and children. Unofficial estimates of the possible number of deaths vary from 100,000 to 300,000. Several of the areas are still inaccessible, though the armed forces of Pakistan have been mobilized for relief on the widest possible scale and all the ships of the Pakistan Navy are ploughing the seas to bring succour to the stricken.

74. I have already given the estimate of the homeless as about 1 million. The loss of cattle, on which the stricken farmers, tenants and peasantry depend for their livelihood, and the destruction of homes, shelters and other property are officially stated to be colossal.

75. The danger of epidemics is an inevitable consequence of such natural disasters and we fear that it may be imminent.

76. Figures and statistics cannot convey the human tragedy of the catastrophe which has overtaken my country. The tens of thousands of bread-winners and protectors of families who have been annihilated, the mothers, wives and sisters who have been swept out of existence, and the sons and daughters who have been struck down add to an immeasurable ocean of tragedy and sorrow. In hundreds of cases whole families have been wiped out, without a trace. Pakistan has indeed been overtaken by a calamity of a magnitude and horror unparalleled in recent times.

77. My Government is bending every effort to mobilize all its resources to bring relief and succour to the stricken people of the area in the speediest possible manner. As I have said, all the resources of the armed forces of Pakistan have been brought to bear in a massive relief operation. Nevertheless, in spite of all the efforts that might be undertaken by my Government, the sheer magnitude of the tragedy is such that a massive programme of assistance, not only on the national scale but also by the international community, will be necessary to mend the broken lives of those who have survived.

78. I am sure that the United Nations will act immediately within the extent of the authority delegated to the Secretary-General to make contributions in the case of such natural disasters and that the Secretary-General will act speedily to offer any assistance he can to my Government. But let me say to representatives that the limit of the Secretary-General's authority in any single case is \$20,000. Faced with the tragedy of the magnitude that I am talking about—100,000 to 300,000 feared dead, an incalculable loss of property and over 1 million homeless—representatives can imagine how far a contribution of \$20,000 by the international community could go in providing even a moiety of what is required to bring some solace to those who are left broken and desolate. That would be but a token contribution.

79. Representatives will recall that when a similar tragedy struck Peru in July of this year the Economic Commission for Latin America adopted a well-considered resolution going far beyond the provision of token relief to help a country which had been visited by a major catastrophe to repair the massive disruption of its economy. And the Economic and Social Council, at its forty-ninth session, adopted resolution 1518 (XLIX) on measures to be taken following the earthquake in Peru. That resolution is, of course, specific to the consequences of the earthquake in Peru.

80. My country, however, has been visited by a disaster of even greater magnitude, and it will be the endeavour of my delegation within the next few hours and the next few days to undertake intensive consultations with our colleagues, with the Secretary-General and with other officials of the Secretariat to examine to what extent the international community can make a meaningful contribution to repairing the massive disruption in the economies and the life of countries which are victims of such acts of God.

81. I would hope that, learning not from one or two, but from several of the disasters which have struck us in repeated succession, we would evolve a truly meaningful programme to bring, if not adequate, at least substantial assistance to people whose lives have been destroyed and whose families have suffered unparalleled tragedy.

82. Finally, Mr. President, once again I should like to to express the gratitude of my delegation and my Government to you, to the Secretary-General, and to all our colleagues for sharing with us this moment of our profound sorrow and affliction.

83. The PRESIDENT: I can assure the representative of Pakistan that representatives have listened with profound emotion to his statement. We shall heed what he has said and the solidarity of the international community will be given appropriate expression.

84. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Mr. President, allow me to offer my deep condolences, on behalf of my delegation, to our colleague, Mr. Shahi, and to all our brothers and sisters from Pakistan in the calamity that has befallen their countrymen. We pray God that the souls of the departed may rest in peace. "The dead have preceded us, and we in turn follow them. We proceed from the Creator and unto Him we return." We cannot add more to what I have said, quoting from the Koran.

85. I had not planned to speak on the item before us this morning. It may be noticed that I was on the list to speak this afternoon, but I was told that I would be the lone speaker at the afternoon meeting and, not wishing to have my colleagues come only to listen to me, I thought that I would speak this morning—not knowing why so many speakers who are on the list for tomorrow could not have spoken this afternoon. You, Sir, are one who has prodded us to make good time in order to handle all the items on our agenda. I hope that your prodding will be heeded in the future so as to enable us to dispose of as many items on the agenda as we are seized of.

86. I shall speak on this question in an unorthodox manner. It is high time, after 19 years or so, since 1951, that we should call a spade a spade. It is high time that we should look objectively and without any political motives at the facts as they obtain with regard to the representation of China in the United Nations.

87. The Assembly has been divided since the early 1950s on who represents China. In fact, what is known as Taiwan today was the Republic of China and still is the Republic of China in that it is a signatory to the Charter. As we all know, after the incident known as "the Chinese incident"—I was in Western Europe during those days—the United States was aligned against Japan on the side of China. Let us bear this in mind.

88. During the Second World War, none other than Chiang Kai-shek distinguished himself in fighting on the side of the Allies. What followed was that there was internal trouble on the mainland of China. But we all know that in Cairo, as well as in Potsdam, the Republic of China was considered as one of the five big Powers that would sit on the Security Council; and in fact it has done so since those days.

89. Curiously enough, those who have accepted China as a member of the Security Council do not mention the Republic of China when they have caucuses, when they meet on important issues, and they speak in terms of the Big Four as if China had not existed as a Power. One may ask why it is so. The answer is very simple and not far-fetched. It is because

General Chiang Kai-shek, after the civil war in China, had to retreat to what is known as Taiwan.

90. So the four big Powers, having pledged to consider the Republic of China as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council, have accepted Taiwan formally as such, but in practice many a time the Republic of China has not even been allowed to vote on momentous issues in the Council. I am not going to cite examples, because that would be very embarrassing to the four big Powers.

91. Therefore, there is a sort of schizophrenia in the behaviour of the Security Council, not to mention the General Assembly. The letter killeth, it is true, but the facts are clear. And here I must cite what has been said time and again by my colleague from Brazil, Ambassador Araujo Castro, about power and how it corrupts. Lord Acton used those words before Mr. Araujo Castro, but the dissertations of our Brazilian colleague are worthy of scrutiny by each one of us.

92. Now, of the four big Powers—let us name them: they are United States of America, the Soviet Union, France and the United Kingdom—only one, the Soviet Union, is both Asian and European; the rest are European. Not only in the Security Council but in the United Nations they have been the arbiters of momentous issues, and Asia, which has been represented by the Republic of China, has been sorely neglected, time and again. When it suited those four European Powers to say that the Republic of China was a legal and legitimate Member of the United Nations, they did so without reservations. I am talking of the early fifties—indeed some of them did so up till the late fifties. On the other hand, when the balance of power swung and they thought it was in their interest to recognize, *de jure* if not *de facto*, the People's Republic of China, they did so without blushing.

93. Now, is the question of China with which we are presented a juridical or a political one? It should have been, from the beginning, a juridical one, but the four Powers made political capital of an Asian State. I am not talking about whether the Republic of China is the heir to all the Chinese territories, or whether the People's Republic of China, now recognized by most of those who abjured it, is the legitimate representative of China. I am talking objectively, without taking any sides, because after all I do not want to make a political speech. This question is purely juridical; it is not political. But it shows that we have not made much progress since the days of the League of Nations, which I observed, *ex officio*, in the thirties, in Western Europe.

94. Either we change our approach to such questions or we will be treading the path of the League of Nations, which finally dissolved because it mixed issues and was not courageous enough to state what should be done in time of crisis. I want to engage in some plain talking to my colleagues because, after all, in spite of the fact that each one of us represents a sovereign Member State of the United Nations, we are committed to the Charter, as well as to the principles of the United

Nations—not only those in the Charter, but those outside the Charter, those that are not spelled out, the unwritten principles of any organization, those principles based on good sense and on equity and justice.

95. We all know that the Republic of China came into being because of a revolution. Against whom? Against the Manchus; and that was in 1911. Dr. Sun was the architect of the new China, and his successor was Chiang Kai-shek. I remember that in 1927 we had heard of Chiang Kai-shek, then a young general who had led the northward expedition from Canton to Peiping. We know also that there was an insurrection of the Communists. We also recall how, in 1931, Japan seized some of China's rich provinces. And I still remember that when I was in England in the thirties the press, as well as the Government, took issue, stating that Japan had not declared war on China—hence the term, “the Chinese incident”; and they said, “this is not the civilized way to wage war”—as if war or any of its aspects were civilized.

96. Ironically, 20 years later, one of the big Powers sent advisers, and it is at war in the Far East. We shall not embarrass it by calling it by name everybody knows who it is. So I wonder whether the civilized way is to send advisers and not declare war. What is in a declaration of war? War is war, and it is a sacrificing of lives usually to serve small segments of the population—those which profit and benefit from war. The young generation is alert; nowadays it no longer believes in fighting a war “to save democracy”, as was the slogan of the First World War, or for “the four freedoms”, the slogan of the Second World War. Freedom from fear—and everyone is afraid nowadays.

97. Those days are gone. Youth is going to triumph and that is why my speech will be in the spirit of the younger generation rather than in the spirit of those arch politicians who thought they could again drive the young like sheep into the battlefield to be slaughtered. And for what?

98. We all know too that there was a war between China and Japan in 1894 or 1895, which China lost and ceded what is now known as Taiwan to Japan. In 1945 Japan had to relinquish its authority over Taiwan, which was returned to China. Some have questioned whether Taiwan is Chinese. Even in *The New York Times* today we find a certain article by Dr. Lung-chu Chen, who is Secretary for External Affairs of World United Formosans for Independence and co-author of *Formosa, China and the United Nations*.³ This gentleman claims that Formosans, to a large extent, are not Chinese. The Scots also claim that they are Scots and do not form a part of Britain. So do the Welsh for that matter—some of them. But, there is a common culture and a common language that binds them. Hence, a people does not need to be ethnologically pure. There is no such thing as an ethnologically pure people. A people consists of a conglomeration that has a common culture, language, customs and traditions which are quite general in every province of

a State. Sometimes it has a common religion, but not necessarily so.

99. Therefore, we cannot stretch a point and say the Formosans are not Chinese, just as in my area we cannot say that those who were Arabized, like the Berbers of North Africa, are not Arabs or that the Circassians in Jordan who were Arabized, are not Arabs. But it is significant that *The New York Times* should have published this article in today's issue at this juncture when the question of China is before us.

100. But it is also significant that last week on the eve of this question being discussed, there was a supplement in that same *The New York Times* about the Republic of China, meaning Taiwan. Are our American friends pulling the two sides of the rope? They want us to note that after all the Formosans, all the people of Taiwan, are an entity by themselves as is evident from this subtle article which was published in *The New York Times* today while at the same time in opposition to that idea there is a very interesting supplement and I have a couple of pages of it which I am using for my historical facts.

101. I return to where I started. Is this question so political that the juridical element has been lost sight of? Today I asked my colleague from the United States to furnish me with a copy of Ambassador Phillips' statement on the question of the Chinese representation. Ambassador Phillip said:

“And my Government has taken a number of concrete actions—actions for which we neither proposed nor anticipated a *quid pro quo*—to ease relations between us. The fact of the matter is that the United States is as interested as any in this room to see the People's Republic of China play a constructive role in the family of nations. All of us are mindful of the industry, talents and achievements of the great people who live in that ancient cradle of civilization.” [1902nd meeting, para. 88.]

102. That is a great departure from three or four years ago, or from the early 1950s or from the late 1950s for that matter. Is it a change of attitude and who will pay the price? Will this article by Dr. Lung-chu Chen in *The New York Times* be revived a year from now or will it be buried? “It depends on the circumstances”, we may be told. Juridical? No, political. Who is the arbiter of our fate and destiny in Asia? The Asians? No. At one time it was the four big Powers, but now it is becoming one great Power. Let us keep that in mind. And we talk of the Chinese representation. We want to know—and you, Sir, are a jurist—where does the United Nations stand? Are we mixing issues? Are we playing a political game here? One day some of us are on the side of the People's Republic of China while others maintain that Taiwan is the Republic of China and is heir to all of China. That is why I said I wanted to call a spade a spade and not beat around the bush—using some American sayings which I think will be well understood by my colleague from the United States.

103. What shall we do about this subject, year in year out? And here I want to be very frank. Who are we here, collectively or individually, to say that such

³ L. C. Chen and H. D. Lasswell, *Formosa, China and the United Nations—Formosa in the World Community* (New York, St. Martin's Press, 1967).

and such a State does not obey the rules, the principles and the lofty ideals enshrined in the Charter and therefore should not be admitted, having noted that many States which are Members of the United Nations do not perhaps live up to the Charter and yet we do not expel them?

104. Who is living up to the principles and ideals of the Charter as we had hoped would be done? Practically none of us. It is only by rationalization that we do so. The Charter is perfect; it does not need to be amended. I am talking not about the procedural part of the Charter, but about the lofty principles and ideals of the Charter.

105. Therefore, what shall we do? In a few years, or maybe next year, if there should be an understanding between the United States and the People's Republic of China, shall we sacrifice Taiwan? Will it come to that? Is it right that we should sacrifice Taiwan? That is the question. Should there be two Chinas? That has been asked time and again. Can there be two Chinas? Will the Republic of China, that is, Taiwan, accept that there be two Chinas? They tell us categorically that they do not agree that there are two Chinas and that they are the representatives of China. On the other hand, we are told by those who have representation in Peking that Peking likewise does not agree that Taiwan should be a separate entity.

106. But in whose hands is the decision? I submit that it is in the hands of the United States because the United States is dealing with a highly political question, not a juridical question. If and when next year, whether they meet secretly or overtly with the representatives of the People's Republic of China, they make a deal—that is another Americanism—our friends from Taiwan will be shed like the rind of a squeezed lemon. It has happened in other situations. Is that fair?

107. We want to know: where does the United Nations stand juridically, not as the victim of the political aspirations of certain States, especially the big States and, in this case, the United States of America? This may be called *realpolitik*. Hitler also practised *realpolitik*. Are we to be the witnesses of *realpolitik* in the United Nations? Is there no solution? If the People's Republic of China is adamant and will not settle with the United States unless Taiwan becomes part and parcel of the People's Republic of China and, conversely, if the Republic of China—Taiwan—also is adamant and refuses to abdicate what it considers to be its responsibilities towards the mainland of China, then we have an impasse. Who is going to get us out of that impasse? The trend is to be with the powerful. Many European States which now recognize the People's Republic of China many years ago cast their votes with the United States against the People's Republic of China. What is the factor that has made them behave like that? Power—because the People's Republic of China exercises power. If we take power as the criterion, what will happen to the Republic of China next year if it happens to be in the interests of great Powers or of lesser Powers to recognize the People's Republic of China? Will they be cast away?

Or will the impasse be further prolonged until it becomes a farce in the United Nations?

108. Our dignity is at stake here; the dignity of this Organization is at stake. Can we do anything about it? I maintain that we can. I will confess to you, Sir, that six or seven years ago I was approached to give my personal opinion—I am not a jurist but they thought I had enough common sense as to what to do to get us out of this impasse. I had a plan but it seems it was refused by both sides. Incidentally, those who approached me had the best of relations with Peking and I told them, when they asked me my candid opinion, "We do not recognize the People's Republic of China and why should I be asked?" They said, "We are asking you as Baroody." The plan was as follows: that a plebiscite should be taken in Taiwan as to whether the people of Taiwan would like to remain independent or be part and parcel of the People's Republic of China.

109. How could I give such advice? Well, from having worked for seven years elaborating in this same United Nations the principle of self-determination into a precise fact. Many members know that self-determination admits of secession. In fact, if there are many people in a certain country or in a given province of that country who want to secede on cultural or linguistic grounds, they may secede. That is a basic principle of the right of self-determination. Nobody mentions it, but it is valid. We may wage wars against secession. Our host country waged civil war against the Confederates. Why? Because of economic interests. The question of slavery was the motivation and, my good friend of the United States, I am quoting your scholars and historians who delve into historical events. Of course, Abraham Lincoln is still saluted as a liberator, but he was also driven by the economic interests of the North. So the motivation was to free the slaves, but the war was an economic war.

110. But why go past 1815? Your country, Norway, Mr. President, formed a union with Sweden after the Napoleonic wars. I am not talking here about that union, but it was dissolved 90 years later in 1905, allegedly because of certain differences of conscience. But in fact Norway thought that it was in its best interests to secede from the union and it seceded.

111. By why go back as far as 1905? Quite recently there was the example of the United Arab Republic, which in its broader sense was a union between Syria and Egypt. They are people having the same culture, the same language, practically the same religion and the same customs and traditions—and they seceded. They separated, if you want to use the word separated instead of the word seceded.

112. I am trying to give the Assembly some food for thought. If Taiwan is going to be the victim of power politics, would it be in its interests to secede? That is not up to us; we have no right to determine the fate of a people, whether they are Asians or non-Asians, but I am jealous of our Asian integrity. I, as an Asian, do not want to see our brothers from Taiwan

sold down any river for that matter because of political expediency.

113. Our American friends never tell us about the secret conversations they hold in Warsaw with the People's Republic of China and elsewhere; nor do I think that the friends of the People's Republic of China are kept *au courant* on those secret conversations. What are we here in the United Nations, false witnesses? The other day our brother and good friend, Ambassador Yost, mentioned quiet diplomacy. What about quiet diplomacy? It should be open diplomacy, it should be frankness, it should not follow the ways of the Congress of Vienna, of Talleyrand and Metternich, with all due respect to their political acumen, men who quite often said things that they did not mean and who quite often meant things that they did not say. This is the United Nations, we are supposed to turn over a new leaf. Have we turned over a new leaf since the League of Nations and will this policy of quiet diplomacy, secret talks, expediency and mixing the political with the juridical and the juridical with the political get us anywhere in the United Nations or elsewhere? I submit that the answer is no, that it will not.

114. I may be reminded that I said something about a plebiscite, as to whether the people of Taiwan would like to be independent as such, regardless of whether they can regain control of mainland China which as a person I think is far-fetched, no matter what they tell me about the alleged tyranny that prevails in the People's Republic of China. I have never visited either Taiwan or China so I have no right to say what is what. But it stands to reason that mainland China is much stronger than 15 million people living on the island of Taiwan, and the powerful quite often are drawn to the powerful when it suits their purpose and they espouse the cause of the weak when it suits their purpose. What assurance do we have that next year they will change their policy of espousing the cause of the strong and leaving the weak in the lurch? I am not talking about the morally weak or the morally strong, I am talking in terms of power.

115. All of this plebiscite is conditional on the will of the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China—in other words, Taiwan. Someone might say forthwith, "This is not possible because both sides are adamant." I reply that there is a solution to this. The first plebiscite will be conditional on a second plebiscite which will be held from 5 to 10 years after the first plebiscite—or a referendum may be held, call it by whatever name you will. It would be to ascertain after 5 to 10 years whether Taiwan or the Republic of China would like to merge with the People's Republic of China or not.

116. Taiwan is a very prosperous island. I read only a few days ago that the *per capita* income is \$300. Who knows? The level of income in the People's Republic of China may also rise. I am talking about constant currency, not about inflated currency. Why should not the People's Republic of China be content with the plan that after a few years the people of Taiwan

can opt as to whether to preserve its integrity or to join mainland China? What is wrong with such a plan? In the meantime Taiwan will remain a Member of the United Nations and the People's Republic of China would assume its seat in the United Nations, and power politics would be reduced to only a narrow common denominator, not to a broad common denominator.

117. I do not see why such a plan should not be discussed here in this Assembly instead of each faction taking an adamant stand, leading us nowhere. And you, Mr. President, and the Secretary-General could be less formalistic and explore any possibility of trying to find a solution in this framework because I see the writing on the wall. This host country, whose population numbers only 6 per cent or 6.5 per cent of the world's population cannot underwrite situations in Asia or in Latin America for that matter its own hemisphere, or in Europe or in any continent of the world. They tried to do it through the Marshall Plan and it worked for a few years in Europe, but Europe has been dissociating itself from the dictums of the very strong Power economically and even politically. NATO is not the NATO we knew in the 1950s and the economies of European countries are becoming healthier every year, although this country, the host country, still is supreme in technology.

118. They cannot underwrite political situations all over the world. When I say "they" I mean the host country. In fact, none other than the President of the United States has said that his Government is thinking of a new approach—it is called in the press the Nixon Doctrine—to fortify States abroad, not necessarily by sending troops or advisers but by making them think of helping themselves so that they may stand on their own feet and opt for whatever ideology or political situation is best for them. It is a wise policy; disengagement, it is called. Why not let Asia settle its own affairs, let Africa settle its own affairs, let the Arabs settle their own affairs? Do not put your fingers, you great Powers, in the pie of continents or States because that is in contravention of the Charter, whether today it be in the Far East or in the Middle East or tomorrow in Latin America or elsewhere. It is high time that we small Powers were frank and outspoken and came out with what should be done, committed to the United Nations as we should be and I hope we are.

119. It might be said that we have to vote. Of course we have to vote on two draft resolutions. One is a broken record. I like broken records sometimes, especially if they are broken at a lilting tune that caresses the ear. But sometimes even the best of tunes, when repeated too often, jars the ear. Then there is the Albanian to Zambian draft resolution [A/L.605]—a to z, what more could one want than the whole gamut of the United Nations? They tell us that we should recognize the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China as the lawful representative of China to the United Nations—in other words, that we should expel the others.

120. I submit that we should not expel the Republic of China because, after all, they are a people. They have become a people regardless of the article that

appeared in the supplement of *The New York Times* by none other than the Speaker of the Legislature, the Luan. They are a people mixed with the Japanese and other ethnic strains. The extreme has been assumed in that concept by Mr. Lung-chu Chen. But, however we look at the whole problem, I think the people of Taiwan have an economic system which is different from the economic system of the People's Republic of China, and they are a people now just as the Americans, who were a colony of the British, are a people.

121. Of course when it suited Mr. Churchill in the First World War he called them, "our American cousins across the sea". I wondered why he did not call them brothers. I believe he thought they were mixed up with the Irish, the Italians and negroes and that "cousins" was an appellation he could use safely. When it suits somebody they use all kinds of epithets to attract people and when it does not suit them they wage war against the same people. Have we forgotten the war of liberation? Washington was called a traitor, but now, if you go outside the National Portrait Gallery in Trafalgar Square the irony of it is that you will find Washington has been adopted by the United Kingdom. There is a bronze statue of Washington there. May the name of the Creator be praised—He who changes things but never changes himself.

122. This is my unorthodox approach to this question. I don't have to sum it up. My argument must have been noted by those who favour the one China or the other. I sum up by saying that for the time being if both Chinas, so to speak, agree they should both sit among us as Asian States, with the proviso that a second plebiscite will be taken to determine whether at that time they would like to merge or to remain separate. Talking practically, by that time Mao Tse-tung and Chiang Kai-shek will have faded from the picture. They both have charisma in their respective countries. People with charisma wonder in the world as we have witnessed in what General de Gaulle did with a fallen France, which within 25 years became a leader in world affairs. It depends on the person. It depends on the rulers. This is why I end my statement today with the words of Menceus 2,300 years ago. He said: "Let a prince seek to nourish men and he will be able to rule the whole empire. Anyone who fails to win the heart of the people cannot make a good ruler."

123. After those two giants, Mao Tse-tung and Chiang Kai-shek, fade out of the picture, it remains to be seen whether a man of their stature will arise. Then there will be no problem about two Chinas. I think all the Chinese will follow him and do what he wants them to do, provided that, like that prince of Menceus, he edifies the peoples of China.

124. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Firstly, I wish to associate myself with those representatives who have conveyed their condolences and sympathy to the delegation and people of Pakistan.

125. It must be recognized that this debate on the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic

of China in the United Nations risks ending up by maintaining the status quo. Actually it would be less a matter of thrashing it out and arriving at a solution to a problem which is of such concern to our Organization and has been for so many years, than once again admitting that our efforts have been in vain, in view of the complicated and subtle political games which damp our enthusiasm, however strong it may be, for reaching felicitous solutions which would strengthen the United Nations. Is there any clearer conclusion than that which would affirm the tremendous contribution People's China could make to our Organization? But this conclusion, which is admitted by some because it is obvious and which others reject because of its incalculable consequences, would not seem to be the outcome of our discussions this year at least. Despite the inevitability of this debate, can it be permitted to representatives of a country attached to the idea of non-alignment to participate without prejudice in a discussion where we all have to endeavour, despite the imperative needs of political interests, to make lively and fruitful? What is in sum the point at issue? It is a question of resolving a problem which has been with us since 18 November 1949, when after the victory of the forces of Mao Tse-tung over the armies of Chiang Kai-shek, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China sent to the President of the General Assembly a letter informing him that the credentials of the Chinese delegation were no longer valid.

126. The General Assembly at that time could have invited the representatives of the People's Republic of China to take their place in the Assembly. The Government of General Chiang Kai-shek was not yet firmly established in Formosa, that island which the Cairo Declaration of 1943 and the Potsdam Declaration of 1945 recognized as being an integral part of China, which under the leadership of General Chiang Kai-shek fought side by side with the Allies against the Japanese occupation forces. Then there was only one China. But even at that time it would have been advisable for the victorious régime of Mao Tse-tung to be recognized as being the only Government of China.

127. Events were too recent and there was too great a hope to see the situation reversed in such a way as to ensure that the Government recognized up to then by the majority of the United Nations would recover its authority. The legitimacy of the representation of Nationalist China, which was reaffirmed by Mr. Wei on Thursday 12 November [1902nd meeting], was at that time justified. Is it still justified now when the régime of People's China has been existing for more than 20 years, when it is recognized by a large number of countries, including my own, several of which were the allies of the Nationalist régime during the Second World War? It is becoming more and more incontestable that the liberation of continental China by the Nationalist Government resident in Formosa is within the realm of pure fiction and that, even if the thesis defended by the representative of Nationalist China, Mr. Wei, that the régime of the People's Republic represents only 2 per cent of the Communists of the Chinese population and that one day or other the Chinese people will change its master were admitted, it is highly prob-

able that this would not be in favour of the Government resident in Formosa, for what has been happening for 20 years in China has so disrupted the former structures that any changes that could occur could not lead China back to their ancient ways. But that is another problem which could be discussed ad infinitum. The essential point is to recognize that the reality of today is not that of 1949. The representative of the United States, Mr. Phillips, recognized that unambiguously when he stated:

“My Government fails to see how it is possible for a delegation that favours universality of membership—or for any delegation at all—to vote to expel from our midst a Government which effectively governs 14 million people” [ibid., para. 90].

128. Thus it is no longer a question of the representation of China, unless China, like the *peau de chagrin*, has shrunk somewhat. The reality of 1970, is, therefore, not that of 1949.

129. It is clear in this year of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations that China has a Government residing in Peking and that it is essential that our Assembly recognize that reality unequivocally. It is a question of principle which can no longer be ignored. But we do not believe that an affirmation of that principle is sufficient in itself to resolve the problem which has been confronting us for some years. As the Organization responsible for peace and security throughout the world, the United Nations should ensure that its decisions consolidate peace and do not create dangerous and explosive situations. Hence it is our duty to analyse the consequences resulting from the restoration of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China. We sincerely believe that, whatever is said, the contribution of People's China to our Organization would be considerable. There are weighty reasons for believing that a country so immense, which has played such a great part in the developing of human civilization, cannot, despite its internal problems and the ideology that its leaders profess, fail to draw the conclusions of its own experiences and those of others and ally its efforts with those of all peace-loving countries for the happiness of mankind.

130. Whether it be the question of the struggle against *apartheid*, the question of completing the process of decolonization or the question of working for the development of the under-developed countries, China, we hope, will be able to strengthen the actions of the United Nations. The efforts it is making at the present time could merge with the universal pattern and become the sort of positive action of which we have great need.

131. Furthermore, the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China would create a new situation. Because of the recognition of this principle, the present Chinese delegation would no longer have a juridical basis for continuing to participate in our work, whereas in fact its Government occupies a part of China, the island of Formosa, where approximately 14 million inhabitants live. Should the United Nations

reflect this reality? We are aware of the attitude of the Government of Formosa, which considers itself the only representative of China and will not agree to be seated at the same time as the representatives of Peking. At least that is what we are given to understand. But that does not resolve the problem. The case of Formosa remains unaffected.

132. Can we foresee the reaction of the Government of Peking? Respectable opinions have it that Peking will never accept the solution of two Chinas or even the solution of one single China and a small Formosa to which the status of an independent State would be granted. The Tunisian delegation, however, will continue to wonder whether the Government of China does not, in the final analysis, desire peaceful coexistence with all Member States as well as with Formosa, which it would recognize at a later stage as having the status of an independent State.

133. Peace in the region commends such an outcome. Who could not fail to be overjoyed if negotiation, after the confrontation, were to lead to co-operation, thus sanctioning the evolution of a process which has been in ceaseless ferment for 20 years?

134. The United Nations should not overlook or underestimate such possibilities. We shall have to pronounce ourselves on the draft resolutions before us in the light of all available data.

135. First of all there is the draft resolution contained in document A/L.599 and Add.1 which would require a two-thirds majority, since, pursuant to Article 18 of the Charter, any proposal to change the representation of China in the United Nations is considered an important question. In order to facilitate the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China, my delegation will not vote in favour of that draft resolution, despite the respect we have for the judgement of its sponsors. Furthermore, Article 18 of the Charter speaks of the admission and suspension of States, not of delegations. There is no question of excluding China, which represents 700 million inhabitants; it is a question of confirming its rights as a Member of the United Nations, entitled to enjoy an accredited representation by its Government seated in Peking, the capital of China. The “nationalist” delegation, in the opinion of one of the sponsors of that draft resolution, no longer represents anything but a Government which controls 14 million inhabitants living in Formosa, a Chinese territory, whose status, I might add, could be defined anew, taking into account developments which have occurred over the last 20 years. It is therefore impossible to invoke Article 18 of the Charter to maintain the latter delegation in a status which has recognizably been altered by time and by men.

136. With regard to draft resolution A/L.605, which has been submitted by a group of Afro-Asian countries, the Tunisian delegation subscribes to the preamble. We also subscribe to the first part of the operative section concerning the restoration of “all its rights to the People's Republic of China” and the recognition

of "the representatives of its Government as the only lawful representatives of China to the United Nations", and that because of the invariable position of Tunisia in favour of restoring the rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

137. With reference to the second part, which is organically linked to the first and which reads "and to expel forthwith 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 the view of my delegation, it gives rise to a number of questions.

138. Firstly, is there any point in expelling the present delegation when it would not itself accept the presence of the delegation of the People's Republic of China and would itself withdraw as soon as a decision was adopted to accept the delegation of Peking as being the sole and unique representation of China?

139. Secondly, by linking this expulsion clause with the question of admission would that not make it more difficult for a decision to be adopted with regard to the People's Republic of China during the present session of the General Assembly and, further, would it not contribute to once again postponing the taking of a decision to another session, whereas there seems to be a consensus in favour of admitting the one without necessarily expelling the other?

140. Thirdly, should not the United Nations reflect regional realities by provisionally keeping the present representation which would subsequently be possibly transformed into a delegation of Formosa? What is not acceptable today might well become so tomorrow as a result of political developments.

141. The sponsors of the draft resolution could facilitate the task of the Assembly by rewording their proposal—either by making no mention of the question of expulsion or by laying down a provisional status for the present delegation, which would be juridically deprived of its seat if the delegation of the People's Republic of China were to be seated until that political problem is resolved by the parties concerned, or at least by putting them in separate paragraphs, which could be put to the vote separately: (a) the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China, and (b) the expulsion of the present delegation.

142. If the sponsors are prepared to modify their text, there are a number of possible versions. We could envisage a new formulation of the operative part that would read as follows:

"Decides:

"(a) To restore the lawful rights of 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;

"(b) To maintain provisionally the representation of the Government of Formosa in the various organs of the United Nations until its new status has been defined."

143. The second clause would not prejudice any final decision which might be taken on this representation. That decision could be either recognition, with the consent of People's China, of the State of Formosa and its representation or the possible disappearance of that representation.

144. In this connexion, I should like to recall that my Government does not have any relations with the Government of Formosa.

145. In any event, the draft resolution should, I believe, in a new paragraph, instruct the Secretary-General to get in touch with the parties concerned so as to implement the decision to be taken and measures to be taken consequent upon the subsequent membership of the People's Republic of China in our Organization. Whatever the result of that discussion, the Secretary-General should be invited to submit a report to the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly on the question of China, on the basis of the contacts which he has established with the parties concerned, in particular with the Government of the People's Republic of China. At that time he could present to the Assembly a formula for settling the question of China.

146. We believe it would be possible, with a little goodwill to make some headway with the question of China, during this twenty-fifth anniversary session of the United Nations. We believe that a flexible and reasonable attitude on the part of delegations, particularly on the part of the sponsors of the draft resolution, would help us to reach a positive conclusion in this debate.

147. If the present wording of the draft resolution is maintained, however, we should have to think very hard before registering our vote.

148. However I should like to make it abundantly clear that the Tunisian delegation is not proposing any formal amendment. We are confining ourselves simply to underlining the problems and suggesting possible solutions in order to participate objectively in a discussion which with the good will of all, rather than being a routine debate in which principles are discussed for political purposes only, could turn into a fruitful debate which will finally remedy this situation which pursues us so remorselessly and which, unfortunately, often condemns us to impotence.

149. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Since the representative of Tunisia has suggested amendments, I should like to remind representatives that new amendments and proposals may be submitted until 6 p.m. tomorrow, which is the deadline.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.