

United Nations  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



1969th  
PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 19 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*) . . . . . 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. KJARTANSSON (Iceland): The debate in which we are now engaged in this Assembly signifies the great importance of this question of the membership of China in the United Nations. True to its policy of equal rights for all nations, my Government will support the membership of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations with all the rights and obligations involved. We shall vote for all the proposals aiming at this goal and oppose all measures and manoeuvres that deflect from the attainment of full membership of the People's Republic of China in this Organization.

2. It has been argued that the People's Republic of China has not been interested in membership and that it does not fulfil the lofty qualifications which the Charter sets forth for membership in this world body. We understand, to the contrary, that the Government of the People's Republic of China is not only willing to occupy China's seat here, but most desirous of doing so. We therefore strongly believe that it is only just and logical that the seat belonging to China should be taken as soon as possible by the People's Republic of China. Its participation in our deliberations and in the constructive role of the United Nations all around the world will indeed greatly enhance the capacity of the United Nations in working for peace and justice. The largest nation on earth will bring to our counsels the wisdom of Confucius blended with the vigour and optimism of China today.

3. We detect at this session of the General Assembly a breath of new realism in this matter. We applaud this new realism, which is a heartening sign of improved international relations and is in the interest of world peace. My Government has always put great faith in the principle of universality in the United Nations. This action will bring us one important step closer to the realization of this aim.

4. Let us not, however, lose sight of the need for all nations to be Members of this Organization. We would therefore welcome developments which would enable those nations which are not yet members to join the United

Nations. With these considerations in view, we would welcome and support the legitimate aspirations of all nations for membership.

5. Mr. MWAANGA (Zambia): The most important issue facing this session of the General Assembly is unquestionably the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

6. The Chinese question has been examined continuously for the past 22 years and this obviously means that all the aspects of the problem have been debated over and over, and exhausted. The problem is and has always been the systematic and unrealistic opposition of the Government of the United States and its allies to the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

7. It has been disappointing to note that while we have been engaged in a serious debate some representatives of what would normally be regarded as serious countries have attempted rather clumsily to use this rostrum as a platform for play-acting, and court-jesting. We view this with absolute scorn, because it does tend to reduce, rather than add to, the seriousness of this important debate.

8. My delegation listened attentively to what Ambassador George Bush of the United States had to say yesterday on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolutions A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2. We respect Ambassador Bush very much and equally respect his ability to defend what is obviously a desperate, a hopeless and, above all, a losing cause.

9. Ambassador Bush stated:

"... [the] act of expulsion is the issue before us today.

"Both sides agree that the People's Republic of China should be admitted. Both are in agreement on that. Both agree that it should sit in the Security Council as a permanent member. But one fundamental point divides us... whether to retain or to expel the Republic of China." [1966th meeting, paras. 69-70.]

That is obviously not a factual statement because my delegation and many others have maintained over the years that the question before us is not one of admitting a new Member, but rather one of redressing the injustice perpetrated by the United States against the great Chinese people of 800 million. It is common knowledge that China is a founding Member of this Organization, and what we are now discussing is the question of restoring its lawful rights in this Organization.

10. Ambassador Bush was quite right in pointing out that in the 26 years that the United Nations has been in existence, there has been no precedent of a Member State having been expelled from the Organization, but he conveniently omitted to mention that there is provision in the United Nations Charter for the expulsion of a Member State in certain circumstances.

11. Be that as it may, no one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2—including Zambia—is talking about the expulsion of a Member State. We are merely talking about the question of rectifying the credentials of the Chinese representatives in the United Nations. The big question is, therefore, who should represent the people of China in the United Nations? Is it the Government of the People's Republic of China, representing 800 million people, or the Government of Chiang Kai-shek, which imposed itself on the 14 million people of Taiwan? This is the big question which this Assembly must obviously face, and face realistically.

12. Ambassador Bush was obviously speaking about the "representation of China" and not the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China, and his statement would have been much more logical had it been made under the item entitled "The representation of China in the United Nations". The policy of "dual representation" which the United States is demanding from this Assembly for the sake of admitting Taiwan, I submit, is too high a price for the United Nations to pay merely for the lawful restoration of China's rights in the United Nations.

13. It is to be regretted that the United States has awakened to international realities in the past rather late in the day. That country did not recognize the Soviet Union until 16 years after the Bolshevik proletarian revolution took place. It is now 22 years since the establishment of the People's Republic of China, and Washington has still not recognized Peking.

14. It is indeed gratifying to see that the efforts which Zambia and many other countries have been involved in to make the United Nations a truly universal body are gathering strength. Let it be stated that there can be no true and lasting solution to any of the major problems of this contemporary world without the full and effective participation of the People's Republic of China. The exclusion of this great and populous nation from our Organization has proved itself to be and continues to prove itself to be profoundly harmful to the fundamental interests not only of the United Nations but of the world at large.

15. A fictitious state of affairs has been maintained here by virtue of which a State is not represented in the Organization by its lawful representatives. Can it really be claimed without absurdity that the persons who today occupy the seat of China in the General Assembly, in the Security Council and in other international bodies in any way represent the Chinese people and express its will? The answer has got to be a big "no". The representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek régime, who were rejected and expelled by the Chinese people, in no way represent China in the United Nations and, consequently, their presence in the United Nations must be considered illegal. We have, over the years, stated why we feel that the restoration of the

lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations requires a vote by a simple majority and not by a two-thirds majority as demanded by the United States and its allies.

16. The United States draft resolution seeking to make the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China an important question [A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2] rests, in our opinion, on erroneous premises. The sponsors of the United States draft resolution contend that the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations should be considered an important question within the meaning of Article 18 of the United Nations Charter. In defence of this thesis they implicitly argue that the item currently under discussion should be considered within the context of General Assembly resolution 396 (V) of 14 December 1950. To contend that the mere restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is an important question within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter—and must therefore be decided by a majority of two thirds—is contrary to the spirit and letter of Article 18 itself.

17. My Foreign Minister, in his address to the General Assembly [1945th meeting], has already served notice that, should the United States and its allies succeed in their desperate efforts to have our draft resolution classified as an important question within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter, we shall have no alternative but to demand that the substantive United States draft resolution [A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2] on the representation of China and which seeks to seat two delegations from one country should, as a punitive measure, be subjected to Article 18, paragraph 3, of the Charter, which states:

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

18. The sponsors of the United States draft resolution would be well advised to bear that in mind. The role of the General Assembly in regard to the representation of Member States is clearly defined. The Organization must ensure that the credentials of representatives do, in fact, emanate from the effective Governments of the States concerned. In the present instance, since no one questions that China is a founding Member of the United Nations, the only duty of the General Assembly is to make sure that the representatives who occupy the seat of China at the United Nations are duly accredited by the true Government of that country, namely, the Government of the People's Republic of China. There is only one China—the People's Republic of China—and the people purporting to represent China in the United Nations today must have obtained their credentials by false pretences.

19. The greater interests of the United Nations dictate that an end be put to an injustice and to the discrimination that has thus far been applied against the great Chinese people. It is completely undignified for the United States, holding as it does a unique position of prestige and enormous responsibility, to employ its political muscle to hang on to an old myth in the face of new international

realities. The United States has an opportunity this year, more than in any other year, to adopt a stand that does credit to its maturity and position of leadership.

20. I realize that it is not the length of speeches which will decide this issue; it is not the dramatic speeches which will decide this issue; it is not oratory which will decide this issue; it is not the grammar contained in the resolutions which will decide this issue; it is not the eloquence of the speeches delivered from this rostrum which will decide this issue; it is not the petitions of financial blackmail directed against the United Nations which will decide this issue; it is not even the financial blackmail directed against small developing countries which is going to decide this issue. It is the policies of the Governments here represented which will decide this issue in the form of votes. It is the hope of my delegation that this Assembly, with its customary sense of justice, will join with us in decisively and totally rejecting the United States draft resolutions in documents A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2. The eyes of the world are upon us as we deliberate this issue. Let us make 1971 the year of final decision.

21. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): Once more the General Assembly is considering the absurd and completely indefensible argument that Taiwan is entitled to retain the name of "China". We thought that we were being relieved of this absurdity by the dramatic switch in United States foreign policy after the announcement of President Nixon's pending visit to Peking. But the United States still resists the acknowledged theory that the sun rises in the East, and, accordingly, only one China exists.

22. Is it not utterly incongruous for the United States to sponsor the seating of the real China in the Security Council and the General Assembly, while it simultaneously exerts every possible pressure to keep Taiwan in this Organization under the name of China? It is an argument that overlooks facts and distorts the proper course of logic.

23. Some argue, very zealously, that the ideal way out of this repetitious debate is through the adoption of the insupportable theory of the dual representation of China. Again, this is a trap which the United Nations should not fall into, as the aim of the trap is the creation of two Chinas in defiance of the will of the Chinese people and the dictates of logic and realism, and in violation of the United Nations Charter.

24. What is at stake is not the expulsion of a Member State, as Ambassador Bush stated [*1966th meeting*], or the admission of a new member, but the relentless obstinacy of a major Power in refusing to listen to the dictates of reason and accept the facts.

25. Taiwan has never been a Member of the United Nations; neither has it enjoyed any legal status as an independent entity. China is a founding Member of the United Nations and has a permanent seat in the Security Council. In 1949 Chiang Kai-shek was ousted from power and sought refuge in Taiwan. With the support of the United States, he succeeded in keeping his representatives accredited to the United Nations as the representatives of the people of China, despite the fact that the people of China owe him no allegiance at all. Righting the wrongs of

the past should not be left to the unpredictable mood of a major Power; rather, we in this Assembly should decide now to put things in their proper perspective.

26. Taiwan has for a long time occupied a chair it was not entitled to. So let us set things right once and for all. Let us extract from the incongruity of the past the rectitude of the future.

27. Kuwait recognizes the People's Republic of China as the sole representative of the Chinese people. My delegation whole-heartedly and unreservedly supports the Albanian draft resolution in document A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2.

28. This Assembly should not afford an opportunity for any manoeuvre that would delay the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China, by using the ridiculous pretext of the so-called "important question" procedure.

29. No expulsion is implied in the Albanian draft resolution. Formosa has been usurping a name and seat which unquestionably belong to Peking.

30. The representative of the so-called Republic of China, in his speech yesterday [*1967th meeting*], ridiculed the theory of "two Chinas" which the United States and others are championing. The choice before us is not to seat the Peking régime and at the same time keep the Chiang Kai-shek régime in this Organization, but to decide which régime represents the real China. In our view Chiang Kai-shek, who is sitting on a small island which is part of the People's Republic of China, cannot continue to claim that he represents the 800 million people whose complete allegiance is to the Peking Government.

31. If we again accept the United States argument which, in letter spirit, implies the carving up of China in order to preserve a part of it as a separate entity, we will then do irreparable harm to the people of the real China.

32. I hope the majority will gallantly favour the right decision.

33. Sir Alieu S. JACK (Gambia): Mr. President, as this is the first time my delegation has spoken during this twenty-sixth session, I wish to associate it with the many tributes already paid to you by my colleagues. Your election to this high office is, without doubt, a sign of the great esteem and respect in which both you and your country are held in this Assembly. My felicitations also go to your predecessor, Mr. Hambro, for the able way in which he conducted the affairs of the Assembly during the previous session. Lastly, I should like to take this opportunity to convey the appreciation of my Government, through you, Mr. President, to Secretary-General U Thant for the valuable service he has rendered this Organization during the past decade. His devotion to the promotion of peace and security and the well-being of mankind is a source of inspiration to people all over the world.

34. The founding fathers of the United Nations in their collective wisdom drew up a Charter for this world body in which they sought to establish a new world order which took into account all the hopes and aspirations of mankind

in its aim of achieving a richer and fuller life, free of turmoil and free of strife. But, alas, 25 years after the founding of the United Nations mankind is no nearer its goal; instead it has virtually lived in the shadow of terrible and terrifying calamities rooted in the ideological conflicts and power politics that characterize the twentieth century.

35. It is heartening to my delegation that, after 25 years of precarious and perilous existence, serious and constructive efforts are currently being made by the big Powers and the United Nations to find permanent solutions to some of the most burning issues that have divided the world for so long. Perhaps no other subject has consistently occasioned so much controversy in this Assembly during the past two decades as that posed by the representation of China, a founding Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council. The historical circumstances that led to this great human drama are so well known to representatives that I feel able to skip them without causing inconvenience to anyone.

36. My Government has long held the view that many urgent world problems, such as disarmament, the settlement of the conflicts in South-East Asia and the Middle East, and so on, can never find a permanent and lasting solution unless and until the People's Republic of China takes its place in the great concert of nations and actively co-operates with it. On the other hand, it has always been obvious to everyone that the key factor in the solution of the problem posed by the representation of China was the relation between the United States, on the one hand, and the People's Republic of China, on the other. My Government therefore rejoices and applauds the efforts of rapprochement at present being undertaken by the leaders of the two States and hopes that they will be crowned with success.

37. While it is true that there is and can only be one China—a fact recognized and repeatedly asserted by all Chinese leaders, irrespective of their ideological persuasion—it is equally an indisputable fact that there now exist two different types of régime, unequal in size of course, within the same entity. The Gambia Government has always maintained that the Chinese problem is a domestic matter within the terms of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. The final settlement of this critical problem must, therefore, await an exclusively Chinese solution. For our part, we are confident that the present impasse in which the great Chinese people have been locked for the past 22 years is not and cannot be a permanent and irreversible state of affairs. On the contrary, we believe that it is in the nature of things for man to respond to changing circumstances and situations. In consequence, we look forward with hope to the day when China will again speak with one voice and act as one man.

38. However, our hopes and aspirations for the future must not blind us to the realities of the moment, for right now we are confronted with two Governments effectively in control of two distinct parts of the same entity. On the one hand, we have the People's Republic of China with its 700 million people and, on the other, the Republic of China with its more than 14 million people.

39. It has been argued here by some representatives that the People's Republic of China should be accorded its

rightful place in the United Nations and the Republic of China expelled from it forthwith, and this, they argue, would do justice to China. The United Nations cannot and must not be seen condemning and coercing over 14 million people—a population by far superior to that of a large number of States represented in the United Nations, including my own country—to live in a political and economic system in which they do not believe. This, in the view of my delegation, would not be justice at all, but a form of sacrifice, unwarranted by any lesson drawn from history, especially in the not-too-distant past. The initiative to expel the Republic of China is very unfortunate in its timing, since it would seem to my delegation that the urge for universality has gathered such momentum that now not only are small States admitted to full membership in the United Nations but there is also open talk of the possibility of admitting divided States, such as Viet-Nam, Korea and others.

40. Some have argued that the dual representation of a single State is unethical and contrary to the United Nations Charter. To persist in that line of thought is to ignore the fact that the precedent has already been created whereby a particular State was and still is allowed triple representation in the United Nations. It is true, of course, that the circumstances in which such a unique formula was devised are not entirely the same as those confronting us today. For my delegation, however, what is of importance is that at a particular point in time an extraordinary formula was used to solve an extraordinary problem. It is the contention of my delegation that the problem of the representation of China falls within this category of problems and therefore deserves similar treatment.

41. Therefore, consonant with its strong belief in universality, in justice and fair play for the large as well as for the small, my delegation would welcome the admission of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations, where it would occupy both its seat in the General Assembly and its permanent seat in the Security Council. It will nevertheless formally oppose any resolution that seeks to expel the Republic of China from the United Nations.

42. Furthermore, my Government believes that the expulsion of a Member State is a very serious matter capable of having far-reaching consequences for smaller States in the future. We therefore request that the matter be treated as an important question within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter.

43. Mr. MOLAPO (Lesotho): Mr. President, the Lesotho delegation is happy to participate in the deliberations of this session of the Assembly under your distinguished presidency, and we add our congratulations on your election to those extended to you by other delegations that have spoken before us.

44. The question of who should represent China in the United Nations has been a source of controversy for over 20 years. We believe that the problem of the seating of the Chinese representatives has been complicated over the years for two main reasons. The first reason why this issue has remained unresolved has been the fact that it was approached on the basis of the cold war and, as long as the big Powers refused to accommodate one another, no solution



could be found. The second reason for the stalemate has been that the Chinese people itself has not yet found a workable solution to its internal differences. In the course of time the international community found itself faced with the existence of two *de jure* and *de facto* Governments, one in Peking and the other in Taipei, each of which is recognized by a significant number of other Governments.

45. In the circumstances the question that immediately arises is whether the United Nations is competent to pronounce on the question of who should occupy the China seat before the Chinese people itself has reached a final decision. The uniqueness of this problem consists in the fact that the representatives of the Republic of China have participated in the United Nations without interruption since the founding of this Organization.

46. We in Lesotho have had bilateral relations with the Government of the Republic of China. We have found them worthy and honourable representatives of their country. Since our admission into the United Nations we have watched with great interest and admiration their impeccable performance in all the organs of the United Nations.

47. Over the past years the Lesotho Government has noted—as other Governments have also done—the beginnings of significant changes in the relationships of the big Powers. These are developments of considerable importance and they hold the promise of a better climate for the solution of long-standing international problems, including the problem of China in the United Nations. It would be a distinctly retrograde step, in our view, to continue to approach the China question on the basis of the cold war, as the Albanian proposal [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2] does.

48. In previous statements before the General Assembly of the United Nations we have strongly advocated universality of membership in the United Nations. One of our reasons for advocating universality is that the absence of the representatives of some Governments weakens the effectiveness of the United Nations. But if the admission of one State leads to the expulsion of another State which has faithfully discharged its obligations under the Charter, such an admission would weaken much further the effectiveness of the Organization.

49. That is why we have sponsored draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, whose operative paragraphs call for the representation of the People's Republic of China while retaining the representation of the Republic of China.

50. Our belief in universality of membership in the United Nations is predicated on the hope that all Governments that assume their seat will have pledged themselves to respect for the Charter of the Organization. It is therefore inconceivable to us that we could violate the principle of universality by advocating the exclusion of representatives who have scrupulously observed the Charter.

51. The provisions of the Charter governing expulsion are very clearly spelled out in Article 6, and we are convinced that these provisions do not apply in this instance. Accordingly, we shall oppose any attempt to deprive the Republic of China of representation.

52. In addition, we have affirmed our belief that any proposal in the General Assembly which would result in depriving the Republic of China of representation in the United Nations is an important question under Article 18 of the Charter. We have thus sponsored draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2.

53. We fully share the following views expressed by the representative of New Zealand:

“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.” [1967th meeting, para. 97.]

54. Mr. JAKOBSON (Finland): This debate on the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations takes place in circumstances dramatically different from those of last year. After the vote at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly [1971st meeting], when for the first time a majority supported the seating of the People's Republic of China, a growing number of States have recognized the Government of the People's Republic and established diplomatic relations with it. The President of the United States is about to visit Peking. Indeed, almost every Member State now professes to support the entry of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations. It would seem, therefore, that at last the time has come for this Organization to adjust itself to reality and to make room for the representatives of the biggest nation on earth—an ancient civilization and a nuclear Power.

55. And yet the General Assembly remains divided on how to bring about this necessary and long-overdue change. We are divided on the proposal linking the entry of the People's Republic of China to retaining a place for those who now occupy the seat of China in the United Nations.

56. The position of the Finnish Government on this issue is clear and straightforward. It is also well known. Finland recognized the Government of the People's Republic of China as the sole Government of an undivided China 21 years ago. Ever since, we have maintained friendly relations with China, and co-operation between our two countries has developed favourably. In the United Nations, Finland has consistently supported the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China, and naturally we shall do so again at this session of the General Assembly. And as was stated by the Foreign Minister of Finland in the general debate on 27 September [1971st meeting], we shall oppose any proposal the effect of which may be to obstruct or delay the entry of the People's Republic of China into this Organization.

57. The issue before the General Assembly is not of membership. We are not dealing with the admission of a new Member or the expulsion of an old one. What we have to decide is simply who is entitled to represent China in the United Nations. In our view, it is the Government of the People's Republic and only that Government, which has the right to speak for China, here and in all other bodies of the United Nations of which China is a member.

58. The proposal to allow another delegation also claiming to speak for China to remain in the United Nations seems to us to be in conflict with the intent of the Charter and established international practice. But it is not only constitutionally unsound, it is also in practice unworkable. The Government of the People's Republic of China has made it quite clear that it will not take its seat in this Organization if such a proposal is adopted. We would then be left, not with dual representation, but with the continuance of the present situation, which the great majority of Member States consider unrealistic and unacceptable.

59. Let me restate briefly what has been said many times before by spokesmen of the Finnish Government about the reasons why we take the position on this question which I have just put forward. It is not only a consequence of our act of recognition or the state of our bilateral relations with the People's Republic of China. Our attitude is determined by our conviction that it is of overriding importance to the United Nations as a whole to make it possible for the People's Republic of China to take its seat and fully participate in the activities of this Organization. The absence of the People's Republic constantly weakens, and in some instances has crippled, the capacity of the United Nations to act fully and effectively for the maintenance of international peace and security. The entry of the People's Republic will be a decisive step towards making the United Nations what it was originally intended to be—a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations. It is for that reason that we hope that the General Assembly will now at last take the necessary action to ensure that the People's Republic of China will be able to take its seat in the United Nations without any further delay.

60. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I thought I was to be the thirty-second speaker in the debate. Yesterday I did not make from this rostrum the principal statement of Saudi Arabia pertaining to the item before us. All I did was to address myself to the substantive draft resolutions, and in particular the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Albania and the other sponsors [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2]. I did so at an early stage so that we would not get entangled in a procedural debate which would confuse the issue before us with regard to that substantive draft resolution, which is the third one; this is an issue which we may have to decide upon sooner or later.

61. I mentioned that in good time I would submit certain amendments to the so-called Australian substantive draft resolution [A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2]. I am not going to do this today because I would like to hear more speakers express themselves—rather than withdraw their names from the list in order to see what others have to say before they make up their minds how to cast their votes. Fortunately, I do not belong to that category of speaker because, as I have said, we in Saudi Arabia are independent and do not belong to the so-called third world or to the aligned or non-aligned world. We are a part of this world and have our own mind.

62. Having said that, I would add that the question before us is not whether there exists one, two or more Chinas. The real question is whether or not the Republic of China, a well-defined political entity, should lose its seat on account of the fact that about one half of the Member States of the

United Nations—if not more, believe that the People's Republic of China should rightfully assume its permanent seat in the Security Council and become a full-fledged State Member of the United Nations.

63. Arguments have been adduced from this rostrum to the effect that if representatives of the People's Republic of China sit amongst us, *ipso facto* the representatives of the Republic of China should forthwith be expelled from the United Nations. That is the question—not the question of the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China. I think that to those who for 20 years objected to the People's Republic of China, this is no longer a problem, because in their substantive draft resolution the Australians and the United States—the name of the United States appears towards the end of the draft resolution, but it proposed that text—not only do not object to but even welcome the admission of the People's Republic of China. Perhaps I should not say “admission” lest I irk or irritate some of my friends, but the “restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations”. Do not let us play on words as to whether it should be “admission” or “restoration”, this is semantics. In other words, the People's Republic of China is being invited to assume its seat; let us put it that way so we may not get lost in the labyrinth of semantic expressions.

64. We should not predicate our arguments on political solidarity. We should have the courage as Member States to decide the issue on its own merits. There are those among us who think that because the island of Taiwan assumed the name “Republic of China”, once the People's Republic of China occupies its seats in the Security Council and the General Assembly there will be such a dearth of seats that the representative of Taiwan would—nay, should—not have a place among us.

65. I remember when there were many fewer seats. We have been adding to them by admitting mini-States and mini-countries with populations of 100,000 or 200,000 or 500,000. But now, if the representative of the People's Republic of China comes and sits among us, there will be no more seats to be had. And the representatives of Taiwan, or the Republic of China, will be expected to make their exit politely. They will not belong here any more—after 25 years' participation. What logic is there in such an argument?

66. Representatives are confusing the issues here. Most of us are not being frank or honest with ourselves—let me put it bluntly. Many here among us lose sight of the fact that the people of Taiwan, alias the Republic of China, constitute a political entity, a clear-cut political entity that has, since the founding of this Organization, developed its own socio-economic system. Moreover, it is well known that, but for a couple of million, the people of Taiwan are not ethnologically purely Chinese in culture. However, many representatives here speak of the people of Taiwan as though for all intents and purposes they are prototypes of the Chinese of the mainland—in spite of the disparity in the social and political organization of mainland China and Taiwan. Even if it is conceded that at one time China exercised suzerainty over the island of Taiwan before the Japanese occupation, that fact does not bestow upon the mainland Chinese the right to claim political suzerainty over a people who, I submit, should be consulted.

67. We should not play politics with the destiny of any people. Unfortunately, that is what we are doing here.

68. That brings me to this question: What is a people? We were engrossed with that question for eight years with certain colleagues of mine, including my illustrious friend the former President of this Assembly, none other than Ambassador Pazhwak, elaborating the right of self-determination from the principle enshrined in the Charter. We spent eight years on that in the United Nations in order to give content to the definition of a people.

69. Is a people a conglomeration of individuals? No. Tourists in Times Square, on Forty-second Street, coming from all parts of the world to look at the tower on New Year's Eve are a conglomeration of individuals. Do they constitute a people in the political sense? No. Is a people determined by a common language and culture? To some extent, yes; but not necessarily so, I submit.

70. Why talk in the abstract? We in Saudi Arabia happen to occupy the major part of the Arabian peninsula. Only the other day three Arab States were admitted to this Organization. Two of them—Qatar and Oman—lie in the same Arabian peninsula. They speak the same language as us; they have a common culture with us; they have the same religion; our literature and poetry are identical. Saudi Arabia did not claim suzerainty over those entities. Qatar lies next to us. We did not say that Qatar is a small country and we should absorb it. Why? Simply because Qatar has developed its own political and social organization, which may differ in many respects from ours, and we let them—and rightly so—be independent. We did not go and pounce on them because we are a larger State of 7 million and they are so like an oyster we could swallow them, as many countries of Europe have done in past centuries. I am not going into the days of Charlemagne; this has happened even in recent times, in the two world wars.

71. I shall give another relevant, concrete example: Bahrain. Our brother from Bahrain sits among us as the representative of a full-fledged State admitted into the United Nations. And if you throw a stone from the coast of Saudi Arabia, so to speak, it lands in Bahrain. We did not say that at one time Bahrain was geologically part of the peninsula, the people speak Arabic, their religion is Islam, their poetry is our poetry, their culture is our own, and therefore we should take Bahrain. We respected Bahrain's integrity because it likes to evolve its own social and economic institutions, which are very similar to our own. But they are free. We did not say Bahrain should not be independent, and to the honour of the Iranians I must say this from this rostrum: at one time the Iranians occupied Bahrain; they thought they should have title to it; but their Majesties the Shah of Iran and the King of Saudi Arabia met and said "Why should we have title to Bahrain? Bahrain should be independent." And it is because of the political sagacity of the Iranians and—without trying to blow our horns—to that of Saudi Arabian Government under His Majesty King Faisal that Bahrain emerged as an independent State and is now a Member of the United Nations.

72. Bahrain is nearer to Saudi Arabia and to Iran than is Taiwan to the Chinese mainland. By what dint of logic do

you who sponsor substantive draft resolutions based on political solidarity seek here to "dispose of a people"? Is it because you get assistance from the People's Republic of China—and there is nothing wrong with that—or is it because you want to irritate another State, which happens to be the United States of America? And then you say, "What do you lose?" You lose nothing here except words. That is what you lose. And our stock-in-trade is words. You want to dispose of 14 million persons. What right have you to do that, those of you who are talking about the People's Republic of China and Taiwan, alias the Republic of China?

73. Examine your conscience, set aside for a little while the instructions you got from your capitals and do not think aloud, think silently to yourselves. Do the principles and purposes of the United Nations allow you to ask a people to merge with another people without ascertaining whether it is its will to do so? Have you forgotten that in defining "a people" in the United Nations over a period of eight years we decided that sovereignty resides in the people? Are they chattels that they should be transferred or expelled by you? Who do you think you are? Are you sitting here as a tribunal? Let us reform the tribunals in our respective countries. Let us divest ourselves of political solidarity and our political loyalties. I do not say "political loyalties motivated by national interest". There is nothing wrong in being motivated sometimes by national interest. The other day in one of the Committees I mentioned that nationalism has its good aspect—for protecting the State and for the right sort of patriotism—but it can become nefarious, it can become chauvinistic and jingoistic.

74. Do you want to transfer one people to another people, the people of Taiwan to the people of mainland China, against their will? Maybe they would like to be transferred. Maybe they would like to merge. Have you taken the trouble to ascertain whether they would like to join the people of the People's Republic of China? Or are you being arbitrary here in the United Nations, where there should be give and take, where there should be compromise and where the will of the people should be ascertained? Perhaps the People's Republic of China does not want to absorb the people of Taiwan because they might become a thorn in their side. How do you know? Have you a mandate from the People's Republic of China or is it from sheer political loyalty? I am reasoning with you, my brothers. I am not arguing with you; I am reasoning with you.

75. The two peoples have the same culture and the same language, I concede that. Let us go back to the nineteenth century. After the Napoleonic wars, as I mentioned from this very rostrum last November when we were dealing with the same question [1906th meeting], Norway and Sweden had a political arrangement which lasted for 100 years and then they found that that arrangement did not work as it should and so they separated. In recent years, in 1957, Egypt had a political arrangement with Syria and together they were known as the United Arab Republic. That arrangement worked for a little while and then the two sides amicably chose to separate. We now hear that they are confederating. There is nothing wrong with confederating. It is up to the people of each political entity to decide. We have no right to impose our will on a people whether it be

Arab, Chinese, American, English, or what have you. We would be going against the principles and purposes of the Charter if we assumed the responsibility of so doing and we would be violating the right of peoples to self-determination.

76. I am reasoning with you; I am not arguing with you. Who are you to send down 14 million persons—not down a river but down that channel—just because of your political solidarity? I repeat and repeat that you have no right to do that, and as long as there is breath in the representative of Saudi Arabia, he will go on repeating that refrain, that you have no right to do so. The only people that has that right is the people of Taiwan, alias the Republic of China.

77. Let us now shift the ground of analogies from historical events to the region of South-East Asia. At one time China—there was no People's Republic of China at that time—built a wall around itself. But the Chinese found out that they could not isolate themselves from the world. The Mongols invaded China—Kublai Khan was a Mongol—and it will be remembered that he found the Chinese to be highly-cultured. In fact they are considered today by historians to have the oldest civilization on earth. Four thousand years before Christ there was a Chinese culture, a political and social organization and history. Lao-tze and Confucius existed 500 or 600 years before Christ and millennia before the Europeans. I go to the Grand Palais in Paris sometimes or to the academies in London to see symbolism in art. It is child's work. The Chinese had symbolism in art 3,000 years ago. We, the Arabs, 2,000 or 3,000 years ago, had a proverb which said, "Go after knowledge though it be in China". China was known to us in Arabia 2,000 or 3,000 years ago.

78. Kublai Khan was fought by his own son because he did not want to impose Mongolian habits, customs and traditions on the Chinese. He reasoned with his son and told him "My son, they are more civilized than us". You know from history that the son of Kublai Khan fought against his father and was killed. But China, like other countries, expanded; it went as far as Sinkiang. Recently it incorporated Tibet. I believe my Indian colleagues still have the Dalai Lama of Tibet as a political refugee in their country. China invaded and ruled Indo-China for centuries. There were wars for about 1,000 years, but finally Chinese political sagacity transcended petty national interest and the Chinese developed their own culture and withdrew from occupying many lands which they thought they could not rule except by force.

79. This is true of the Arabs. They arabized the Berbers and they went as far as Spain and southern France and stayed 800 years in Europe. But we do not claim title to Spain although many of our Spanish brothers today have, so to speak, Arab blood in them. It would be foolish for us to claim that we should go back and occupy Spain because we were once there for eight centuries. Just because at one time China ruled Taiwan should it now absorb Taiwan? This is an antediluvian concept. We are living under the Charter of the United Nations which gives a people the right to determine its political institutions, its social progress and its economic development.

80. I can see and understand why about half the Member States of this Organization have recognized the People's

Republic of China. After all, its Government is the *de jure* and *de facto* Government that has control over the whole mainland. Are we sitting here as arbiters of a people and their destiny? Many of us from this rostrum took issue with the United States of America for obstructing the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China. And now the United States comes forth and says "we made a mistake in the past"—well, it would not say that, for it is a big Power, and big Powers do not make mistakes, you know. It says it is "facing the realities". It is facing the realities—describe it by whatever expression you like.

81. Many of you, instead of being gratified that a big Power such as the United States of America has seen the light and has seen that it cannot obstruct the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China, say, "You are an imperialist country and you want to—" and then you get confused and rationalize. You call the others names. "Imperialist" has become a hackneyed *cliché* as has "capitalist" and phrases such as, "He is a socialist", "he is a revolutionary" and so on. When I was young, when I was 14, I shouted in the streets of Beirut and Damascus, "Long live Arab nationalism!" The word "nationalism" fired my imagination and that of other teenagers. That was at the end of the First World War, but did we know that nationalism prescribes responsibilities and obligations to the State? No, the word fired our imaginations. And I am bemused when I hear not youngsters of 14, but men of 40 say, "Long live the revolution!" The word "revolution" fires their imagination. They do not take into account that it entails bloodshed, loss of treasure and loss of life. "Revolution"—and people march like sheep—kill and get killed. And they revolve, revolve and revolve until they get dizzy. Then some one emerges on the scene like Napoleon after the French Revolution—they called him the *enfant terrible de la Révolution*—or like Mr. Krushchev, who was called a revisionist by none other than the Chinese, and then the people have to settle down; they cannot live in revolution all the time. They cannot live always shouting, "Long live nationalism!" because they might become jingoists. I am saying this at the age of 66. I did not know these facts when I was younger. So do not be carried away by political solidarity or political emotionalism or by ideology.

82. I once spoke to a colleague about Indo-China. I shall not mention his name. I said, "Is it not a shame that the same people should be bisected even after 1951? They are the same people in Viet-Nam, the same people with the same language and culture. Ethnologically they are the same people." He told me "Ideology is more important than ethnology". In other words, if that is so, a brother should fight his brother and kill him if he belongs to a different ideology. This is not the language of the United Nations. This is political rationalism—what they did to Germany. Germany was divided between so-called progressive communists and capitalists, but the Germans are the same people. But those who make such divisions get away with it because they are great Powers. Thank God that I belong to a small Power and can speak my mind to you.

83. Forget about selling the people of Taiwan, by whatever name they call themselves or you choose to call them, down that strait between the mainland and that island because you will start trouble. If the United States of



America will not support them, they will find someone else to support them. If they find no one to support them, they might rebel. And then we will have another case for the United Nations. The whole question revolves around the right of self-determination. If you try to resolve this on any other basis, you will be fooling yourself and violating the Charter of the United Nations, in which the principle of self-determination is enshrined. You will be violating the first article in both Covenants on Human Rights, which were drafted in the United Nations.

84. Think as individuals and not as the recipients of stereotyped instructions from your respective Governments. After all, Governments are not something abstract. They consist of individuals and, I hope, of statesmen. Let them ponder what would happen if we decided here that the people of Taiwan had no say in the matter. If you open that door and expel Taiwan from the United Nations because it has a non-representative government, what about 50 or 60 other Member States of the United Nations that will come under the scrutiny of anyone who would like to challenge their legality? Many governments are labelled dictatorships. Who is going to judge who is a dictator and who is not a dictator? You will cut the thread of the rosary and the beads will be scattered, and there will be no United Nations; there will be no one to string those beads. Think before you act and ask for resolutions to be passed that may not only become unworkable, but may bring calamity, because here what is at stake is a power play and the game is spheres of influence, and the Charter of the United Nations has not transcended the petty national interests of States. What will prevent the People's Republic of China from claiming 1 million kilometres from the Soviet Union which it alleges were at one time under the suzerainty of China?

85. Think, Powers, big and small, what would prevent the Mexicans from saying, "You took California from us"? I am speaking to the big Powers. What would prevent the Scots, who once in a while try to steal the Stone of Scone from Westminster Abbey, from saying, "We are a people and we must secede"? But they do not do it because there are common interests. Do not be afraid. The Californians prosper in the United States; they will not ask to secede.

86. Someone yesterday said, "My Government cannot agree to separating the political entity of Taiwan because we may have inside our State people or tribes who want to secede". The right of self-determination gives the right of secession, and the right of secession we know has never been invoked unless the people were being tyrannized and oppressed.

87. Look at the United Kingdom. As I mentioned the other day—I think it was at the 1594th meeting of the Security Council—it has Welsh, it has Normans, or at least English of Norman origin; it has Angles, Saxons, Manx; it has Yorkshire and Cornish people, and Scots people. Still, they are called a United Kingdom—united by a common culture, by language, and by choice, and not by compulsion.

88. Do you want to compel the people of Taiwan to merge? Who are you to compel them to do that? I submit that you have neither the right nor the power to do so.

89. Mr. PRATT (Sierra Leone): It is difficult to speak immediately after an orator such as Ambassador Baroody. Yet I shall try. When I last addressed this Assembly [1949th meeting] I explained the policy of the Sierra Leone Government on the China question—namely, that of recognizing one, and only one, China, while at the same time realizing that two separate Governments have been competing for sovereignty over that one China. If only we can all be realistic, if only we can face the realities of the present situation and decide the issue in accordance with those realities, we shall be moulding a golden precedent for posterity.

90. Let us not mince words. The present China question, though peculiar, is one which has remained unsolved for over 22 years now, and is one whose proper solution will ultimately strengthen the United Nations. In the circumstances, I appeal to my fellow representatives to examine this matter, critically if they wish, but by all means objectively. All too often we come with fixed positions. But let us make certain that those fixed positions do not stand in violent opposition to the Charter. Let us not be carried away by notions of expediency and friendship to the extent where we act against the spirit and even the letter of the Charter. Speakers from this podium have again and again appealed to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. What are these principles? They are to be found in the seven clauses of Article 2 of the Charter. I want to refer specifically to the second clause, which reads as follows:

"All Members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter."

This clause refers to the rights and benefits resulting from membership. How does one acquire membership rights? If those rights are lost, how can they be restored? That is precisely the problem the General Assembly is debating in relation to China. Draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 deals with the restoration of its rights to the People's Republic of China and draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 seeks to affirm the rights of the People's Republic of China as well as of the Republic of China.

91. Now, how are such rights exercised when they are restored or affirmed? It is essential for us to realize that the United Nations, as an institution, is made up of four distinct but interrelated strata: firstly, the peoples; secondly, the States; thirdly, the Governments; and fourthly, the delegations. We shall examine the problem of China along those four strata.

92. First, the peoples. We often forget that the opening words of the United Nations Charter state: "We the peoples of the United Nations . . .". The *fons et origo* of the United Nations must be found in the Albanian people, the Algerian people, the Australian people, the Saudi Arabian people and so on including the Chinese people.

93. Secondly, the States. Since those peoples have to come together within the United Nations international machinery for the promotion not only of political stability but also of universal economic and social advancement, the

framers of the United Nations Charter made it clear that the peoples acquired membership in the Organization through their States. Article 3, for instance, ensures that:

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

Again, Article 4 provides that:

“Membership in the United Nations is open to all . . . peace-loving states . . .”.

94. I want to stress that, when the Charter talks about membership, we must understand the word to refer to States. Governments are not members of the United Nations. Sierra Leone, for example, is a Member of the United Nations but my Government cannot claim membership. It seems to my delegation that this important distinction is not apparently recognized by the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2. Ambassador George Bush of the United States, for instance, had this to say yesterday:

“In the 26-year history of the United Nations no Member has been expelled or deprived of its seat—not one. In fact, the whole trend has been just the other way, so that the original 51-nation membership has now grown to 131 and includes countries of an immense variety of sizes and an immense variety of political systems. Yet here it is proposed that a Member in good standing, a Government representing more than 14 million people, served here by decent men,—a Government which has committed no violations of the Charter and has no violations against its name, but, on the contrary, has a most constructive record—should be expelled utterly from the United Nations and all its agencies solely because certain other Governments question its legitimacy.” [1966th meeting, para. 71.]

That was what Ambassador Bush said yesterday. It thus appears that Ambassador Bush's understanding of that particular Member “in good standing” that it is the Government “representing more than 14 million people, served here by decent men” and so on. No, that Government is not—and I repeat, not—a member of the United Nations, whatever may be the qualities of decency of the men who serve it. The Government of Chiang Kai-shek is no member of the United Nations. The State known as China is a Member.

95. Ambassador Scott of New Zealand likewise fell into this error yesterday. He courageously admitted that: “The difficulty confronting us is that there is not one Chinese Government but two” [1967th meeting, para. 87]. Ambassador Scott then proposed his own resolution of the problem in the following terms:

“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.

“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.” [Ibid. paras. 89-90.]

96. Thus Ambassador Scott also apparently thinks of membership in the United Nations in terms, not of States, but of governments and it is abundantly clear from the speeches of the supporters of draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 today that they all want the continued representation of the Republic of China in the United Nations not because the Republic of China is a separate State, but because it houses—temporarily or otherwise—a second and distinct Chinese government.

97. Now for the third United Nations stratum, the Governments. The framers of the United Nations Charter had good reasons to restrict United Nations membership to States, rather than to Governments, even though the importance of the latter in the institutional framework was recognized. The United Nations Charter recognizes that the peoples which are organized into States must undertake international intercourse through their respective Governments. Thus the Preamble to the Charter makes it clear that it was Governments which agreed to the United Nations Charter and which at San Francisco established the United Nations.

98. The United Nations can recognize only one Government, one Government only, for one State; otherwise, we would be actively encouraging anarchy and we would be acting against the purposes and principles of the Organization. If anything is an international truism it is that there is one, and only one, State known as China. The sponsors of the draft resolutions contained in documents A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 are agreed on this, and so is the representative of Saudi Arabia in his amendments [A/L.637], one of which reads:

“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 . . .”.

99. The Government at Peking stresses that there is only one China and the residents at Taipei say the same. Their representative told us yesterday that:

“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.” [1967th meeting, para. 36.]

That was said by Mr. Chow yesterday. He went on to say that the Government at Peking is

“...un-Chinese in purpose. It can in no sense be regarded as the true representative of the great Chinese nation.” [*Ibid.*, para. 37.]

That is the Taiwanese view, which we of course do not share.

100. Everyone concerned is thus agreed that there is one, and only one, China. China may be called by different names—the Republic of China, by some or the People’s Republic of China, by others—but it is still the self-same China; and all of us agree that that China is a State Member of the United Nations.

101. Yesterday Mr. Chow Shu-kai treated us to some historical recollections, starting with the year 1931. He tried to convince us that the problem in China had always been a political one, to be solved by political means, to be decided by the 850 million people of China. He told us that in 1930s and the 1940s there was a political struggle for power between the Communists and the Nationalists, as we know them. The following is from his address yesterday:

“The Communists . . . 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.

“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.” [*Ibid.*, paras. 53-54.]

102. What Mr. Chow Shu-kai forgot to tell us is that there was a civil war—as there have been civil wars in the United States and other countries; that one side in that civil war, namely, the Communists, was victorious; that the victorious side concluded its liberation in October 1949 by setting up in China the Chinese People’s Republic; and that those defeated fled to Formosa—now Taiwan—where they established a quasi-Government in exile, utilizing the garb of the Republic of China and under the benign and understandable protection of the United States of America.

103. Since 1949 the question has not been whether or not there were two Chinas; nor whether there was one China and one new State of Taiwan; it has, rather, been which of the two Chinese Governments should be recognized as representing China.

104. The United States of America, as long ago as 1792, developed what has been termed the Jeffersonian principle of recognition. According to that principle a government which enjoys the habitual obedience of the bulk of the population with a reasonable expectancy of permanence, whether or not that government comes to power after free elections or after a coup d’état, is entitled to recognition.

105. Thus it is that governments resulting from military coups in Sierra Leone and in other parts of Africa, and indeed in many other parts of the world, have been recognized by the United States and by many other civilized nations in recent times.

106. One would have expected the same principle to be applied to China, where, as Ambassador Scott of New Zealand tells us:

“The Government in Peking has effective control of a . . . large area and population, and wields considerable power.” [*1967th meeting, para. 87.*]

My colleague the Foreign Minister of Japan said this morning:

“There is, furthermore, a large and growing voice in the international community, which we share”—that is to say, Japan—“supporting the participation in the United Nations of the Government of the People’s Republic of China, which effectively controls mainland China. It appears that the People’s Republic of China desires to respond to that voice.” [*1968th meeting, para. 90.*]

107. The point of departure has been the island of Taiwan, where the defeated Nationalists set up their government in exile. The régime in Taiwan has concluded a defence treaty with the United States,<sup>1</sup> which sees in this arrangement some sort of desired obstacle to the spread of communist ideas in Asia. It is therefore understandable that any appearance of withdrawal of United States support from the Taiwan régime would be not only a repudiation of the defence treaty but also, in American eyes, an abandonment to communist ascendancy over millions of persons in Asia, persons who—again in the American view—want to be insulated from communism.

108. In that light, one can further understand the recent reactions of United States Congressmen who threatened to withdraw United States financial support from the United Nations, since American citizens may feel that many non-communist Governments in Asia would start concluding that promises of support from the United States were worthless. And, after all, the United States is a great Power, whose prestige must be kept up.

109. With the greatest respect to Ambassador Bush and his supporters, draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 is not the way to enhance United States prestige in the China question. It is based on a fallacy, namely, that Taiwan as a territory is not a part of the State known and recognized internationally as China. Taiwan, or Formosa, has never in modern times been an independent State. It has always been recognized, as part and parcel of China, even when the Japanese seized it by conquest during the First World War. During the Second World War, President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the United States, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek of China and Prime Minister Winston Churchill of the United Kingdom jointly made this statement embodied in the Cairo Declaration of 1 December 1943:

<sup>1</sup> Mutual Defense Treaty, signed at Washington on 2 December 1954 (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 248, No. 3496).

“The Three Great Allies are fighting this war to restrain and punish the aggression of Japan. They covet no gain for themselves and have no thought of territorial expansion. It is their purpose that Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the first World War in 1914, and that all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China. Japan will also be expelled from all other territories which she has taken by violence and greed.”

Nothing could be clearer from the foregoing Declaration than that Formosa, or Taiwan, was a territory belonging to China, which the Japanese had stolen and which was to be restored to China after the successful conclusion of the war.

110. Under the Potsdam Declaration of 26 July 1945, which confirmed the Cairo Declaration, Japan surrendered, *inter alia*, Formosa, or Taiwan, which was thereupon immediately handed over to China, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's Government being then in command. That sealed the status of Formosa as an integral part of China.

111. It is significant to recall that, even after the Chinese civil war, when the Generalissimo and his supporters fled to Formosa, the United States, in a statement made by President Truman on 5 January 1950, made it clear that:

“The United States has no predatory designs on Formosa, or on any other Chinese territory. The United States has no desire to obtain special rights or privileges, or to establish military bases on Formosa at this time. Nor does it have any intention of utilizing its Armed Forces to interfere in the present situation. The United States Government will not pursue a course which will lead to involvement in the civil conflict in China.

“Similarly, the United States Government will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa.”<sup>2</sup>

112. It is thus the view of my delegation that even the United States—at least after the Chinese Revolution—accepted the fact that Taiwan was a sacred part of Chinese territory. Ambassador Bush has not told us that that policy has changed.

113. On the other hand, Ambassador Bush tells us that his draft resolution:

“... does not in any way purport to divide China into two separate States or to commit those who vote for it with respect to how they may in the future regard the legal or the diplomatic situation of the parties involved. It does not take either a ‘two Chinas’ position or a ‘one China, one Taiwan’ position, nor does it in any other way seek to dismember China. It is simply founded on the reality of the present situation as we all know it to be, but it does not seek to freeze this situation for the future. On the contrary, it expressly states in the preamble that a

resolution of the problem should be sought without prejudice to a future settlement.” [1966th meeting, para. 67.]

Those were his words yesterday.

114. I understand Ambassador Bush to imply that the United States does not rule out a future settlement which will get all concerned to recognize the inevitable truism that there is one, and only one, China, Taiwan notwithstanding. If my understanding is correct, should the best way of achieving this objective be along the lines of accepting two opposing Chinese Governments in the United Nations? And this is precisely what draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 and Mr. Baroody's amendments [A/L.637] want to do. My delegation would have understood some reasoning to the effect that the present *status quo* should remain as it is with the mainland Chinese kept out of the United Nations, but even the United States can no longer defend the wisdom of such an unacceptable policy.

115. The only alternative at this juncture is here, and it is contained in the Albanian draft resolution [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2].

116. Let us now make a close examination of the United States draft resolution [A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2]. This text starts by acknowledging “that since the founding of the United Nations fundamental changes have occurred in China”. I have already intimated what those changes were. They did not result in the birth of two Chinas or of one China and one Taiwan. The United States and its supporters all agree with this. The membership of the Chinese State continued. The internal philosophy within that State underwent fundamental changes to the extent that the great majority of the 850 million Chinese people on the vast mainland embraced socialist principles. A small minority of only 2 million, who called themselves Nationalists, imposed their hegemony on some 12 million Taiwanese, who had for long been regarded as an integral part of China. Such is the existing factual situation which the United States draft resolution should bring to our notice in the second sentence of the preamble.

117. The third sentence of the preamble of the United States draft resolution also states a fact, namely, that China—in the old days usually called the Republic of China—“has been continuously represented” in the United Nations “since 1945”. This is so. The Member State, China, has been represented, first by a Government which lawfully and properly was in control of the country up to 1949, and thereafter by a Government which was neither lawfully nor properly nor actually in control.

118. Let me repeat that the recognition of a State—in this case China, known before 1949 as the Republic of China and so termed even in the United Nations Charter—is quite different from the acceptance of the government purporting to represent that State. China is recognized as a State Member of the United Nations. But even the United States now agrees that the Government of Chiang Kai-shek should not be accepted as the representative of that State. Otherwise, why does the United States in effect propose that the Government of the People's Republic of China be seated as one of the five permanent members of the

<sup>2</sup> *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Harry S. Truman, 1950* (Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1965), p. 11.



Security Council? Article 23 of the Charter begins as follows:

“The Security Council shall consist of fifteen Members of the United Nations. The Republic of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America shall be permanent members of the Security Council.”

The State which is expressly named there in 1945, is called the Republic of China. And the United States now expressly concedes that that State is one and the same as the People's Republic of China. If this is not the American intention, Mr. Bush will no doubt reply. He will then have to convince us that he is thinking of a Member State completely different from the one called the “Republic of China” in Article 23. He will then have to convince us that he is not thereby suggesting an amendment to the Charter—for instance, by proposing hypothetically that the words “United States of America” in Article 23 can at any time be understood to mean the “Republic of Sierra Leone” without any regard to the provisions of Chapter XVIII of the Charter. Of course, the United States recognizes that what is now known as the People's Republic of China is precisely what was known as the Republic of China in 1945. The governments may have changed, but the State remains the same.

119. There is no rule in international law forbidding a State to change its name. In our own generation Egypt, for instance, has been known successively as Egypt, as the United Arab Republic, and as the Arab Republic of Egypt. What was once Cambodia is now the Khmer Republic. And only this year we have transformed ourselves from Sierra Leone, a monarchy, into the Republic of Sierra Leone. All these changes have been accepted without any question. My delegation can see no reason for impliedly questioning whether the People's Republic of China is or is not the same as what before 1949 used to be known as the Republic of China, and what, for purposes of international clarity, we all refer to as China.

120. Now, the United States draft resolution mentions the fact that China has been continuously represented in the United Nations since 1945. What the United States draft does not mention is the fact of the change of government in 1949, when the representatives also should have been changed.

121. Let me illustrate what I mean. Substituting “the United States” for “the Republic of China”, we can truthfully say that the United States of America has been continuously represented as a member of the United Nations since 1945. That representation has, however, been effected by different Governments as follows: from 1945 to 1953, Democrats; from 1953 to 1961, Republicans; from 1961 to 1969, Democrats; from 1969 until today, Republicans. Whenever there has occurred a change of government there has simultaneously taken place a change in the representation. That is what should have happened in the case of China in 1949. But it did not happen, mainly because the Government of the People's Republic of China had never been Machiavellian. Contrary to the abusive epithets hurled against them yesterday by Mr. Chow, let us

listen to the testimony of no less a statesman than Lord Lindsay of Birker, as contained in the 1961 *Year Book of World Affairs*. Appraising the foreign policy of the Peking leaders, Lord Lindsay of Birker had this to say:

“On several occasions they could have made important gains if they had been more ready to use deceit. For instance, by negotiating peace with Li Tsung-jen in 1948 they could have become the dominant partners in a coalition government. A year or so later they could have repudiated any agreements which prevented them from taking complete control. There would then have been no break in the legal continuity of the Government of China, and the Communists would automatically have succeeded to the UN seat and recognition by all the Powers. Any régime which Chiang Kai-shek established in Taiwan would then have been the new Government. Again, in 1958 the United States Government was greatly helped by the very clear and explicit declarations from Peking that the attack on the off-shore islands was a preliminary to an attack on Taiwan. If Peking had presented the attack on Quemoy and Matsu as its last territorial demand, or even if it had simply kept quiet on the subject, it would have been very much harder for the United States Government to obtain support for its policy of assisting in the defence of the islands.”<sup>3</sup>

That is the opinion of the Peking Government of Lord Lindsay of Birker. It should go to the everlasting praise and credit of the Peking leaders that they are open and forthright and not unpredictably diplomatic in the Western sense of that word.

122. And now let us examine the fourth United Nations stratum, the delegations. I have thus far shown that the Chinese people are in the United Nations family, that China is a State Member of the United Nations, that there is one and only one China, that there are two opposing governments claiming sovereignty over that one China—one government on the mainland, exercising control over 850 million Chinese people, and the other government nesting in the Chinese territory of Taiwan, ruling 2 million Chinese and 12 million Taiwanese.

123. The General Assembly is now called upon in both draft resolutions to take a decision about representatives coming from those opposing Governments. The Albanian draft resolution calls for the enjoyment by the Peking Government of the rights which that Government should have been enjoying since 1949, and the consequent expulsion of representatives of the Taipei Government.

124. The United States draft resolution, on the other hand, wants representatives of both to be given places in the United Nations.

125. It is clear, for the reasons I have given above, that the Sierra Leone delegation cannot support the United States draft resolution. We must not, in the General Assembly or in any other organ of the United Nations, embark upon any course of action not sanctioned by the Charter. Nowhere

<sup>3</sup> Lord Lindsay of Birker, “Chinese Foreign Policy: Recent Developments”, *The Year Book of World Affairs, 1961* (London, Stevens and Sons Limited, 1961), pp. 70-71.

does the Charter stipulate that a Member State should be entitled to dual representation.

126. Let me pose this question: If we were to support the United States draft resolution and agree to dual representation, how many States Members would then be in the United Nations—131 or 132? If the number remains at 131—that is to say, we have not admitted a new Member—whom will the Chiang Kai-shek delegation be representing? It is clear that they will not, under such circumstances, be representing China: they will be representing only themselves. And there is no provision in the United Nations Charter to cover that situation.

127. Ambassador Bush was no doubt aware of this when he said:

“We are aware that some, although recognizing that this is a political initiative to solve a practical political problem, have raised legal questions. It is unavoidable that what we propose should be new because the situation with which we are dealing in October 1971 is unique. But the Charter, which is flexible enough to allow for the representation of Byelorussia, the Ukraine and the Soviet Union in the United Nations, is certainly flexible enough to accommodate this situation. Therefore we have sought to develop a draft resolution which is compatible with the law of the Charter and which recognizes that, if the United Nations is going to be strong and if it is going to keep pace with the times, it cannot, and it must not, be afraid to innovate.” [1966th meeting, para. 68.]

128. I must confess that I do not understand Ambassador Bush's reference to the representation of Byelorussia, the Ukraine and the Soviet Union, which are all independent States Members of the United Nations with no competing Governments, any more than I would have understood it had such a reference been made with regard to Egypt, Syria and Libya and the new Federation of Arab Republics. Perhaps this is what he meant about the flexibility of the United Nations Charter.

129. But the Sierra Leone delegation fails to see how a provision for the representation of the Peking and Taipei Governments, without any increase in United Nations membership, can be said to be—and I quote Ambassador Bush—“compatible with the law of the Charter”.

130. True, we must not fear to make worth-while innovations. But we must avoid making illegal innovations. And surely the progressive sponsors—and I call them progressive, looking at them—of the United States draft resolution are charitable enough to accept this, since they do not advocate either a “two-Chinas” position or a “one China, one Taiwan” position. It does seem, however, that the sponsors of the United States draft are in fact thinking of increasing the membership of the United Nations automatically from 131 to 132.

131. Ambassador Scott of New Zealand, for instance, said:

“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 over 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.” [1967th meeting, para. 87.]

That was what Ambassador Scott said yesterday.

132. Mr. Aichi, the Foreign Minister of Japan, spoke this morning [1968th meeting] in a similar vein when he suggested that the adoption of the Albanian draft resolution would have the effect of depriving the Republic of China and its people in Taiwan, of its long-standing loyal status in the United Nations.

133. Indeed, it appears to my delegation that all the statements of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 about expulsion and universality stem from their implied proposal to increase the membership of the United Nations from 131 to 132, without following the procedure laid down in Article 4 of the Charter. Ambassador Bush hinted at this when he said:

“Let us remember realistically that, once this Government has been expelled, the likelihood of the Republic of China's ever being readmitted to the United Nations as a separate Member under whatever name or label would be approximately zero, given the fact that under the Charter a proposal for its readmission could be vetoed in the Security Council.” [1966th meeting, para. 72.]

134. The Sierra Leone delegation will not be a party to any attempt to by-pass the provisions of Article 4 on the admission of Members. While we sympathize with the fact that Taiwan has a population of over 14 million souls—some five times as many as Sierra Leone—we must insist that if, in the context of universality, Taiwan considers itself a candidate for membership in the United Nations, then let it follow the procedure laid down in Article 4.

135. If the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 at this stage are afraid of Peking's probable use of the veto in the Security Council, or if they doubt getting the required majority in the General Assembly, then something is obviously wrong and they should try to correct it instead of seeking to evade the provisions of Articles of the United Nations Charter.

136. It also appears to us that we are deliberately not seeing the wood for the trees if we make any artificial issue over the term “expulsion”. To expel an existing Member State is a grave decision and, rightly, should be taken by a two-thirds majority vote. However, the General Assembly is not being called upon to expel any Member State. The Member State of China, whether known as the Republic of China at one time or the People's Republic of China at another time, or even as “Communist China” by certain people, remains a State Member of the United Nations. All that the Albanian draft resolution asks is:

"... 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."

137. The Sierra Leone delegation fails to understand by what process of reasoning the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 who have so far spoken from this podium can advance their own theory that a Member State known as the Republic of China is to be expelled from the Organization. To put the matter in its simplest form, what the Albanian draft resolution seeks is a decision straightaway by the General Assembly on a matter which is closely related to credentials.

138. Are the representatives of the Government in Taipei or the representatives of the Government in Peking entitled to have the Chinese seat? That is the question. It is not that a Member State known as the Republic of China should be expelled and a new State known as the People's Republic of China should be admitted to take its place. It is rather that certain representatives who know that they have no right to represent China should have the good sense to withdraw; if they fail to do so, then those individuals should be expelled. Article 18 of the United Nations Charter therefore does not enter into the picture at all and my delegation sees no difficulty in voting against draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 whenever it is brought forward.

139. Let me end where I began. The question of China has tested the endurance of our Organization for 22 long years now. Let us at last be realistic. Let us uphold the Charter of

the United Nations. Let us act legally by adopting draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 and by rejecting draft resolutions A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, both of them.

140. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Czechoslovakia who has asked to be allowed to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

141. Mr. CERNÍK (Czechoslovakia): In the record of the plenary meeting of the General Assembly held on 18 October 1971 there is a reference to the effect that, after the First World War, a part of Germany was incorporated into Czechoslovakia [1967th meeting, para. 134].

142. In the interest of historical truth I am in duty bound to note that the frontier region of my country, to which reference was made, has constituted an integral part of Czech lands since time immemorial and has never in any form belonged to Germany. The border between Czechoslovakia and Germany has for centuries been an historically created border which was not established by peace treaties after the First World War.

143. The PRESIDENT: I should like to remind members that, in accordance with the decision taken this morning, the list of speakers in the debate on the item under consideration will be closed tomorrow, Wednesday, 20 October, at 5 p.m. It would be of great assistance if the delegations which intend to submit draft proposals on this item would do so as soon as possible.

*The meeting rose at 6 p.m.*

