

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**1967th
PLENARY MEETING**

Monday, 18 October 1971,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 93:

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

Page

1

President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 93

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

1. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): When my country became a Member of this Organization in 1960 it was provided, for the first time, with an opportunity to express itself on the question of the representation of the State of China [887th meeting, para. 10]. There was no doubt in the minds of the Somali Government as to the position it should take: the facts were clear, the constitutional aspects were set out by the Charter, and the body of rules and precedents established by the United Nations provided the necessary procedural framework. Simply stated the facts were these.

2. Firstly, the State of China was admitted to membership in the United Nations on 26 June 1945 and was also made a permanent member of the Security Council.

3. Secondly, from the date of its admittance to 30 September 1949, the State of China was lawfully represented at the United Nations by the accredited representatives of the then Government which was under the leadership of General Chiang Kai-shek.

4. Thirdly, following a popular revolution which resulted in the successful ousting of the Kuomintang Government, a new authority was set up by the Chinese people to govern the country. It was known as the Government of the People's Republic of China and became the effective Government of China from 1 October 1949.

5. On 18 November 1949,¹ 8 January 1950² and again on 20 January 1950,³ telegraphic communications were addressed to the President of the General Assembly and to the Secretary-General of this Organization announcing the change in Government and making it perfectly clear that the Kuomintang representatives could not represent China and had no right to speak for its people in the United Nations. In the communication of 20 January 1950, the

then Chinese Foreign Minister, Chou En-lai, announced the appointment of Chang Wen-tien as Chairman of the delegation of the Government of the People's Republic of China "to attend the meetings and to participate in the work of the United Nations, including the meetings and work of the Security Council".

6. The constitutional issues presented no problem for those who preferred to adhere to a correct interpretation of the Charter and who had no wish to confuse and obscure the issues by resorting to political expedients which were contrary to the letter and the spirit of the Charter. Simply put, those issues were as follows.

7. Firstly, it is the State, and not the Government of a State, which is a Member of the United Nations. The State has a permanent life in the Organization so long as it accepts, and is able and willing to discharge, the obligations of the Charter. The role of the Government is to represent the State so long as the Government lawfully represents the people of the State.

8. Secondly, each State is entitled to one seat on any organ of the United Nations. There is no provision for dual or plural representation of a Member State.

9. Thirdly, in the case of China the Kuomintang Government was ousted from power in September 1949 following a successful revolution and was replaced by the Government of the People's Republic of China, with effect from 1 October 1949.

10. Fourthly, the United Nations should have accepted the credentials of the delegation sent by the People's Republic of China; it should not have accepted the credentials of the Kuomintang régime, which no longer possessed the authority to represent the Chinese people. The series of blocking actions which prevented the representatives of the *de facto* and *de jure* Government from occupying the seat of the State of China constituted an unprecedented act by the United Nations and a defiance of its own norms of law and justice.

11. As for precedents, the facts are equally clear. I can count many States Members of this Organization, including my own country, which are currently represented by Governments which came to power as a result of a popular revolution. The right of our Governments to be considered the effective authorities of our countries was established when those Governments took effective control of the national territory. When a change of government takes place, either by revolution or by normal procedures, it is customary and necessary for the United Nations to be informed of the change and to be given the names of those who will represent the new Government. Our Governments

¹ See document A/1123 (mimeographed).

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, No. 1*, 459th meeting, p. 2.

³ See document S/1462 and Corr.1 (mimeographed).

did this when they came to power, and so did the Government of the People's Republic of China, and we must expect that other Governments will do so in the future. By making an exception in the case of the Chinese people and their Government, the United Nations paid no heed to law, to justice or to the true interests of the Organization.

12. In 1961, 36 States voted for the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China in the organs of the United Nations, 48 States voted to prevent the representatives of that Government from taking their lawful places here and 20 others abstained.⁴ But if our numbers were insufficient in 1961 to carry the resolution, our conviction of the justice of our case was as strong then as it is today. In the past 10 years the facts of the situation have not changed, and yet today only three or four States in this Organization now challenge the right of the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China to take their lawful places in the various forums of our Organization. What is the reason for this revolution in the attitude of a great many Member States? Obviously it is the recognition that the procedural devices of the past were dishonest and illegal.

13. My Government had hoped that, with the recent thaw in relations between the United States and China, the last hurdle to the representation of the latter in the United Nations would have been overcome. Regrettably, we see a continued resort to political expediency and to procedural devices which could have the effect of keeping the representatives of the People's Republic of China out of the United Nations.

14. We see in the present situation the same element that has characterized this question for the past 21 years—the element of confusion. The argument is being made that, by withdrawing recognition of the right of the Kuomintang representatives to occupy the seats in the United Nations reserved for the accredited representatives of the People's Republic of China, the United Nations would in fact be expelling a Member State. Nothing could be further from the truth.

15. Taiwan is an integral part of the State of China, a fact recognized both by the Government of the People's Republic of China and by the Chiang Kai-shek régime. A search through the records of the United Nations for the past 21 years during which this issue has been before the Organization would reveal that that régime has never once claimed any existence for Taiwan separate from China.

16. The question of the expulsion of a Member State therefore does not arise. The question is simply that of the withdrawal of United Nations recognition from a delegation which represents a government that is no longer in power.

17. Furthermore, the question of the relationship of Taiwan to China falls exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the lawful Government of China. It is the Chinese people, and not outsiders, who have the right and

responsibility to determine questions affecting their territorial integrity and sovereignty. If the question had indeed been one of the expulsion of a Member State, the United Nations would have had to have recourse to Article 6 of the Charter, which reads as follows:

“A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.”

I submit that the question is not one of expulsion: it is one of credentials, since no one is questioning the right of the State of China to continued membership in the United Nations.

18. We have heard the argument, based on premises that are demonstrably false, that taking the course of action advocated in the 22-Power draft resolution [*A/L.630 and Add.1*], of which my delegation is privileged to be a co-sponsor, would set a dangerous precedent. The very opposite is the case. That draft resolution seeks to nullify a truly dangerous policy which has enabled a group of States, throughout the years, to block the seating of the representatives of a *de facto* and *de jure* Government because of differences in political ideology. That is the dangerous precedent that the United Nations must remove, and avoid in the future. That is the precedent which has had results that are completely anachronistic in this age of peaceful coexistence.

19. The State of China has its seat reserved for it. Let us ensure that that seat is filled by the Government of that great State, and not by persons who have no official standing with the Chinese people either in fact or in law. The half-truths and half measures that are clouding the real issue behind the China question can only have an adverse effect on the dignity, the authority and the effectiveness of this Organization.

20. Mr. BEAULNE (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): As the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada said in his statement in the general debate on 29 September [*1944th meeting*], this twenty-sixth session opens a new quarter-century in the life of the Organization, and it may mark a turning-point in our history if the Assembly moves promptly and effectively to seat the People's Republic of China in the seat of China.

21. Whether the year 1971 will in fact mark that healthy turning-point depends on the will of this Assembly to move with determination and clarity of purpose to seat the representatives of the People's Republic of China. If we keep that essential purpose clearly in focus and do not permit it to become confused with questions of procedural or secondary concern, we shall be able to accomplish what so obviously needs to be achieved.

22. For Canada the issue is simple and straightforward. We recognize that the State of China has always had its place here as a founder Member of the United Nations. We recognize, too, that there can be only one China and that its sole and legal Government is that of the People's Republic of China. We consider that it is that Government

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1080th meeting, para. 29.

whose representatives have the right to speak from the Chinese seat in this Assembly, in the Security Council and in every meeting of this Organization in which the State of China is entitled by its membership to participate.

23. To achieve that desirable result, Canada will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1, which it hopes will be adopted by an overwhelming majority of this Assembly so as to leave no doubt as to its adoption.

24. It follows that Canada will oppose any procedural or substantive proposal tending to defeat that clear purpose. Among those would be, of course, any proposal for dual representation. In whatever form dual representation might be proposed, Canada would be obliged to vote against it.

25. In the view of the Canadian Government, such a proposal would raise grave political and legal difficulties. It has been firmly stated by the People's Republic of China that it will not take its seat in this Organization as long as there exists any possibility that others who claim to speak for China may continue to be represented here in some way. Furthermore, any such proposal is of very doubtful validity in the light of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. The issue is not a question of membership of the Organization or of expulsion of a Member. It is a question of who represents China. My Government considers that we cannot further delay a decision that it is the People's Republic of China which speaks for China in the United Nations and it is in the light of that firm position that the Canadian delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1.

26. Our attitude to the various other draft resolutions that are now, or that may come, before the Assembly will be decided in accordance with this same basic position. In particular, I should like to refer to the suggestion that depriving those now sitting here as the representatives of China of their right to represent that Member State is an important question under Article 18 of the Charter. Last year when I spoke to the General Assembly [1904th meeting] I stated that Canada's vote in the past on the "important question" resolution had not been a procedural device, but that our purpose had been to ensure that any decision on this did indeed reflect the considered judgement of a significant proportion of the membership.

27. In so far as the issue of Chinese representation is concerned, it has now become clear that a very substantial and growing proportion of the membership is in favour of the seating of the People's Republic of China. In the light of that clear-cut trend, we have examined our position on both the previous "important question" draft resolution and the new version of it that is now before the Assembly. We have come to the conclusion that the General Assembly should not apply the provisions of Article 18 of the Charter, requiring a decision by a two-thirds majority, in relation to the vote on draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1. We believe that the application of those provisions in this instance no longer serves the interests of the world community. We shall therefore vote against any proposal that these provisions be applied to part or all of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1. Similarly, we shall vote against any proposal that a decision on the application of those provisions be voted upon prior to the voting on the document itself.

28. As I have emphasized, the Canadian delegation believes that most of the delegations present here are eager to see the People's Republic of China take its rightful seat in this Organization with a minimum of further delay. If we keep that desirable end firmly in view in the debate that has now begun, I have no doubt that the outcome of our efforts here will be successful.

29. The PRESIDENT: Before I call on the next speaker, I should like to remind Members of the decision taken by the Assembly at its 1965th plenary meeting on 13 October 1971. That decision was in accordance with subparagraph (g) of resolution 1898 (XVIII), of 11 November 1963, which appears as annex IV to the Assembly's rules of procedure. The pertinent passage reads as follows:

"(g) Presiding officer should . . .", *inter alia*,

"(ii) Urge representatives to take the floor in the order in which they were inscribed on the list of speakers, it being understood that representatives prevented from so doing will normally be placed at the end of the list, unless they have arranged to change places with other representatives".

I propose to follow that reasonable procedure.

30. Mr. CHOW (China):⁵ In this statement I shall attempt to place the so-called question of Chinese representation in its proper historical perspective and, at the same time, to view it in the light of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

31. Let me at the outset say at once that the Republic of China, which I have the honour to represent, has earned its place in the United Nations by virtue of its contributions to the cause of peace and freedom during the Second World War.

32. When the war that started in China in 1931 developed into a global conflict, the Republic of China became one of the principal allies which signed the Declaration by the United Nations of 1 January 1942. It was due to the vision and indomitable will of our leader, President Chiang Kai-shek, and the courage and steadfastness of purpose of our people, as well as our close co-operation with the Allies, that the war in the Pacific was finally won.

33. We of the Republic of China looked beyond the victory. We envisaged the day when all mankind would be able to live in peace under the rule of law. The Republic of China therefore played an active part in the Dumbarton Oaks Conversations on World Organization of 1944. It was one of the four sponsoring Powers of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, held at San Francisco in 1945, which brought the United Nations

⁵ In the present document, references to "China" and to the "representative(s) of China" are to be understood in the light of General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI) of 25 October 1971. By that resolution, the General Assembly *inter alia* decided:

"to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations, 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."

Organization into being. It has since faithfully discharged all its Charter obligations. It has, even under most difficult circumstances, served the cause of peace with dedication and diligence.

34. In this connexion, it may be recalled that during the war years the Republic of China lost a major portion of its territory and was cut off from land and sea communication with other parts of Asia. Yet no one questioned the right of the Government of the Republic of China to speak and act on behalf of the Chinese people at international conferences. It was the Government of the Republic of China in Chungking, not the puppet régime in Nanking, that was regarded as the authentic representative of the Chinese people.

35. References have been made to the fact that China was a founding Member of this Organization. The Foreign Minister of Costa Rica spoke eloquently and judiciously this morning [1966th meeting] on this point.

36. The Government that participated in the founding of the United Nations is the same Government of the Republic of China which I have the honour to represent. There has been no break in the continuity of its leadership, institutions or policy. Its legal status has not changed. The fact that the Communists have been in occupation of the Chinese mainland since 1949 does not in any way alter this legal status. In the eyes of the Chinese people, the Government of the Republic of China represents the spirit of the Chinese nation. It stands as a beacon of hope for the enslaved millions on the mainland, the standard-bearer of Chinese culture and civilization, the rallying-point for freedom-loving Chinese everywhere in the world.

37. The Chinese Communist régime, on the other hand, has never had the moral consent of the Chinese people. It has kept itself in power through torture and terror, surveillance and intimidation. In cultural identification, in social structure, as well as in political objectives, it is totally alien to the China that participated in the founding of the United Nations. It is, as my delegation has more than once made clear, un-Chinese in character and un-Chinese in purpose. It can in no sense be regarded as the true representative of the great Chinese nation.

38. Yet for some years Albania, Algeria, Cuba and countries of their ilk have been demanding what they call "the restoration of the lawful rights" of the Chinese Communist régime in the United Nations. Inasmuch as the rights of the Republic of China in the United Nations, as I have already indicated, extend in an unbroken line from 1944, when the Charter was framed, to the present day, it is difficult to know what is meant by the phrase "restoration of lawful rights". It seems to me that it is the rights of the enslaved millions on the mainland—the right of free speech and assembly, the right of residence and movement, the right of worship and religion, even the right of silence—that must be restored.

39. The whole purpose of Albania, Algeria and other henchmen of the Chinese Communist régime has been the expulsion of the Republic of China from the United Nations. This is indeed a matter of the utmost seriousness. It has far-reaching implications for all Members of this

Organization. A previous speaker alluded to Article 6 of the Charter. Permit me to read again the provisions of that Article:

"A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

The previous speaker somewhat twisted and distorted that Article.

40. It is clear that the expulsion of a Member State must be based on two express conditions: first, persistent violation of the Charter and second, a recommendation of the Security Council.

41. The Republic of China, which the General Assembly has been asked to expel, is a Charter Member of the United Nations. Far from "persistently violating the Charter", it has scrupulously and consistently discharged all its Charter obligations. The idea of expelling the Republic of China is thus as absurd as it is unthinkable. This is no mere "legalistic" quibbling; this is a question with far-reaching consequences for the future of this Organization.

42. Albania and other mouthpieces of the Chinese Communists tell us that the so-called restoration of the so-called lawful rights of the Chinese Communist régime is "essential both for the protection of the Charter of the United Nations and for the cause that the United Nations must serve under the Charter" [A/L.630]. This, I submit, is a most preposterous statement. I wonder if they really mean what they say. The paramount purpose of the Organization is the maintenance of international peace and security so as "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". To this end, the Charter commands Member States to refrain from the threat or use of force against the independence or territorial integrity of other nations; to practise tolerance and live together with one another as good neighbours; to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; and to settle their international differences by peaceful means.

43. The Chinese Communist régime negates all those basic Charter principles. It believes that war is not only inevitable but positively desirable. Lin Piao, Mao Tse-tung's heir-apparent, whose fate is now a subject of speculation, has described war as a "great school" capable of "tempering the people and pushing history forward". That régime makes a fetish of force and violence. It foments armed insurrections and promotes so-called "people's war" against established governments. It is the world's most flagrant exponent and most assiduous practitioner of political infiltration and subversion. On the Chinese mainland there have been, and there are now, training centres for guerrilla warfare, with young men from various parts of the world being trained in sabotage and guerrilla tactics for eventual use in their own countries. The essence of the Maoist creed can be summed up in this much-quoted but highly significant sentence:

"The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of the issue by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution."⁶

⁶ Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung (Peking, Foreign Languages Press, 1966), p. 61.

44. For all the gestures of goodwill which Peiping has recently displayed towards certain other countries, there has been no discoverable change in its basic foreign policy. Its military aid continues to go to the Communist troops in Viet-Nam, Laos and Cambodia. In North Korea, it has encouraged Kim Il Sung to take a more militant stance vis-à-vis the Republic of Korea. Arms and ammunition are still being smuggled to rebel bands in the jungles and swamps of Thailand, Indonesia, Burma, Malaysia and the Philippines.

45. The Chinese Communist régime was branded as an aggressor in Korea in 1951 [*resolution 498 (V)*]. This condemnation remains on the books of the United Nations. Such a régime obviously has no place in an organization dedicated to the maintenance of international peace and security. To seat such a régime would be to give implicit blessing to aggression, to undermine the role of law in international relations and to undercut whatever claim the United Nations might have to being a moral force in the world of today.

46. Yet there are those among the representatives here who contend that world peace will be better served by having the Chinese Communist régime inside the United Nations rather than outside of it. They are for ever telling us that the United Nations needs the presence of Peiping to solve such crucial problems as disarmament and the control of nuclear weapons.

47. The exponents of this view, it seems to my delegation, betray a total lack of understanding of the nature of Chinese communism or choose to ignore it. They exaggerate the role Peiping can, or is willing, to play in resolving the awesome problems of our time. It is difficult to understand how a régime bent on reshaping the world by force of arms could contribute to the cause of international peace. Peiping's interest in the United Nations stems primarily from a desire to broaden the scope of its aggressive activities and to transform this Organization into its own instrument of policy. It can wreck the United Nations, as it has torn asunder the much-vaunted monolithic unity of international communism.

48. In any case, it is dangerous to abandon the vital purposes and principles of the Charter in order to accommodate Peiping. The Charter is the basic law of the Organization. You cannot tamper with the Charter without doing irreparable damage to the United Nations itself.

49. We of the Chinese delegation are well aware that weariness with recurrent crises and the fear of nuclear holocaust have engendered in the minds of many men a yearning for normality and a craving for a world-wide *détente*. But peace, it seems to us, does not come by merely wishing it. History bears witness to the fact that peace bought at the cost of vital principles can lead only to disaster.

50. No one should be misled by the gestures of goodwill which Peiping has sometimes seen fit to display. It should be remembered that barely three years ago that régime had no qualms at all in sacking foreign embassies, in subjecting foreign diplomatic personnel to harassment, humiliation and abuse, and in violating every rule of civilized inter-

national behaviour. It may be doubted whether in the long run it is possible for any Government to have any kind of meaningful relationship with that régime at all.

51. Yet there are those who, though otherwise well informed, continue to harbour the most fantastic illusions about the Chinese Communist régime. They detect in the régime's every turn and twist of policy signs of mellowness and maturity. They seem to have forgotten that in the past 20 years there have been a number of such turns and twists, now shifting from a hard line to a soft one and then back again, in accordance with what is called the "objective" demands of the moment. The change has always been one of tactics rather than of basic objectives, and this is still so. World revolution and world domination are, and will remain, the cardinal tenets of the Maoist ideology.

52. That being so, the deceptive change of attitude on the part of Peiping towards the United States and the rest of the world cannot be taken as anything more than a tactical manoeuvre. There can be no question that the new posture is designed to exploit the prevailing pacifist-isolationist mood of the people of the United States to force the complete withdrawal of United States influence from Asia. Indeed, Peiping has not concealed the tactical nature of its present posture. With special reference to the projected visit of President Nixon to the mainland of China, *Wen Hui Pao*, the Chinese Communist newspaper in Hong Kong, published in late July 1971 a collection of 24 old quotations from Mao Tse-tung's works under the general heading "Chairman Mao on policies and tactics of struggle against the enemy". Thus it is all too clear that, so far as the Chinese Communists are concerned, there is no question as to who their enemy is or how Peiping's diplomatic manoeuvres must be viewed.

53. It is significant that most of the quotations in the aforesaid collection are of the 1930s and 1940s, when the Communists negotiated with the Central Government of China, namely, the Government of the Republic of China, in the name of national unity. In the 1930s the slogan was the so-called united front against Japan. The Communists then promised to incorporate their forces into the National Army under the over-all command of Supreme Commander Chiang Kai-shek. Events soon proved that, instead of fighting the invaders, the Communists took the opportunity to expand their own influence. At the close of the war they openly defied the Central Government and set up a rebel régime in north-west China.

54. In the 1940s the Communists negotiated with the Central Government with the ostensible purpose of creating a "strong, united and democratic China". Again they used the opportunity to expand their armed forces and, equipped with arms handed over to them by the Soviet occupation army in Manchuria, they were ready to challenge the authority of the Central Government. In 1949 they took over the Chinese mainland.

55. That is the tragic history of my Government's attempts to co-operate with the Chinese Communists. The lesson of this tragedy should not be lost on those who today think that they can co-operate with the Chinese Communists on terms of mutual advantage.

56. Twenty-two years have passed since the Communist occupation of the Chinese mainland. Chinese society has been remoulded beyond all recognition. The vast country has now become an enormous slave camp. Tens of millions have been slaughtered in the name of liquidating counter-revolutionaries. What sort of rule is this which has felt impelled to resort to such mass executions? What manner of men are Mao Tse-tung, Chou En-lai and company, who at this very moment may be machine-gunning their fellow-Chinese who are trying to escape the so-called Communist paradise to Hong Kong and other places in search of freedom? Such genocidal predilections of the Peiping régime are of course being drowned out in the swelling euphoria surrounding the first direct access to the Chinese mainland for foreign journalists and experts in more than two decades.

57. This grim state of affairs on the mainland offers a glaring contrast to the conditions in Taiwan, at present the base of the Republic of China. Here the masses of people are enjoying a happy and abundant life. The masses of people there have a standard of living which is one of the highest in all Asia. The Republic of China's foreign trade in 1971 is estimated to reach \$U.S. 4,000 million, which would be equivalent to the highest volume of foreign trade ever recorded for the Chinese mainland in any year up to 1970. All this demonstrates what the Chinese people are capable of achieving under conditions of freedom and stability.

58. I believe the facts I have set forth in the course of my statement are enough to show how markedly the Chinese Communist régime has deviated from the pattern of progress and peace laid down in the United Nations Charter. It represents a massive and brutal threat to the independence and freedom of the countries in the vulnerable areas of the world.

59. In the past two decades the Chinese Communist régime has held the United Nations in utter contempt. It has maligned every major United Nations attempt to maintain minimum international order. It has denounced United Nations efforts at peace-keeping. It has vowed to "reform" this Organization thoroughly and completely and transform it into its own image.

60. It would be a tragic and irreparable mistake if the Assembly should bow to the demands of those who would replace the membership of the Republic of China in the United Nations by that of the Communist régime in Peiping. If Albania, Algeria and countries of that ilk are allowed to have their way, then the era of collective aggression is upon us. That, I submit, would mark the beginning of the end of the United Nations as an instrument for the preservation of international peace and security based on law and justice.

61. Let me, therefore, request the majority of the Assembly to declare, in firm and unequivocal terms, the transcendent importance of affirming the right of representation of the Republic of China in the United Nations. Let the Assembly decisively reject the draft resolution submitted by Albania, Algeria and others seeking to exclude the Republic of China from the United Nations. Let the Assembly consider the so-called question of the representa-

tion of China in the light of Charter principles. Any other approach to the question is illegal and must be resisted with firmness and vigour by all loyal Members of this Organization.

62. Mr. CAMARA (Guinea) (*interpretation from French*): The restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China at this twenty-sixth session of the United Nations continues to serve as the backdrop for our work, with the very future of our Organization at stake, and thus it is a test which could tell us whether we have attained a minimum of discernment and whether reason, justice, the desire for peace and security, the cardinal foundations of our Charter, are still to be trampled underfoot and flouted by the traditional subterfuges of dilatory procedural tactics which have always embroiled our debates in sterile oratorical jousting aimed at postponing the solution to the problem.

63. The delegation of the Republic of Guinea, aware that each and every one is sufficiently well enlightened on the question, would be tempted not to take the floor in a debate entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations" because matters are so clear, the facts so precise and the elements involved so well-known that it is perhaps the only too evident simplicity of the problem which entitles certain delegations to sow confusion in order to delay the rightful solution.

64. One day, as Diogenes was walking in broad daylight holding a lantern in his hand, he told an astonished passer-by who questioned him: "I seek a man." Now a quarter of a century after the creation of our Organization, are we also seeking with a lantern in our hand to discover where the People's Republic of China is? Is it possible that for some at least this is a difficult task, although the fact that there is none so blind as he who will not see.

65. At all of our previous sessions we had to consider the question which now appears on the agenda of our current debates. Over the years, some evolution has occurred so that today we have reached the point of no return where, for the first time, each delegation will have on this occasion in full awareness and knowledge of the facts, to assume its responsibilities and make its choice which is irreversible because it is governed by the inevitable triumph of truth over lies and mystification. Twenty-five years ago, following upon a world war, the horrors and destruction of which had reached such terrible dimensions, the survivors of that cataclysm felt the need to create the United Nations on the ashes of the defunct League of Nations in order to preserve peace, improve and clarify international relations and prevent any threat of world war, taking precisely into account the colossal development in weapons of destruction and death.

66. As they have attained national sovereignty and independence all nations of the world have joined and continue to join this Organization. A certain number of States have arrogated to themselves the privilege of deciding the course of the world's advance and in the last analysis as permanent members of the Security Council of deciding on the preservation and maintenance of international peace and security. The history of the United Nations teaches us

that these nations call themselves the five great Powers. Far be it from us, at least at the present stage of our debates, to discuss whether or not this exorbitant privilege is well founded. But what is important to us is that in practice these five great Powers have themselves seen their numbers reduced to four—and that happened a good many years ago. Such a situation cannot be explained except by the non-existence of the fifth partner or by the absence of the person rightfully entitled to the seat.

67. The United States of America, the Soviet Union, China, the United Kingdom and France are the States which we have come to call the five great Powers. However, behind the name-plate of one of the five great Powers, China is now represented by a certain number of persons. Who are these people? Who and what do they represent? That is the question that the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session should resolve in order to extricate our Organization from a flagrantly unjust situation that paralyzes its regular operations.

68. China is a founding Member of the United Nations. By the size of its population, its economic and scientific potential, by its cultural influence, and because of its political weight and its influence in its own region and throughout the world, it was included in the Charter signed at San Francisco as a member of the "club" of the five great Powers. Internal upheavals owing to the victories of the popular forces of democracy led to the advent of a new régime which is qualitatively superior and in accord with the objectives and ideals of the Chinese people.

69. As a logical consequence of this popular victory, the leaders of the old régime took refuge on an island which is an integral part of China. By an ironic twist of the kind which common sense refuses to conceive of, as it developed, it is the so-called government-in-exile which countries claiming to embody the virtues of democracy and liberty have succeeded in imposing as the representative of China in the international community of the United Nations.

70. It is tragic to think that for more than 20 years we, the representatives of sovereign Governments that have been elected by universal popular suffrage—at least in the large majority of cases—should have agreed to such a *diktat* which is repugnant to anyone's conscience, for it has been established that the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek are actually exiles who represent only themselves and the interests of those who, flouting all laws and logic, have succeeded in imposing their presence upon us. It is from this standpoint therefore and from this standpoint alone that the problem should be posed if we want to provide a final solution which is appropriate, which is necessary and which is consistent with the dictates of our conscience.

71. One thing is certain—it is conceded, for that matter, by most delegations—that the problem which concerns us does not and cannot involve the question of the admission of a new Member or of the expulsion of another Member. Once this indispensable preamble has been established, let us look at the question raised by the restoration of the lawful rights of a people, the Chinese people. If we concede that in this Assembly the people of China are entitled to a seat in their capacity as a permanent member of the Security Council and that this has been true ever since the

founding days of our Organization, the only question which arises is who represents the Chinese people. To answer that question our General Assembly is seized of three draft resolutions.

72. The Republic of Guinea and 21 other Member States demand in draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 that the international community should finally decide to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and immediately to expel, without appeal and without recourse, the Chiang Kai-shek usurpers. This draft resolution in clear and precise terms places the problem in its true context for no one today can dispute these facts. Firstly, China was the cradle of culture, hailed by poets and historians of all ages, and that it has participated for centuries in the history of civilization to which it has made an exceedingly valuable contribution. Secondly, this China is certainly the one which was and remains a founding Member of the United Nations. Thirdly, the Government of the People's Republic of China is the authentic expression of, and the authorized and mandated spokesman for, the 800 million men, women and children who make up the great Chinese nation. Fourthly, we cannot talk of international peace and security without the presence and participation on effective terms of one quarter of the population of the globe. Fifthly, the reactionary puppet clique which is temporarily still taking shelter behind the nameplate "China" in this Assembly represents nothing other than a bunch of traitors expelled by the sovereign people, who took refuge in a province of China under the military protection of a foreign Power for economic and strategic reasons. These fugitives have obtained the inadmissible privilege of representing within the international community a people which has withdrawn its confidence from these representatives. Sixthly, to try to isolate the most densely populated State of the world, a State recognized by more than 60 sovereign nations, which by its creative genius and desire for progress and peace has emerged from the ranks of the exploited to explore the secrets of the atom and take its place among the great Powers, is a Utopian and blind endeavour.

73. Draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 requires no comment because it is so widely accepted and understood that the Government presided over by Prime Minister Chou En-lai certainly represents the great Chinese people which, under the enlightened leadership of one of the most prestigious Heads of State, President Mao Tse-tung, has made considerable progress so that our debates today are being carried out in a different atmosphere.

74. Opposed to this draft resolution, we have in document A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 the United States draft resolution affirming on the one hand the right of the People's Republic of China to be represented as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council and affirming on the other hand the alleged right of an alleged Republic of China to continue to be represented.

75. The Guinean delegation has read very carefully the United States draft resolution. After having heard this morning [1966th meeting] the spokesman for the United States inject doubt and confusion in the minds of many delegations, it becomes of overriding importance to clarify the situation. Let us repeat that it is not a matter of the

admission or expulsion of a Member State, but rather of the restoration of the lawful rights of a people. For more than 20 years the same men on behalf of the same States have clamoured that there was only one seat for the Chinese people. That seat was allocated to one of their by-products, protected and maintained by a colossally strong military strike force.

76. Today, under the pressure of events, the same men are telling us that things have changed, that the authentic representatives of the Chinese people, the Government of the People's Republic of China, should hold the seat which is theirs by right as a permanent member of the Security Council. If the United States draft resolution had stopped there, my delegation would have been particularly happy to congratulate the United States and its co-sponsors on the courage and lucidity with which they had put an end to 20 years of error, ineptness, illogic and injustice. It is never too late to do the right thing. There is no harm in confessing that one has been wrong. Unfortunately, the United States draft resolution, because of its paragraph 2, under which the General Assembly would affirm the alleged right of an alleged Republic of China, constitutes not only a step backward but also a true act of provocation designed to maintain the erroneous concept of two Chinas.

77. We have already said this in the past. In this Assembly there can be only one seat for the Chinese people. To recognize on the one hand—as indeed is confirmed in the United States draft resolution—that fundamental changes have occurred in China which compel the international community to revise the false judgement that has held sway for 20 years in order to restore to the authentic representatives of the Chinese people their rightful place, and on the other hand to concede in the same draft resolution a right to the false representatives of the same people to occupy the same seat is, we think, insanity.

78. My delegation does not wish to consider draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2, under which the same sponsors invoke Article 18 of the Charter to decide that the subject of our debate is an important question. In my delegation's opinion, what is at stake here is neither the admission of a Member State nor the expulsion of a Member State, and therefore we cannot invoke Article 18. The true matter of substance which should concern the delegations here present is that of determining how and why so many sovereign States have allowed themselves to be led along in such a state of mystification, and why so many other States still today cling to this attitude so stubbornly.

79. It is not my delegation's intention to give any lessons to anyone, but in our opinion it is essential that certain points of clarification should be given in order to avoid any confusion.

80. To neutralize and condition certain delegations in order to bring them to the point where they will support the view set forth in the pernicious United States delegation's resolution, we have heard reference to dangerous precedents which by the interplay of majorities might lead to the exclusion of a Member State. The trap is a crude one and would not withstand any critical analysis. That is why we would solemnly request the United States and their

friends purely and simply to withdraw their draft resolution; in so doing, they will have rendered an inestimable service to the cause of mankind, to the maintenance of peace and to the improvement of relations among nations.

81. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand): For more than 20 years—most of the lifetime of this Organization—there has been disagreement as to who should represent China in the United Nations. The problem arose both from developments within China and from differences between the great Powers. It still exists. But in the past year or so important changes have been taking place, and these changes hold out hope that progress can now be made. At this session the General Assembly has, perhaps for the first time, a real opportunity to come to grips with this issue, and to bring its own composition, and that of other United Nations bodies, more into line with the realities of the world we live in.

82. My Government has long felt that the People's Republic of China should be represented in the United Nations. As far back as 1961, New Zealand took the initiative in proposing an item on this subject,⁷ so that the General Assembly would have an opportunity to consider carefully all its implications. Early in 1969, my Prime Minister made it clear that New Zealand wished to see the People's Republic of China represented in the United Nations and accepting the responsibilities and privileges that membership entails. And at the twenty-fourth regular session he pointed out that "the United Nations is increasingly faced with the need to come to terms with a situation where a quarter of the world's population remains unrepresented in it" [1757th meeting, para. 139].

83. The effectiveness of this Organization has undoubtedly been impaired by the fact that the People's Republic of China does not take part in its work. The absence of that State reduces the value of this Assembly as a forum for the discussion of international issues, and limits the authority of its decisions and recommendations. Its presence would make the United Nations a more accurate reflection of the real world, and should enable it to face up to some major problems of peace and security that it has hitherto been unable even to discuss seriously.

84. New Zealand is therefore in favour of seating the People's Republic of China. We want to see it take part, not only in the General Assembly but in all other United Nations bodies, including the Security Council. If the Council is to fulfil its functions properly, it must include all the great Powers. The People's Republic of China is clearly one of them, and it should be a permanent member of the Council.

85. What we in New Zealand have long felt desirable seems now to be within our grasp. The reason is that in the past year or so a significant beginning has been made in the development of a changed relationship between great Powers. This is a matter of considerable importance to New Zealand. As a small country in the South Pacific, on the fringe of Asia, we cannot but be concerned about the effect these relationships have in the Pacific basin. The tension

⁷ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixteenth Session, Annexes*, agenda items 90 and 91, document A/4873.

that has long been present, and the conflicts to which it has led, have worried New Zealanders profoundly. They have long looked forward to the day when this tension would ease, and a more relaxed atmosphere would prevail. We see in President Nixon's visit a sign that that day may at last be approaching.

86. New Zealand therefore wishes to see the People's Republic of China represented in the United Nations, and we believe that this is now a practical possibility. There are, however, various ways of realizing that possibility, and they are not all equally consonant with the realities of the world we live in, with the interests of the United Nations, or with the cause of peace.

87. The difficulty confronting us is that there is not one Chinese Government but two. It is an indisputable fact that the territory and people which acquired representation when the Republic of China ratified the United Nations Charter as a founding Member in 1945 are now divided between the Republic of China and the People's Republic of China. The Government in Peking has effective control of a very large area and population, and wields considerable power. But the Government in Taipei also controls a substantial area and a population greater than that of most Members of the United Nations. Nor is this an ephemeral situation. It has already persisted for over 20 years, and there seems no immediate prospect of its coming to an end.

88. The People's Republic of China is one of the world's great Powers and one of the world's nuclear Powers, recognized by about half of our membership. The Republic of China, however, is a stable and well-armed Power, also recognized by about half our Members and having a mutual security treaty of continuing validity with one of the great Powers. An attempt by either to achieve reunification by force, rather than by negotiation and with the free concurrence of those most directly affected, namely the people of Taiwan, could not fail to have serious implications. This Assembly can make its best contribution by acknowledging these realities, by making room for both voices of the Chinese people, and by encouraging a peaceful solution to outstanding issues affecting both of them.

89. A just and reasonable approach to the problem of Chinese representation must therefore take account of the fact that there are two well-established Chinese Governments. They may eventually come to terms and be reunited peacefully. Other countries could only welcome such a development.

90. But there is no sign that such a development is imminent, or that it could be brought about by international pressure. If the United Nations is to reflect the real world, therefore, if it is to include the governments that actually exercise authority, provision must be made for the representation of both the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China. Those States may even find in participation in this Organization, as the Secretary-General has said when speaking of divided countries generally, a common ground for working together to overcome their differences [A/8401/Add.1, para. 103]. This is the solution most in keeping with the spirit of the United Nations, with its past practice, and with its function as a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations.

91. It is for those reasons that New Zealand has joined in sponsoring draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2. We believe this draft resolution does provide a fair and reasonable solution to this vexed problem. By affirming the right of representation of the People's Republic of China, and by recommending that it be seated as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council, the draft seeks to correct a serious anomaly and give the People's Republic of China its due place in this Organization. At the same time, by affirming the continued right of representation of the Republic of China, it acknowledges, not only that the Republic of China is a political reality, but also that it has for over 25 years conscientiously fulfilled the obligations of a Member of the United Nations. The draft merely accepts the fact that, for the time being, there are two Chinese Governments. It does not either assume that the present situation is permanent, or seek to perpetuate it. The final preambular paragraph makes it plain that this draft resolution is without prejudice to the eventual settlement of the claims involved, which can only be reached by the parties themselves.

92. But what of the other proposal before us—the one put forward by Albania and a number of other countries? Does it not lead us from ignoring one set of realities to overlooking another? It calls explicitly for the expulsion of the representatives of the Republic of China. Its supporters argue that this does not mean the expulsion of a Member, but only the removal of those who represent a régime that has been overthrown and no longer exercises the authority of a government. But this is patently untrue. The Government in Taipei does exercise authority: if it does not do so throughout China, then neither does the Government in Peking. The effect of the Albanian resolution would be to deprive the Government of the Republic of China of the right of representation in the United Nations, which it has enjoyed and exercised for more than a quarter of a century. To say that this is not expulsion is casuistry.

93. My Government has long felt that any proposal that contemplates the withdrawal of the right of representation falls squarely within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter and should therefore be subject to adoption by a two-thirds majority vote. That view has not changed. We believe the question of expelling any Member is an important one and we have therefore joined in sponsoring draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2.

94. In taking this action we have had in mind more than merely legal considerations. We have been guided by the belief that this Organization has been better served throughout its history by taking a broad rather than a narrow view of its Charter. We have been concerned about the Organization's fundamental nature and purposes. The United Nations exists no less for the benefit of the small than for that of the great. The Charter is largely designed to protect the rights of those who have relatively little power of their own, and to ensure that they are not sacrificed to the interests of those who have much. It would be quite contrary to this purpose, and to the cause of peace, for the representatives of the Government in Taipei to be driven out to make way for those of the Government in Peking. It would also, my delegation believes, be inimical to the well-being of this Organization.

95. There is a further consideration that is no less weighty. Many of those who spoke in the general debate stressed the need for universality of membership. There is clearly a wide-spread and growing feeling in this Assembly that the United Nations should be open to all governments, including those in countries that are at present divided. My Government has considerable sympathy with this view. As long ago as 1955, when the first large group of new Members was admitted, the New Zealand representative expressed the view that admission to the United Nations was not a prize, not a reward, not an accolade: it was a right—the right of all peace-loving States that accept the obligations of the Charter and are able to carry them out. That is still our view. Divided countries present particular difficulties that may still take time to overcome. But as my Minister said in the general debate:

“It is for the Assembly rather to make clear that a resolution of the basic conflict lies with the parties concerned, while providing for the seating of both in the Organization.” [1955th meeting, para. 167.]

96. At a time when the demand for universality is strong, and when the admission of divided countries is becoming a real question, would it be consistent to expel one part of the only divided country that is already a Member, in order to make way for the other part? My Government believes that it would not. If the Republic of China were expelled, as the Albanian resolution requires it to be, the principle of universality would be as far from realization as ever. Rather than moving towards a solution to the problem of divided countries, we would have moved away from it, back to the period when the rival claims of two Governments could be seen only as mutually exclusive alternatives. That is not the way to universality.

97. To sum up: my Government has long believed that the People's Republic of China should be represented in the United Nations—not only in the General Assembly and in other organs, but as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council. We believe that this has now become a practical possibility, because of changes in the attitudes of the People's Republic of China and of the United States of America. We do not, however, agree that its realization must, or should, involve the expulsion of the Republic of China. In our view, any proposal to deprive that Government of representation is an important question under the terms of Article 18 of the Charter, and should be decided only by a two-thirds majority. The expulsion of the Republic of China would be contrary to one of the fundamental purposes of the United Nations, the protection of the less powerful against the more powerful. And it would be a flat contradiction of the principle of universality, on which the case for the admission of divided States is almost entirely based.

98. This Assembly now has the opportunity to deal with a problem that has bedeviled the United Nations for most of its existence. It can do so in a crude way, ignoring the complexities of the problem, or it can adopt a realistic and reasonable approach: it can try to make the United Nations a more accurate reflection of the real world and it can thus enable the Organization to fulfil more effectively its function of harmonizing the actions of nations. We hope that it will choose the latter course.

99. Mr. ARIKPO (Nigeria): The first concrete result of the stock-taking exercise which Members of the United Nations performed during the Organization's twenty-fifth anniversary celebrations last year will be the correction of the inequitable situation which compelled the United Nations to exclude one fifth of the world's population from participating in its activities. It will be recalled that in the speeches marking the twenty-fifth anniversary celebrations almost all delegations referred to the desirability of making effective the principle of universality in the membership of the United Nations by admitting to membership in the Organization those countries which are at present excluded for one reason or another and by ensuring that the Chinese people are represented by the Government which is in effective control of their territory and which commands their allegiance and loyalty.

100. The Nigerian delegation to the twenty-fifth anniversary celebrations fully supported the concept of universality advocated by most delegations, particularly as it pertained to the People's Republic of China, whose 800 million inhabitants had for too long been deprived of active participation in an Organization of which they were one of the founding Members.

101. My Government was and is still convinced that the United Nations cannot realistically tackle the issues of world peace and international security as long as the People's Republic of China, with its immense economic and military potential and its nuclear capacities, is excluded from the membership of the world body.

102. I recall, in this connexion, the declaration adopted by the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lusaka, Zambia, in September 1970:

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

103. It is also pertinent to recall that, for the first time in the history of the United Nations, the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session [1913th meeting] voted, by a simple majority, in favour of restoring to the People's Republic of China its lawful right to occupy the seat allocated to China in the United Nations. The wish of the majority of the Members of this Organization was thwarted by the minority who found shelter in legal and procedural technicalities, thereby further delaying the quest for world peace.

104. My delegation cannot see any justification for accepting both sets of credentials presented by two rival delegations which claim to represent the same country, for this is what the China controversy is about. The representatives of both the Government of the Republic of China, which is at present taking shelter in Taiwan, and the Government of the People's Republic of China, which is in complete and effective control of all the Chinese mainland, claim to represent the whole of China. The whole world is in no doubt about who, on the evidence before us, in fact

represents the whole of China. China has one seat in the United Nations, and even the best friends of the Republic of China now agree that the People's Republic of China is entitled to that seat.

105. Why, then, is this Organization being asked to provide a second seat for 2 million Chinese people who run a separate administration in Taiwan, outside the Chinese mainland? I ask this question because the real issue is not who represents the 800 million Chinese, but what is the international legal status of Taiwan.

106. The Treaty of Peace with Japan,⁸ signed at San Francisco on 8 September 1951, affirmed the colonial status of Taiwan and kept its legal status undetermined, pending an international settlement. In Article 2 of that Treaty, Japan renounced all its "right, title and claim" to Taiwan, but the Treaty did not specify any beneficiary to Taiwan. We all know that both Peking and Taipei claim that Taiwan is part of China. We also know that the 12 million indigenous inhabitants of Taiwan have repeatedly challenged this claim and that the Taiwanese do not identify themselves with the régime of Chiang Kai-shek. In any case we know of no formal transfer of sovereignty over Taiwan to the Republic of China. Therefore, for the moment, we should be concerned only with the question of which of the two claimants to the China seat should be seated. The answer to that question is simple and there is a general consensus in this Organization: it is that the representatives of the People's Republic of China should occupy that seat.

107. The nature of the régime in any country is purely the internal affair of the people of that country. The Charter makes specific reference to this in Article 2. It will therefore be wrong for this Organization to make it impossible, by procedural manoeuvres, for the clearly acclaimed Government of a Member State to represent that country merely because some Members, or even a majority of Members, do not approve of the complexion of that Government. This principle was further elaborated in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, which provides that:

"No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements, are in violation of international law." [*Resolution 2625 (XXV), annex.*]

108. As far as the United Nations is concerned, it is the Government of a country acknowledged by its people that represents that country in this Organization. Unfortunately, in the case of China we have witnessed in this Assembly for the past 21 years a situation where a Government which at best represents a most insignificant percentage of the population of China in fact claims to represent the entire Chinese people, and, with the assistance of its friends, has managed to deprive the legitimate Chinese Government of

the seat which it should clearly occupy. Now that the international community is prepared to reverse this anomaly, the argument is being adduced that, while the legitimate Government can occupy the Chinese seat, the splinter group based in Taiwan should also continue to occupy another seat. The explanation that has not been clearly given to us is, of course, how one Chinese seat can be occupied by two diametrically opposed régimes—one which rightly represents the Chinese people and the other which erroneously claims to represent them.

109. When Nigeria entered into diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China early this year my Government announced that it recognized the Government in Peking as the sole legal representative of the Chinese people. Thus, as far as we are concerned, the Peking Government is the régime that is entitled to occupy the one and only Chinese seat in the General Assembly and the permanent seat of China in the Security Council. That realistic approach has also been adopted by a good number of countries that have entered into relations with the People's Republic of China over the past year. To say that the United Nations should not decide on the merits of the claims of the People's Republic of China and the régime in Formosa is to refuse to face the reality of the situation, for it is not possible for two rival delegations to occupy a single seat. In fact, this Organization would be creating a dangerous precedent if it were to show itself willing to create an additional seat for any group proclaiming itself in opposition to the legitimate government in power in its country.

110. It is amazing that much is being made of the argument that the restoration of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China would result in the expulsion of an existing Member of this Organization and thus create a dangerous precedent. My delegation does not share that view. In fact, we believe that no present Member of the Organization would be expelled by the simple process of the restoration of the Chinese seat to the widely recognized Government of China. China has always been a Member of this Organization and, with the assumption of the seat by the People's Republic of China, will continue to be a Member of this Organization. Wherein, therefore, lies the expulsion, particularly as the régime based in Taiwan insists that it also represents the whole of China? Thus, the premise on which the draft resolution sponsored by the United States and 18 other countries, contained in document A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, is based seems to my delegation to be completely faulty.

111. As far as the United Nations is concerned, there exists only one China. Whoever represents the Chinese people is entitled to that seat reserved for China. That is what the draft resolution contained in the document sponsored by a group of States ranging, in alphabetical order, from Albania to Zambia [*A/L.630 and Add.1*] seeks to do, and that is what my delegation believes the General Assembly should do.

112. The concept of universality as applied to the United Nations is like the concept of self-determination as applied to nation-States. Just as self-determination cannot be interpreted to give the stamp of approval to the right of secessionists to break up a country, so universality must not

⁸ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 136, No. 1832.

be stretched to encourage membership in the United Nations of pretenders who claim to represent people whom in fact they do not represent. Universality cannot be interpreted to mean membership in the United Nations of national splinter groups which represent nobody but themselves.

113. I am sure that the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, seeking to preserve a seat for the Formosa régime, are aware of the controversy that is raging as to the representative character of the Government based on that island. My Government has been inundated with documents and petitions from people who claim to be Formosans, arguing that the so-called Republic of China in exile cannot claim to represent the people of Taiwan. Most of those petitions have also alleged that the régime in Taiwan allows for the 12 million Taiwanese, representing 85 per cent of the population, only 3 per cent token representation in the congressional bodies in Taiwan. In fact, those people claim that the régime in Taiwan has illegally occupied the island and imposed a virtual dictatorship over the 12 million Taiwanese.

114. An article carried by *The New York Times* on 16 November 1970, entitled "Formosa for the Formosans", had this to say:

"When the People's Republic of China under Mao Tse-tung was established in October 1949, Chiang Kai-shek fled to Formosa with the remnants of his military and civilian personnel, and on March 1, 1950, Chiang Kai-shek illegally and arbitrarily became a self-proclaimed 'President' of the 'Republic of China' and the dictator of Formosa."

The article continued:

"The exiled nationalist Chinese régime does not represent the people of Formosa . . .".

115. With those articles and petitions at the back of our minds it should be easy to picture the confusion which would result were the United Nations to embark on the dangerous course of creating two seats, one for the People's Republic of China and one for the Republic of China. Since there are arguments that the so-called Republic of China is under a régime that is not representative even of the people of the island of Formosa, the time will not be far off when the United Nations may again be called upon to create another seat for a group of Formosans who may be able to convince some Member States of this Organization that they in fact represent the people of the island. I cannot image that it is the intention of some Members of this Organization to open the flood-gates for splinter groups and secessionist régimes. The concept of world peace and stability to which the United Nations should address itself can have meaning only if the Organization ensures that peace and stability reign in its component Members. The only solution, therefore, to the long-standing problem of China's representation in the United Nations is to restore to the legitimate Chinese Government the privilege which has been usurped from it these past 21 years.

116. My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 with the clear conviction that the

Government of the People's Republic of China has clearly demonstrated its devotion to the essential elements of the Charter of the United Nations. That Government has strengthened its relations with other Governments all over the world; it has shown its dedication to the maintenance of international co-operation among States; it has demonstrated its unflinching support for the principle of self-determination and the total eradication of colonialism and its twin evil of racism. Moreover, my delegation will vote for the draft resolution because we are convinced that no significant progress can be made in the attempt to achieve disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, without the active participation of the People's Republic of China, which is itself a nuclear Power. My delegation will vote for the draft resolution because we are also convinced that this Organization cannot, in conformity with its Charter, continue to deprive a people of the right of representation by its acclaimed Government.

117. The PRESIDENT: I understand that the representative of Saudi Arabia has asked for permission to introduce the amendments in document A/L.637. That document has been circulated. I now call on the representative of Saudi Arabia.

118. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I have asked to speak not to make my principal statement on the item before the Assembly, but to submit a number of amendments to one of the two substantive draft resolutions presented by various sponsors. I am thirty-second on the list of speakers, and in good time, when my turn comes, I shall unfold to the Assembly practicable plans which I believe to be just and equitable, and not conditioned by expediency or a false basis of political solidarity—far from it.

119. Today, after having listened to the statement of our colleague from Albania [*1966th meeting*], who threw the ball into the arena of the debate, I studied very carefully draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1, which is sponsored by his delegation and a number of others. The sponsorship of the draft resolution starts with Albania and ends with Zambia; hence it runs the gamut of the alphabet from A to Z. But there are many gaps between those two letters. I wonder whether any draft resolution in the United Nations, for that matter, can be considered the last word, or, so to speak, the alpha and omega, for the solution of any problem so complicated as the one of which we are seized.

120. On the other hand, we have before us another substantive draft resolution, co-sponsored by Australia and a number of other States ending up with the United States of America [*A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2*].

121. Neither of these draft resolutions is conclusive or sacrosanct—with all due respect to the delegations that sponsored each of them. Curiously enough, only the United States of America, of the five permanent members of the Security Council, appears as a sponsor of one of these two draft resolutions. Understandably, the delegation of the Republic of China did not find it appropriate to append its name even to the draft resolution that tries to protect its seat in the United Nations. But absent from the sponsorship of both draft resolutions are the other three major Powers of the Security Council, namely, France, the United

Kingdom and the Soviet Union. Are those three Powers so confused by the issue? Or are they simply waiting to see how the wind blows before they show their colours, as the United States clearly did this morning [1966th meeting] through our colleague, Ambassador Bush, who I must say, emerged as a natural orator, shunning the vague, rhetorical and quite often ambiguous phrases that frequently stultify our debates in this hall. I must say, too, that our good colleague from Albania was also straightforward and cogent. He did not mince his words about those whom he considered imperialists. I did not hear whether he vilified capitalists. I hope not, for I happen to be an enlightened one, and would even support State capitalism if it were for the common weal of communities and nations.

122. Are the two substantive draft resolutions before us the acme—remember, “acme” is from *aqaba*, the summit, in Arabic (I do not like to use that word “summit”; too many “summits” lead to nothing these days)—the acme of what is desired by the large majority—the emphasis is on “large”—of the United Nations? I leave the answer to each Member State to make to itself, if not to its neighbour. You have only to look at the sponsors of each of the draft resolutions—and here I mean the two substantive draft resolutions.

123. The sponsors of the so-called Albanian draft resolution consist largely of socialist countries and two or three other States which happen to have vital interests in common with the People's Republic of China. On the other hand, the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, the so-called Australian draft resolution, are drawn mostly from Member States whose political organizations differ in varying degree from the political systems of most of the States that are behind the Albanian draft resolution.

124. There is no unanimity on such an important question. But again I ask, why are the three major Powers sitting on the side-lines? Perhaps they thought it would be wise not to be too sure that either of the aforementioned draft resolutions is satisfactory enough to merit their sponsorship.

125. I wish to state forthwith that there is room for improvement in both of these draft resolutions. Furthermore, I must assure the Assembly that the country which I represent is neither aligned nor non-aligned. I should like to know why you are puzzled. I anticipated that this might intrigue you because, at one time, we thought we were in the non-aligned group of States; and all of a sudden we found many of our non-aligned colleagues dancing on various ropes. So we got dizzy. We preferred not to be labelled anything. We are independent. Let it be known: we are independent of all those alignments, arrangements, free of all considerations such as—“What do I get out of this? Should I shift my loyalty to certain sets of principles?” “Am I a socialist? am I a capitalist? am I a communist? am I a monarchist or what have you?” We are simply a State Member of the United Nations and, in my person, as our representative here, we try conscientiously to make our views known to our colleagues as brothers. And this we do, irrespective of whether they are aligned or non-aligned, whether they are monarchists or non-monarchists, and whatever political system of their own choosing they may belong to. So we are neither imperialist nor socialist, in

spite of the fact that the subsoil and the natural resources of our country are exclusively the property of the State, just as is the case in the most radical socialist countries. It is a paradox, is it not, that we are monarchist, and still the State owns all the natural resources? But it is so.

126. I must also say that we did not do badly in developing our natural resources by dealing with capitalist countries, progressively so, on our own terms. Why have I mentioned this? Lest we be considered aligned with the countries from which some of those companies come. We do not deal politically; we deal economically and financially with companies with which it is in our interest to do business. Hence our independence in our judgement.

127. But let us forget for a moment such hackneyed phrases as socialist, imperialist or capitalist and instead grapple with the question before us. I submit that both of the substantive draft resolutions are deficient and, instead of resorting to generalities to show why they are deficient, I shall explain my amendments, first, to the Albanian draft resolution; at a later stage in the debate I shall submit amendments to the Australian draft resolution—hoping that by so doing I shall be able to prevail on the sponsors of both draft resolutions to see how we may be able to devise a solution, not only by dint of logic and common sense, but also by fairness and justice to all the parties concerned.

128. English happens to be my working language. I realize that the original text of the Albanian draft resolution is in French; however, I am addressing myself to the English text. I am a little disappointed by those English-speaking members who appended their names to the Albanian draft resolution. Why were they not a little more meticulous in their scrutiny? Or do they lend their names without scrutiny? Sometimes this happens. I have seen it throughout a quarter of a century; they say “Oh, put my name down; I am with you.” This is a frivolous manner in which to treat serious draft resolutions of the General Assembly. I shall read the second paragraph of the preamble as it stands in document A/L.630 and Add.1:

“*Considering* that the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China is essential both for the protection of the Charter”—

Good Lord! “Protection of the Charter”! As Member States, do we protect the Charter? I do not think so; we either observe or disregard the Charter or, not infrequently, alternately respect it and violate its provisions. That is what we do. Who are we to protect the Charter? Those who protect the Charter are those who live in the nth degree according to its provisions. Is there any single State which is so perfect as to abide by the provisions of the Charter? I submit that there is not. We either observe or disregard, or, as I have just mentioned, alternately, and not infrequently, respect or violate its provisions. Hence the word “observe” is better diction, and I am sure that my Albanian friend and other colleagues will agree with me about the choice of that word to improve the text.

129. Then we come to the words “and for the cause that the United Nations must serve under the Charter”. What cause? We are not champions of causes here. I submit that the text is also a little involved and confused, and it could

be improved to give it more strength. So I would think that that preambular paragraph could easily be rewritten so as to have it make better sense, and, without going into the details which appear in my amendment [A/L.637], I shall read it out as follows:

“*Considering* that the restoration of the lawful rights of the People’s Republic of China is essential for the observance of the purposes and principles of the Charter”—not “for the protection of the Charter”—“of the United Nations and for the role that the Charter should play in harmonizing the international policies of Member States”.

It is the prime purpose of the Charter to try to harmonize the international policies of Member States—I did not say “harmonize the policies”—vis-à-vis other nations.

130. “Cause”? What cause? With all due respect to my friends who are sponsors of the Albanian draft resolution, that does not make sense, and I beg the pardon of my colleague from Albania for using the English text and not the French text.

131. My second amendment relates to the third preambular paragraph. It reads: “Replace ‘is’ by ‘should assume its seat as’.”

132. And here the text of the original operative paragraph of the draft resolution is not very clear because it states: “*Decides* to restore all its rights”. The pronoun “its” refers to what? The General Assembly? Was our colleague from Zambia napping? He uses good English. Or the others? “*Decides* to restore all its rights”—whose rights? You put the pronoun before the substantive. According to my amendment the third preambular paragraph would read:

“*Recognizing* that the representatives of the Government of the People’s Republic of China are the only lawful representatives of China to the United Nations and that the People’s Republic of China should assume its seat as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council.”

I did not tamper with the words:

“... that the representatives of the Government of the People’s Republic of China are the only lawful representatives of China to the United Nations and that the People’s Republic of China ... one of the five permanent members of the Security Council”.

Instead of “the People’s Republic of China is one of the five permanent members of the Security Council”, I put “the People’s Republic of China should assume its seat as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council”. It is not factual that it “is” now. Maybe it should have been from the beginning. We are not saying when it should have been. We are trying here—at least in the provisions of this draft resolution—to admit the People’s Republic of China. Therefore, we cannot say that it “is” until it assumes its seat. We do not say “admitted”, we say until it “assumes its seat”. This is better diction: “... that the People’s Republic of China should assume its seat as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council”.

133. We now come to the operative paragraph of the draft resolution. My third amendment would “replace the words ‘all its rights to the People’s Republic of China’ by ‘all the rights to which the People’s Republic of China is entitled at the United Nations’”. That is self-explanatory. That amendment would also replace “only” by “sole”—in French “*uniquement*”. “Only” is weaker. So you see I am trying to make clearer what your intent is. The amendment would also replace the end of the paragraph, beginning with the words “China to the United Nations”, by the words “the whole territory over which the People’s Republic of China exercises full authority ...”—“full authority”, that is the concept of sovereignty. You are taking sovereignty for granted, but we cannot take it for granted without the phraseology to express it. In any resolution, that is the tradition in the United Nations. The amendment continues: “... and to notify the representatives of the Republic of China that they represent only the people of the country over which their Government rules both *de jure* and *de facto* and that, as such, that Government may retain its seat at the United Nations”—and here is the crux—“taking into account that no people”—no people whatsoever, I would say—“should be denied the right of self-determination.”

134. The victors of the First World War set aside the right of self-determination, although it was promulgated by the late Mr. Wilson, the former President of the United States, in his Fourteen Points. They sowed the seeds of the Second World War; they incorporated part of Germany into Czechoslovakia—the Sudetenland—they created Danzig on the Baltic; they created the Polish Corridor. To suit whom? The people of Germany or of Danzig? In the 1920s I was in Western Europe and I remember that Danzig was placed under a high commissioner appointed by the League of Nations. And then the plebiscite got 99.9 per cent. The people of Danzig wanted to be part of Germany and the Polish corridor was left as a bone of contention. That was really one of the pretexts for entering into the Second World War. Whom are we fooling here?

135. It then fell to me and eight of my colleagues—later the whole United Nations—to elaborate the principle of self-determination into a right, a right that appears in article 1 of each of the two Covenants on human rights [resolution 2200 A (XXI)], which took us 20 years to elaborate in one of the Committees of the General Assembly. But you Americans do not say anything about self-determination in your draft resolution and you Albanians say nothing about the right of self-determination. You just want to fix things the way you think things should be fixed. But I will stand on the right of people to self-determination and I would like to have anyone challenge me—and I ask right now for the right to reply. How can you play wantonly with the right of self-determination of any people? You have been so meticulous, you big Powers, that you have been bargaining—“We admit this micro-State and we admit that micro-State to the United Nations”, when sometimes their population does not even amount to 100,000 or 200,000. All right, why not? It is not because you like the idea, but because you are looking for the votes of those States.

136. The crux of the whole Chinese question is not one China or two Chinas, or three Chinas, or Taiwan or Formosa, or Peking, or Chiang Kai-shek or Mao Tse-tung.

The whole crux is the right of self-determination and I will not accept the dialectics of certain orators—without naming them—from this rostrum who tried to shift from one rope to the other and danced and pirouetted. No, let us be frank and straightforward. It is not a question of what Mr. Mao Tse-tung and Mr. Chiang Kai-shek want: it is a question of self-determination of peoples and nations.

137. We have been told this afternoon that part of China is Taiwan. And others indulge in hyperbole and say that mainland China is part of Taiwan. Where do we get with these two arguments? I am neither for the one nor for the other. I am for the people, not for concepts that suit the political modalities of States. We should be for the people. If the people want to be part of the whole, that is their privilege. If they want to confederate, that is their privilege. If they want to maintain their independence, that is also their privilege. Why are you Americans and Albanians confusing the issue with your talk of two Chinas or three Chinas, or two seats and one seat and three seats, and clients from one side playing one tune while clients from the other side play the other tune. There are two peoples here. How is a "people" determined? I will leave that to my principal statement when I will give the definition of a "people" as we have elaborated it during eight years here in the United Nations. The question of defining that term was on the agenda of several sessions of the General Assembly until we came to a conclusion about what a "people" is. We are trying to confuse the issue here by your references to one China, two Chinas, Chiang Kai-shek and Mao Tse-tung—and now Chou En-lai and Mr. Nixon, and I do not know to whom else.

138. That is why I got a little worked up. Indeed I saw that the right of self-determination was cast by the wayside and I included it in an amendment to the text, as Members will see. I am sure that my friends the noble Albanians—and look at that tiny Albania which stands up and challenges the whole United Nations on the mistakes it makes—will take this into account and not act simply by solidarity, which we are all sometimes tempted to do. No one is free from temptation—hence the prayer "Lord, lead us not into temptation".

139. I would ask my colleague from Albania and the sponsors of the draft resolution which has become known by his name to ponder and not to dismiss what I say offhand because they have preconceived ideas. Nobody should have preconceived ideas. We are here to give and take, to negotiate, to act with reasonableness in our negotiations and in our give and take. The paragraph would read as follows:

"Decides to restore all the rights to which the People's Republic of China is entitled at the United Nations and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the sole legitimate representatives of the whole territory over which the People's Republic of China exercises full authority and to notify the representatives of the Republic of China"—

and they are here amongst us—

"that they represent only the people of the country over which their Government rules both *de jure* and *de*

facto and that, as such, that Government may retain its seat at the United Nations, taking into account that no people should be denied the right of self-determination".

I repeat a thousand times "taking into account that no people should be denied the right of self-determination".

140. There is an additional paragraph which does not appear, or seemingly does not appear, in the Albanian draft resolution. That is my fourth amendment: to add a new operative paragraph to read as follows:

"2. *Recommends* that the People's Republic of China should also occupy its seat in all the organizations related to the United Nations".

I am sure that my colleague from Albania and the others will understand that we, as the General Assembly, cannot decide such an issue but we can recommend—that is the most we can do—that the People's Republic of China should also occupy its seat in all the organizations related to the United Nations. Why did I put it separately? Because I could not fit it in as a parenthetical phrase and because it is a thing that we cannot decide, but only recommend. I made sure that it would not be dropped from the text of the Albanian draft resolution but would be preserved, lest our Albanian and other colleagues might think that I was tampering too much with the substance. On the contrary I am pointing out the way in which they can include that idea of the People's Republic of China occupying the seat of China in the various organizations related to the United Nations. That is my recommendation, lest someone at the last minute might say that we have no right to decide but only to recommend, which is a fact.

141. I shall not bother the Assembly this evening with the criticism I have regarding the substantive draft resolutions of Australia and its co-sponsors.

142. One last word: I sincerely hope that when the time comes to address ourselves seriously to consideration of the draft resolutions, we shall not be compelled by our Governments to wear the strait jackets of instructions, but will be allowed a certain latitude so that we may tailor those jackets—without disregarding our instructions—to fit comfortably. I also hope that many of us will not force our colleagues to wear the tight pants of procedure. Between the strait jackets of instructions and the tight pants of procedure—if we follow this method—I do not think there is much room for debate or give-and-take. If we have no choice but to act in this way, then I think it will be wiser in future to conduct our debates by computers.

143. We must remind ourselves that we are not a tribunal here but a body of 130 or 131 Members that cannot sit as judges over a people. Finally, we must not make of this question the proverbial Chinese puzzle, for then we would end by puzzling ourselves, not the Chinese people.

144. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Albania has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of his right of reply, and I now call on him.

145. Mr. MALILE (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The representative of the United States of America, in his

statement today [1966th meeting], taking up the theses of his Government against the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, striving to justify his anti-Chinese position by contradictory arguments, arguments contrary to the provisions of the Charter and the most elementary rules of international law, indulged in attacks against the Albanian delegation. That our speech did not please the United States representative does not surprise us. It is not our fault if the truth on this question is a bitter one for the United States to swallow. What the head of the Albanian delegation said in his statement this morning about the policy of the American imperialists against China and their position that is stubbornly hostile to the restoration of the rights of China in the United Nations was based solely on irrefutable facts. The fact is that the denial for 22 consecutive years of the lawful rights of People's China in the United Nations is the direct consequence of the manipulation of this Organization by the United States and of its hostile policy towards the People's Republic of China.

146. The delegation of Albania, like many other delegations, is championing a just cause. It is obvious to everyone that to ask for the redressing of a grave injustice to the Chinese people, numbering 700 million, means defending the interests of sovereign peoples and States, international peace and security, the Charter which the United States of America is grossly violating.

147. The United States delegation is indulging in all kinds of manoeuvres to salvage a lost cause. In this session of the Assembly, Member States see clearly that the United States, in order to hinder the restoration of the lawful rights of great China in the United Nations, is striving to bring into operation all possible means—from procedural devices to open pressure, from demagoguery to distortion of reality. And the United States representative did not fail to do this again in his statement today. The attempts at speculation which the United States representatives seek to make with the feelings of the representatives here in this Assembly on this question delude no one.

148. All this activity proves clearly that the United States is continuing obstinately to pursue its policy of a position of strength. It shows that the truth in the problem we are discussing is not on the side of the United States. It shows, further, the false nature of official United States statements regarding a so-called realistic policy towards the People's Republic of China.

149. The Albanian delegation, firmly rejecting the attacks of the United States delegation, cannot but stress that the time when imperialists ran the world has disappeared for ever and all the intrigues and pressure of the United States in this regard are doomed to failure. We are sure that the overwhelming majority of the representatives of Member States are convinced that the representatives of Albania have only been defending truth and justice, as Albanian representatives have always done.

150. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in exercise of his right of reply.

151. Mr. SHEVEL (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translation from Russian*): In its statement during the

general debate [1958th meeting], the delegation of the Ukrainian SSR has already demonstrated the lack of foundation for the attempts by the United States to use, among other doubtful arguments for the so-called dual representation of China, the argument that the Ukraine and Byelorussia are Members of the United Nations. We note with regret that the representative of the United States, in an attempt to maintain a place in the United Nations for the Chiang Kai-shek régime, persists in resorting to analogies which are devoid of logic and sense. The difficult position of those who can base their arguments neither on the Charter of the United Nations nor on the generally recognized norms of international law is understandable.

152. It is common knowledge that there is only one country of China, and that Taiwan is merely a part of that country which has been torn from it illegally and by force. Moreover, we all know that we are discussing here, not the admission of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations, but the restoration of its lawful rights in the Organization by allowing the real Government to represent its country.

153. Against all logic, the proposal has been advanced that China should be represented by two delegations, one from the Government of the People's Republic of China and one from the Chiang Kai-shek group, which was at one time cast out onto an island and now, with the sole support of foreign bayonets, maintains itself on that island of Taiwan although, as we all know, sitting on bayonets is, to put it mildly, uncomfortable, as indeed today's discussion of this question confirms.

154. However, the United States representative is, as I have already pointed out, unwilling to take logic into account in his attempt to draw some kind of parallel with the representation of the Ukraine and Byelorussia in the United Nations. There is absolutely no basis for parallels of this kind.

155. I would recall that the Ukrainian SSR is a national sovereign State whose formation is a matter of history, and that together with the other Soviet Republics, it formed in 1922 a socialist federation of the highest order, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The sovereignty of the Ukrainian SSR and its status as a subject of international law are secured both by the Constitution of the Ukraine and by the Constitution of the Soviet Union. In accordance with constitutional and international law, the Ukraine takes its place as a full and equal participant in international relations.

156. It should also be recalled that, in view of these facts, and also in acknowledgement of the tremendous contribution made by the Ukrainian and Byelorussian peoples to the defeat of the common enemy of the United Nations, the San Francisco Conference, in April 1945, decided unanimously to invite the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republics to become founder Members of the United Nations. For more than a quarter of a century, the contribution of the Ukrainian SSR and its 48 million inhabitants to the realization of the purposes of the United Nations has been internationally acknowledged.

157. In view of the foregoing arguments, we find any analogy with the Chiang Kai-shek clique offensive, and

devoid of any moral or legal basis. The arguments advanced by the defenders of the Chiang Kai-shek régime, in whatever extravagantly humourous or linguistic form they may be brought up, are far-fetched; their aim is to divert the Assembly from the substance of the matter, and constitute a new attempt to impede a solution to the problem.

158. The question is one of restoring the lawful rights of the Chinese people, and permitting their lawful representatives to participate in the work of the United Nations. It is not a question of admitting one Member and excluding another, as some would have us believe. The political reality

of the day is that there exists only one Chinese State, the People's Republic of China, which should occupy China's place in the United Nations and speak on behalf of the Chinese people.

159. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR considers, with other delegations, that the only just solution to the question is to restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, and to expel from the Organization the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek régime.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

