

United Nations
**GENERAL
 ASSEMBLY**



**826th
 PLENARY MEETING**

Monday, 12 October 1959,
 at 3 p.m.

FOURTEENTH SESSION
 Official Records

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 15:</i>	
<i>Election of three non-permanent members of the Security Council (continued)</i>	441
<i>Agenda item 16:</i>	
<i>Election of six members of the Economic and Social Council</i>	442
<i>Agenda item 8:</i>	
<i>Adoption of the agenda (continued)</i>	
<i>Third report of the General Committee . . .</i>	444

President: Mr. Víctor A. BELAUNDE (Peru).

AGENDA ITEM 15

Election of three non-permanent members of the Security Council (continued)

1. Mr. AMADEO (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): In view of the results of the votes taken this morning, it seems reasonable to conclude that the election for one of the non-permanent seats on the Security Council has reached an impasse. In order to avoid postponement of the discussion of the other items on our agenda, and to give the General Assembly some relief from the tedious business of voting, I formally propose that the Assembly should proceed this afternoon with the other items on the agenda for today—namely, the election of six members of the Economic and Social Council, and the adoption of the agenda: third report of the General Committee [A/4237].

2. I propose that before we proceed with those items we should take one more vote for the remaining seat on the Security Council and if that is indecisive, pass on to the second and then to the third items on our agenda. After disposing of the third item, we could return to the voting for the election of the third member of the Security Council.

3. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): It seems to us that it would be desirable to finish the elections to the Security Council so that we could then go on to consider other items. The Assembly, as we all know, has before it many urgent matters on which it must take decisions. Yet we must bear in mind that twelve ballots have already been taken. My delegation also has regard to the statement made here by the delegation of Argentina. It would like both to support and to supplement the proposal made by that delegation.

4. Our own proposal is as follows: Let us hold the elections to the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council in the order in which they now appear on the agenda, an order which corresponds

to the practice we have followed for many years—first the elections to the Security Council and then the elections to the Economic and Social Council. But we think that the elections to both the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council should be deferred until tomorrow so that in the meantime delegations may hold the appropriate consultations and then proceed to vote, as we hope, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and with the existing agreements on the subject, bearing in mind that the principle of equitable geographical distribution should be observed in all organs of the United Nations.

5. I should therefore like to ask the representative of Argentina if he would be willing to accept this amendment, that is, not to hold the elections to either the Security Council or the Economic and Social Council today, but to postpone them until tomorrow.

6. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I ask the representative of Argentina whether he accepts the amendment to his proposal submitted by the representative of the Soviet Union.

7. Mr. AMADEO (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): I appreciate the courtesy of the representative of the Soviet Union in addressing this question to me. I should like to explain to the Assembly, through the President, that in my opinion the situation which has arisen in regard to the election to the Security Council is different from that connected with the election of members of the Economic and Social Council. In the first case, we are faced with a deadlock—twelve votes have already been taken, as the representative of the Soviet Union has pointed out; in the second case, in the election of members of the Economic and Social Council, there would not so far appear, prima facie, to be any problem. My delegation therefore does not feel that it is essential to establish a link between these two matters. However, in order for a conclusive answer to be given to this courteous inquiry, my delegation would like a final ruling to be given by the Assembly itself.

8. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The Argentine proposal is as follows: first, that we take one more vote for the election to the Security Council, and second, that we then proceed with the election of members of the Economic and Social Council. Afterwards, as I understand the proposal—perhaps the representative of Argentina would make this point clear—we would proceed to the next item on the agenda, or to the election to the Security Council, or else the latter would be postponed. This point should be clarified.

9. The representative of the Soviet Union has in fact submitted an amendment. This amendment has not been accepted by the representative of Argentina. I must therefore put the amendment to the vote, as the rules of procedure prescribe.

10. If there is no objection, I will put to the vote the Soviet amendment that we should vote once again for the remaining vacancy on the Security Council—this is the part of the Argentine proposal retained—but that we should postpone the elections to the Security Council and to the Economic and Social Council until tomorrow and that today we should continue with the rest of our agenda. A vote by roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Romania, Sweden, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Morocco, Nepal, Poland.

Against: Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal.

Abstaining: Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Tunisia, Venezuela, Austria, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Denmark, Ecuador, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Iceland, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama.

The amendment was rejected by 34 votes to 22, with 25 abstentions.

11. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): As the Soviet amendment has not been adopted, we shall now vote on the proposal of the Argentine delegation as explained by the representative of Argentina.

A vote was taken by roll call.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil.

Against: Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Nepal, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria.

Abstaining: Cambodia, Ceylon, Federation of Malaya, Finland, Ghana, Guinea, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Panama, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia,

United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Afghanistan, Burma.

The proposal was adopted by 43 votes to 14, with 24 abstentions.

12. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): As the previous voting was indecisive, we shall proceed, according to the Argentine proposal which has just been adopted, to another round of voting—the thirteenth—which will be confined to two candidates, Poland and Turkey.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Salomon (Haiti) and Mr. Lopian (Indonesia) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	81
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	81
Abstentions:	1
Number of members voting:	80
Required majority:	54

Number of votes obtained:

Poland	46
Turkey	34

13. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We have completed the first part of the procedure agreed upon and I now, therefore, invite the Assembly to proceed to the next item on the agenda.

AGENDA ITEM 16

Election of six members of the Economic and Social Council

14. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): It is necessary to elect six members to the Economic and Social Council to fill the vacancies which will occur when the following countries conclude their term of office on 31 December 1959: Finland, Mexico, Pakistan, Poland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom.

15. Article 61, paragraph 2 of the Charter provides that retiring members shall be re-eligible for the succeeding term. As a result, all Members of the General Assembly are eligible, with the exception, of course, of the twelve members of the Council whose term of office does not come to an end this year, namely Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Costa Rica, France, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Spain, Sudan, the United States, and Venezuela.

16. I invite the Members of the Assembly to put on the ballot papers, which are about to be distributed, the names of the six countries for which they wish to vote. Any ballot paper bearing more than six names will be considered null and void.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Salomon (Haiti) and Mr. Lopian (Indonesia) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	80
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	80
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	80
Required majority:	54

Number of votes obtained:

Brazil	73
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	73
Denmark	72
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	70
Poland	66
Japan	51
India	35
Pakistan	4
Burma	2
Ceylon	2
Haiti	2
Luxembourg	2
Nepal	2
Australia	1
Belgium	1
Canada	1
El Salvador	1
Finland	1
Mexico	1
Philippines	1
Romania	1
Thailand	1

Having obtained the required two-thirds majority, Brazil, Denmark, Poland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were elected.

17. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): One seat remains to be filled on the Economic and Social Council. In accordance with rule 96 of the rules of procedure, we shall now, to fill this last vacancy, take a ballot restricted to the candidatures of Japan and India, which, after the countries elected, received the greatest number of votes in the preceding ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Salomon (Haiti) and Mr. Lopian (Indonesia) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	81
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	81
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	81
Required majority:	54

Number of votes obtained:

Japan	46
India	35

18. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Since the result of the vote is inconclusive, we shall proceed to another restricted ballot, limited to the same candidates: Japan and India.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Salomon (Haiti) and Mr. Lopian (Indonesia) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	81
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	81
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	81
Required majority:	54

Number of votes obtained:

Japan	47
India	34

19. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The result of the vote is indecisive. Under the rules of procedure, only two restricted ballots may take place in elections. Therefore we shall now proceed with the first unrestricted ballot, in which votes may be cast for any Member of the Assembly.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Salomon (Haiti) and Mr. Lopian (Indonesia) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	81
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	81
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	81
Required majority:	54

Number of votes obtained:

Japan	48
India	33

20. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We shall now proceed to the second unrestricted ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Salomon (Haiti) and Mr. Lopian (Indonesia) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	81
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	81
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	81
Required majority:	54

Number of votes obtained:

Japan	48
India	33

21. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We shall now proceed to the third unrestricted ballot.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Salomon (Haiti) and Mr. Lopian (Indonesia) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	81
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	81
Abstentions:	0
Number of members voting:	81
Required majority:	54

Number of votes obtained:

Japan	48
India	33

22. Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I am grateful to the President for giving me this opportunity. We have now taken six or seven ballots on this particular election and the Assembly has made its opinion pretty clear by the steady vote in this matter. It is the opinion of my delegation, after consulting among ourselves, that in an issue of this kind when the Assembly has before it, we hope, two equally good candidates, it is very difficult for the Assembly to make up its mind; and when the bare majority has gone in favour of the other candidate, it would be a good practice and a good convention set up for the other person to withdraw. My delegation would therefore like to withdraw from this contest and let our

colleague from Japan have the place. But we would like to state that when there are so many ballots, one after the other, then, in order to maintain the dignity of the Assembly, instead of voting fifteen or twenty times, in the view of our delegation, if the majority consistently stays with one party, even if it is not a two-thirds majority, we ought to accept it as the choice of the Assembly.

23. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We must, in any event, proceed to a new restricted ballot on the two candidates—Japan and India—notwithstanding the generous gesture made by the representative of India.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Salomon (Haiti) and Mr. Lapien (Indonesia) acted as tellers.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

Number of ballot papers:	81
Invalid ballots:	0
Number of valid ballots:	81
Abstentions:	2
Number of members voting:	79
Required majority:	53

Number of votes obtained:

Japan.....	70
India.....	9

Having obtained the required majority, Japan was elected.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Adoption of the agenda (continued)*

THIRD REPORT OF THE GENERAL COMMITTEE (A/4237)

24. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The next item on the agenda is discussion of the adoption of the agenda: third report of the General Committee [A/4237]. The General Committee has made recommendations regarding the inclusion and allocation of three additional items for the agenda of the fourteenth session of the General Assembly. In paragraph 2 of its report the General Committee recommends to the General Assembly the inclusion of an item entitled "International encouragement of scientific research into the control of cancerous diseases", and its allocation to the Third Committee.

25. Does any representative wish to comment on the recommendation of the General Committee? May I assume that the General Assembly approves the recommendation? In that case, the item will be included on the agenda and allocated to the Third Committee.

It was so decided.

26. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Paragraph 3 of the report of the General Committee contains a recommendation that an item entitled "The United Nations Library: gift of the Ford Foundation" be included in the agenda of the fourteenth session of the General Assembly and be allocated to the Fifth Committee.

27. During the meeting of the General Committee [124th meeting] I had occasion to express the deep satisfaction with which, I knew, the Assembly would receive this item. I was confident that Members would

wish to voice their gratification that in the near future, thanks to the generous decision of the Ford Foundation, the United Nations would have a magnificent building which would house the international Library, and I therefore took the liberty of stating that there would be an opportunity for them to do so when the item was discussed in the Main Committee and when the General Assembly took a final decision as to its inclusion. That procedure could perhaps be followed in plenary meeting, since the decision to be taken today concerns only the inclusion of the item and its allocation.

28. If no representative wishes to speak, and there are no objections, I shall assume that the Assembly approves the recommendation of the General Committee for the inclusion of this item in the agenda of this session and its allocation to the Fifth Committee.

It was so decided.

29. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Before we take up the recommendations embodied in paragraph 4 of this report [A/4237], which deals with the item entitled "Question of Tibet", I should like to call the General Assembly's attention to the following provisions of rule 23 of our rules of procedure: Debate on the inclusion of an item in the agenda, when that item has been recommended for inclusion by the General Committee, shall be limited to three speakers in favour of and three against the inclusion. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule.

30. Mr. SHANAHAN (New Zealand): The delegation of New Zealand supports the inscription of this item. The issue before us is an important one of principle affecting the basic human rights of the people of Tibet. The principles enshrined in the Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are the source of the moral authority of the United Nations, and upon the growth of that moral authority a just and secure world today depends. That is a matter of the utmost significance to all nations and all peoples, especially the small nations and weak peoples. The ultimate purpose of all our activities is to provide a better life for men and women everywhere. Important though material well-being may be, we are at least equally concerned with the goal of freedom, the right of individuals to live their lives under the protection of the rule of law and to mould for themselves the character of the societies to which they belong.

31. There is, of course, a great gap between the ideals of the United Nations and its present capacity to ensure that these ideals are realized. For one thing, the United Nations does not dispose of great coercive power, especially when there is division among its largest and strongest Members. Moreover, as paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the Charter reminds us, the United Nations is not a world Government to which Member States have surrendered their sovereignties. We would do well to recognize these limitations. Indeed, New Zealand has sometimes had misgivings about the wisdom and propriety of attempts by this Organization to influence Governments in regard to matters which are largely within the ambit of their own discretions and responsibilities. Governments must find their own ways and determine their own rates of progress in responding to the needs of their own peoples. The United Nations is not em-

* Resumed from the 803rd meeting.

powered to be the judge of the social order in individual countries.

32. To merit the attention of this Assembly, there must exist a clear-cut situation involving a denial of fundamental human rights on such a grand scale that the implications are universal. But when this situation does arise, the Assembly is not just entitled to consider the matter; it is, in fact, we submit, under a moral duty to do so. The Government of New Zealand, in common with the Governments of many other countries throughout the world, believes that such a situation exists today in Tibet.

33. It is true that our means of knowledge about what is happening in that remote country are imperfect, and that many details remain in doubt. Even so, we submit that the broad outline is painfully clear. The Chinese communist authorities are conducting a campaign of military repression carried out with great cruelty and aimed at the complete subjugation of the Tibetan people. A denial of human rights on such a vast scale assails every principle which is held sacred by this Organization and by the world community. The people of my country believe that the United Nations cannot in good conscience close its eyes to the sufferings of the Tibetan people.

34. It is no answer to suggest that because we may not be able to find a solution to this problem we should not consider or discuss it. As I have already acknowledged, there is a great gap between the constitutional powers of the United Nations and its present capacity to make its influence felt, but how much more dangerous our position would be if we were to fall into the habit of prejudging whether, in regard to any particular matter, the voice of the General Assembly would be heeded. This, I submit, would entail an abdication of responsibility which would only diminish the moral authority and the practical influence of the United Nations. In the opinion of the New Zealand delegation, the fact that we cannot certainly foresee a solution which will assuage the miseries of the Tibetan people and secure their liberties to them, is no good or sufficient reason for our not discussing the situation.

35. I should like now to touch upon the elements in this situation which in our view justify and demand the inscription of this item and its consideration by the General Assembly.

36. First, as the legal literature shows, Tibet has long enjoyed some of the characteristics of a separate international personality. Tibet has been known to the community of nations not as a mere geographic expression, but as a country linked in a special relationship with China. Therefore, in the opinion of my delegation there is justification for concluding that the plea of domestic jurisdiction is not such as to debar the United Nations from considering any question affecting China's repressive measures in Tibet.

37. That is also the view taken in the preliminary report issued by the International Commission of Jurists. After examining the legal complexities, this report contains a statement which is central to our inquiry. This states:

"One fact however, emerges: that Tibet has been to all intents and purposes an independent country and has enjoyed a large degree of sovereignty."^{1/}

^{1/} International Commission of Jurists, *The Question of Tibet and the Rule of Law* (Geneva, International Commission of Jurists, 1959), p. IV.

38. It is, indeed, a matter of record that the Tibetan people have for centuries preserved their separate identity, their own institutions of government and their unique way of life within the borders of their own homeland. It would be difficult to conceive of circumstances in which any stronger case could be made for the exercise of self-determination, and it is against that background that we have to consider the evidence of the suppression of the fundamental human rights of the Tibetan people.

39. The second point which bears on the question of inscription is the reliability of the reports received. One main source is the inquiry conducted by the International Commission of Jurists, a reputable and impartial body which has a consultative status category "B" with the United Nations. Its particular concern is to mobilize world legal opinion whenever there has been a systematic and general violation of human rights and of the principles which the rule of law represents. The other main source of our knowledge is the accepted leader of the Tibetan people, the Dalai Lama himself. No one, I suggest, would suggest that the Dalai Lama has, since his arrival in India, been subject to any form of pressure except his own anguish for the sufferings of his people. No one should doubt the Dalai Lama's sincerity or his authority to speak for his people, or his understanding of the course of events in Tibet.

40. The third point in the case for inscription is the gravity of the situation as disclosed by the evidence. The report of the International Commission of Jurists, after reviewing much detailed evidence, concludes:

"It would seem difficult to recall a case in which ruthless suppression of man's essential dignity has been more systematically and efficiently carried out."^{2/}

The Dalai Lama's own testimony confirms this terrible conclusion.

41. That is the reason why the delegation of New Zealand supports the recommendation of the General Committee for the inscription of this item on the agenda of the General Assembly.

42. Mr. SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia): In considering the inclusion of items in the agenda, the Indonesian delegation has always shown a very liberal attitude. Our approach to this matter is based on two related factors, each of equal importance to us.

43. First, we support the discussion of any question or situation which, in the considered opinion of one or more Member States, disturbs international relations and is of a nature serious enough to warrant the attention of the United Nations. Second, we believe that the foremost aim of such a discussion must be to find acceptable solutions. It is imperative, therefore, that all the parties directly concerned be given an opportunity to state their points of view and in general to participate fully in the debate.

44. Recent events in Tibet undoubtedly have aroused worldwide concern. But about whom? About what? Obviously, this concern stems from and is directed at actions undertaken by China in Tibet. This entire item clearly involves, in the first place, the relations between the peoples of China and Tibet. How, then, can we proceed in the absence of representatives of

^{2/} Ibid., p. 59.

the Government of the People's Republic of China? The plain answer is that we cannot proceed without them. Their presence here is a precondition for a constructive and fair debate.

45. Moreover, one cannot overlook the fact that Tibet is a part of China. The Chinese Central Government's jurisdiction over Tibet is generally recognized. Even the authorities on Taiwan regard Tibet as a part of China and a branch of the Chinese family. In this respect, their views have not changed since the last time that the General Committee considered the inclusion of an item on Tibet. At the seventy-third meeting of the General Committee, on 24 November 1950, the representative seated in the chair of China emphasized most vigorously that all Chinese, irrespective of their party or religion, regard Tibet as a part of China. He further declared that the Tibetan question should not form a separate item on the agenda of the General Assembly.

46. Indeed, many Member States which hold strong views as regards the limitations imposed upon the United Nations by Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, must feel obliged by virtue of consistency to vote against the inclusion of the question of Tibet. For our part, we do not labour under this constraint, since Indonesia has always adhered to the principle that Article 2, paragraph 7, cannot prevent this Assembly from considering questions involving fundamental human rights and the peace and security of the world. Nevertheless, Chinese authority over Tibet does reinforce our view that the Government of the People's Republic of China is the interested party and, as such, its proper representation is indispensable for our consideration of the question.

47. Another statement was made at the aforementioned seventy-third meeting of the General Committee which, I feel, is pertinent to our present proceedings. On that occasion, the representative of the United States reiterated that his Government always supports any proposal to refer international disputes to the United Nations, including even accusations made against the United States, so that they may be aired, considered and settled at international hearings. We agree with and indeed respect this policy. At the same time, however, we are acutely aware—and this is the crux of the matter—that the United States is able to adopt such a position because its representatives are present at our meetings and have the authority to speak for their Government and people. In other words, a Member State properly represented in this Organization can defend itself when accusations are made against it, and a fair settlement may be attained.

48. The reverse is true, however, in the case of China. There is no representative in the United Nations authorized to speak for the people and Government of the People's Republic of China. Consequently, it cannot offer clarifications or defend itself against charges, and issues affecting that Government cannot be settled here. This is the horn of the dilemma on which the United Nations is caught as a result of the continued improper representation of China, a permanent Member of this Organization, and it manifests itself in some peculiar ways.

49. One cannot help but notice, for instance, the curious wording of the explanatory memorandum [A/4234] submitted by the requesting Governments.

Although this item concerns an autonomous region of China, that country is nowhere mentioned in the document. Why this sudden embarrassed reticence? One unreality surely seems to breed the next.

50. In the end, however, one must return to reality and to the truth. The truth of the matter is that we cannot escape the link between Chinese representation in the United Nations and the item before us. Even the head of the delegation of Ireland, whose views we esteem and respect most highly and whose delegation is a co-sponsor of this item, apparently concurs with this conclusion. A few weeks ago, on 21 September 1959, in explaining his Government's attitude on the question of Chinese representation, the Foreign Minister of Ireland, Mr. Aiken, stressed that the most important function of the Assembly:

"... is to carry with us the informed and active good will of reasonable men in a position to influence policy—reasonable men, wherever they may be, who like to hear all sides of a case, to think out political problems for themselves, and to back their convictions with word and deed. [800th meeting, para. 159.]

"In the case of the Far East problems which I have mentioned"—and I may interpolate that these included the Tibetan situation—"that function cannot, we feel, properly be discharged by this Assembly without a fundamental discussion of the critical question of"—Chinese—"representation in this Organization." [*Ibid.*, para. 160.]

51. The Indonesian delegation completely agrees with this estimation. And, though we go further than the Foreign Minister of Ireland in believing that, without any preconditions and in conformity with the principle of universality, the People's Republic of China should long ago have taken its rightful seat in the United Nations, we find merit in his opinion that a discussion of the question of Chinese representation might have brought out constructive suggestions and exercised a healthy influence, leading to negotiations and the peaceful settlement of related problems.

52. The sad fact is, however, that this session of the Assembly again spurred a discussion of this matter. By this decision it automatically closed the door to any fruitful discussion of the present item. Even the United Nations cannot expect to have its cake and eat it too. In excluding China from active participation in its process of mediation and conciliation, this Organization also has placed the People's Republic of China beyond the purview of its benign influence and control. Under these circumstances, a debate on the question of Tibet can serve no other purpose than to intensify the cold war and to sharpen the lines of division among the great Powers. Certainly this cannot be our aim.

53. Almost every delegate who participated in the current general debate decried the pernicious effects of the cold war. The relaxation of cold war tensions was recognized as the supreme task before this session of the General Assembly. The hopeful signs of an improvement in East-West relations were accorded encouragement and approval. These expressions, we are sure, were sincere. It is therefore incomprehensible to my delegation how this Assembly can even undertake a step whose only conceivable result would be to aggravate and bravely excite cold war antagonisms. We have already witnessed a dis-

trekking revival of the cold war when this issue was discussed in the General Committee last Friday [124th meeting]. There can be no doubt any more in anyone's mind that, if discussed in substance, this extremely dangerous situation would be repeated on an even greater scale. This we must adjure by rejecting the recommendation of the General Committee.

54. I am, of course, quite well aware of the argument that this Organization cannot avoid problems solely for fear of exacerbating cold war tensions. But there is one vital and, in my delegation's opinion, indispensable proviso missing in this argument, namely, that this Organization should deal with every problem, including cold war problems, if—and only if—the aim is to seek a removal or reduction of cold war tensions and not to do anything which might merely embitter international relations.

55. It is admitted by everyone that, due to this Assembly's own previous action of depriving the Government of the People's Republic of China of its rightful place in the United Nations for another year, a debate on this issue cannot, and indeed is not expected to, promote a settlement. Yet it is argued that such a debate should be held for the purpose of reaffirming the principles of the Charter. This Assembly often reaffirms Charter principles. It does so, however, as the basis for the solution of problems. Now, what does it mean when we reaffirm the Charter principles divorced from any intent or hope of attaining a peaceful settlement? I am afraid that under these circumstances, when Charter principles are actually reaffirmed solely for our own edification and not as the basis for a recommended settlement, the only effect can be to cast doubts upon our own belief in their worth and general applicability. Alternatively, if this is not the case, it casts dark suspicions upon the actual purpose of this Assembly in wishing to discuss this matter.

56. In conclusion, let me say that we of Indonesia certainly are following the situation in Tibet with careful attention. We hope that a satisfactory solution for all concerned may soon be found to this problem. Our one and only interest is to see an end of the present difficulties and the restoration of peaceful co-operation between the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and the autonomous region of Tibet. We believe that everyone must be guided in this case by the need to exercise restraint and wise judgement. In this lies the hope of a peaceful settlement.

57. For all these reasons, the Indonesian delegation will vote against the recommendation of the General Committee and against the inclusion of this item in the agenda.

58. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (translated from Spanish): I wish to explain why the Salvadorian delegation supports unreservedly the proposal recommended by the General Committee in its third report [A/4237] to include in the agenda of this regular session of the General Assembly the item "Question of Tibet".

59. As you know, during the fifth regular session of the General Assembly in 1950 the delegation of El Salvador proposed the inclusion in the agenda of an item "Invasion of Tibet by foreign forces".^{3/} This request by El Salvador was prompted by the fact,

^{3/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, Annexes, agenda item 8, document A/1534.

which is well known and has not been denied by anybody, that military forces directed from Peking had unjustly invaded the territory of the small country of Tibet and were seeking to impose on its Government the will of the Chinese communist régime.

60. Then the efforts of the Salvadorian delegation in the General Committee were fruitless. The view which prevailed was that put forward by the United Kingdom delegation and vigorously supported by the Indian delegation, namely that the United Nations should not take up the matter but should await the negotiation of a peaceful settlement. Consequently, the Salvadorian proposal was deferred *sine die* and the "peaceful settlement" of the question, as was inevitable, was that in 1951 the Chinese communist régime obtained from the Dalai Lama the forced acceptance of an agreement between the two Governments. In this agreement, however, the Peking régime recognized Tibet as an autonomous country and contracted specific obligations towards its temporal and spiritual head, the Dalai Lama.

61. In the course of the eight years which have elapsed since then, the Chinese communist régime has not only failed to respect the independence of Tibet or to fulfil the specific promises made to its political and religious leader, but has flagrantly violated those promises and made a mockery of the autonomy which it recognized and undertook to observe.

62. The Dalai Lama, hunted, his life threatened by a powerful military assault against the palace where he was living, was forced to flee precipitately from it and abandon his homeland. He escaped to India where the Government immediately granted him asylum. The Cabinet of the Tibetan Government, supported by a vast number of the inhabitants of Lhasa, the capital, valiantly proclaimed the independence of Tibet.

63. In these circumstances, El Salvador can but associate itself with Ireland and the Federation of Malaya, which have proposed [A/4234] the inclusion of the item "Question of Tibet" and congratulate them on the success of their representations to the General Committee and on securing the adoption of their proposal.

64. Perhaps the martyred people of Tibet might have been spared much suffering if nine years ago the General Committee had shown the same wisdom and sense of justice as it has evinced today. However, it failed to do so when the Salvadorian delegation denounced the attack which was launched at that time.

65. In my speech before this Assembly, I said on 29 September 1959:

"El Salvador, which is always ready to champion good causes, will welcome and support any action or any resolution on the part of the United Nations that is designed to restore the traditional independence of Tibet and condemn this flagrant violation of the political, social and religious system of that country, the temporal and spiritual authority of the Dalai Lama, and the fundamental human rights of the Tibetan people. These violations have reached a stage at which they can be regarded as constituting the international crime of genocide."— [812th meeting, para. 127]

66. The arguments which have been made on the basis of Article 2 (7) of the Charter seem to us without foundation. If the principle adopted by certain delega-

tions were followed, the General Assembly might perhaps never have been able to take up questions like those of Morocco, Tunis, Algeria, Western New Guinea nor the problems of racial discrimination in the Union of South Africa which, since 1946, have been a subject of concern for this Assembly and have prompted various resolutions and recommendations based on the precepts of the Charter in the field of human rights.

67. The question of the competence or lack of competence of the Assembly is a complex problem which may be examined with better prospects of thoroughness during the general debate on that subject or in connexion with the specific consideration of draft resolutions and amendments, rather than in this short discussion, limited to three speakers in favour and three against, on the inclusion of an item proposed by the General Committee.

68. In our view, Article 2 (7) is invoked too lightly and without due regard for the origin of the provision, its true aim and, what is even more serious, the scope of the term "intervene" used in it. As we see it, two things are essential for the correct application of Article 2 (7) which establishes the exception concerning the sovereignty of States: first, it must concern a matter which is essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a State; second, the resolution or recommendation at issue must involve an "intervention" in the domestic affairs of that State.

69. Both these matters, I repeat, may be considered more calmly in the discussions on the agenda item itself rather than during this preliminary stage designed merely to decide whether the item should be included in the agenda or not. Moreover, the only two provisions of the rules of procedure which refer to competence are rules 81 and 122 and they concern the competence of the General Assembly or of its Committees to take a decision on a proposal which has been submitted to them.

70. Although it is not at all necessary, we take it that the political status of Tibet will have to be examined. But that is a matter more for the general debate on the item than for the circumscribed preliminary debate in which we are now engaged.

71. Finally, I should like to say a word about another argument which was forcefully stressed last Friday [124th meeting] at the meeting of the General Committee and to which the Indonesian representative referred in his speech just now. The argument is that the examination of the question of Tibet by the General Assembly at a time when Mr. Khrushchev, the President of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, has just visited the United States and the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, is preparing to visit Moscow, would revive the cold war, whereas the aim should be to do the opposite and to facilitate an understanding between the two most powerful States and thus help to bring about a period of peace and relaxation of tension throughout the world.

72. Apart from the fact that it was hardly the representatives of the Soviet Union and its allies who set the best example of serenity and comprehension last Friday in the General Committee, the truth is that neither the visit which has already taken place nor the one planned for the future, nor any hopes there may be of an understanding between the great Powers can, or should, serve as a pretext for conniving at brutal

attacks such as the one which has been and is still being committed against a small nation, weak and defenceless, yet honourable, and therefore freedom-loving.

73. To admit such a principle would be to cease to respect law and justice and to accept the evil doctrine that to secure peace we must temporize with domineering and military dictatorship and allow small and medium-sized States to be swamped by the alliance of the mighty or be subjected by countries which respect neither the United Nations Charter nor the standards of international law.

74. My delegation supports the dual recommendation of the General Committee, namely that the Assembly should examine the "Question of Tibet" and should do so in plenary without delegating the item to any Committee.

75. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation strongly objects to the decision of the General Committee concerning the inclusion of the so-called "Question of Tibet" in the agenda of the fourteenth session of the General Assembly. There can be no doubt that this provocative question has been forced upon the Assembly in order to thrust us back to the worst period of the cold war. That is precisely the intention underlying the request of the delegations of Ireland and Malaya [A/4234] which we are now considering and, in that connexion, I entirely endorse the statement made here by the representative of Indonesia. In doing so, I of course differentiate between the formal sponsors who signed the letter requesting the inscription of this item and those who are really responsible for raising this question.

76. My delegation deems it necessary first of all to draw the Assembly's attention to the following facts.

77. Firstly, it should be clear to any objective person that discussion of the "Question of Tibet" in the United Nations would be a flagrant violation of the Charter of this Organization, which categorically prohibits intervention by the United Nations in matters which are within the domestic jurisdiction of any State.

[The speaker then read paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the Charter.]

78. Everyone knows that from ancient times Tibet has constituted an organic part of China, that it is an integral part of the Chinese State, forming one of its administrative regions. In modern times, the status of Tibet as an Autonomous Region within the Chinese State was clearly established by the agreement of 21 May 1951 between the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China and the local Tibetan Government concerning measures for the peaceful liberation of Tibet, and by the Constitution of the People's Republic of China. In 1954, the Dalai Lama, the Panchen Lama and other representatives of Tibet participated actively in the formulation and adoption of the Constitution of the People's Republic of China, which defined the principles of national policy, principles guaranteeing in particular regional autonomy to the national minorities within the territory of the People's Republic of China.

79. In strict conformity with the Constitution of the People's Republic of China as also with the provisions of the above agreement, democratic measures of all

kinds are being taken in that region. To judge by all appearances these progressive measures aimed at satisfying the deepest aspirations of the Tibetan people are not to the liking of certain circles in a number of States. Nevertheless, the carrying out of such measures is a matter for the people and Government of the People's Republic of China and no one, including the United Nations, has the right to intervene. Thus it follows that the forced inclusion of the so-called "Question of Tibet" in the agenda of the Assembly is nothing but a high-handed and brazen attempt to meddle in the domestic affairs of China and that such actions are in flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations.

80. Secondly, the parties with whom the idea of including the "Question of Tibet" in the agenda of this session originated, being perfectly well aware that their designs are completely irregular and devoid of any legal basis, are seeking to disguise their attempts to intervene in the domestic affairs of China by references to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, by all kinds of hypocritical talk about the protection of human rights and religious and civil liberty, and so on. Various slanderous fabrications concocted by the organizers of this discreditable act of provocation in collaboration with the bankrupt Tibetan feudalists are being circulated.

81. Yet the question we must ask is this: who is it that the proponents of the inclusion of the so-called "Question of Tibet" are protecting? It is not difficult to see that they are going to the defence of the most backward, unenlightened and cruel social order in the world today. In the circumstances, their references to human rights are nothing but the crocodile tears of the advocates of serfdom, an expression of their concern to ensure by hook or by crook that the barbarous system of serfdom is maintained in Tibet. It is a well-known fact that under that system the secular and religious feudal lords, who constitute five per cent of the population of Tibet, owned all the land and other means of production, while the lot of the overwhelming majority of the population has always been appalling poverty, ignorance and hunger.

82. At the same time the democratic reforms, for which the ground is already being prepared in Tibet, are entirely in conformity with the ideas and principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The purpose of those reforms is precisely to ensure that the ideas set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights may prevail as soon as possible in Tibet, to put an end to the arbitrary rule of the clique of serf-owners and to the conditions which deprive the overwhelming majority of the population of its rights. Like the other measures introduced in Tibet, the preparation of reforms is being carried out with full regard for the special conditions in that country resulting from its historical development; what is more, it is being carried out by the Tibetans themselves.

83. Thus, the attempts of aggressive circles to use the Universal Declaration of Human Rights for their own purposes in connexion with the introduction of the "Question of Tibet" are without foundation and are recolling against the instigators of this commotion.

84. I might point out in this connexion that there is still plenty of room in the world for the expression of real rather than pharisaical human sympathy and for

the adoption of measures to ensure the observance of human rights. It is not, however, where they are seeking to find it. We could, for example, give the representatives of the United Kingdom or Belgium, not to speak of several other States whose delegations have voted in the General Committee [124th meeting] for the inclusion in the agenda of the "Question of Tibet", the names of territories where racial hatred is rampant and where those who speak out against an obsolete and infamous colonial system are mercilessly punished. Many millions of people in those territories are deprived of the most elementary human rights, deprived of the opportunity to live their lives in accordance with their own wishes. Several examples have come before us already at this session and it would not be difficult to expand the list, if that subject were under discussion.

85. Let us look the truth in the face and call a spade a spade. The underlying motive, the mainspring behind the raising of the "Question of Tibet" is very far from being a concern for human rights. And the General Assembly ought to know this. Those responsible for the submission of the Tibetan question—and in particular, the State Department of the United States—have launched a malicious and slanderous campaign against the great Chinese people and their Government so as to halt or at any rate to slow down the process of the thawing of international relations which has recently begun. Everyone can see that conditions are now developing which are favourable to the solution of the problems at present poisoning the relations between countries. The obstacles to a lasting peace are being cleared away, a new chapter is opening in the history of mankind—a chapter of peaceful co-operation among all States regardless of their social systems. This development does not suit the enemies of peace at all—those who pursue a cold war policy. In forcing consideration of the Tibetan question upon the United Nations, they are seeking to envenom the atmosphere, to prevent the relaxation of international tension, to hinder the development of more cordial relations among States.

86. Their primary objective in this connexion is to disrupt the fruitful co-operation between the People's Republic of China and the Asian countries, to undermine the solidarity of the peoples of the Asian and African countries, to hinder their efforts to strengthen their national independence and extend the zone of peace in that area. These aggressive circles seize upon any pretext to cause trouble between the People's Republic of China and its neighbours and to create difficulties in its relations with all Asian countries. At the same time, they hope to lure the Asian peoples into the cold war, to associate them with SEATO, CENTO and other aggressive blocs. It can be said straight out, however, that their efforts to deceive peoples recently liberated from colonial and semi-colonial dependence are in vain. These peoples know that the organization of the rebellion of reactionary elements in Tibet and now the raising of a storm in the United Nations over this deliberately contrived question of Tibet are just some of the measures used by these circles to obstruct the ideas promulgated at the Bandung Conference, the ideas of the peaceful coexistence of all countries. It would be far more useful to the United Nations if all delegations were to bend their efforts towards finding a way of settling those urgent international problems which have long been awaiting solution.

87. The submission of the Tibetan question, so its sponsors reckon, ought also to prevent any productive work being done at the fourteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly and to distract attention from the really important questions on its agenda and, first and foremost, from the question of general and complete disarmament.

88. There is no doubt but that the inclusion of the "Question of Tibet" in the agenda will be a serious blow to the prestige of the United Nations. Faced with such a step, the peoples naturally ask themselves how long the United Nations is going to be a tool in the hands of the partisans of the cold war instead of taking action to promote peace and friendship among all countries. Something strange is indeed going on. The whole world can bear witness to the improvement in the relations among States which is at present taking place. But at this very time questions are being dragged in and magnified before the General Assembly with the object of maintaining and continuing the cold war through the agency of the United Nations itself.

89. Let us say it openly and frankly: if the United Nations wishes to justify the hopes of the peoples, to grow strong and to develop, to go forward and not back along the inglorious path pursued by the defunct League of Nations, then it must become an international organization which genuinely contributes to the preservation and consolidation of peace, to the development of understanding and co-operation among States. It should discard everything that will hinder it in the work of strengthening peace. This is a point to which we should give serious consideration before voting for or against the inclusion in the agenda of this deliberately-contrived Tibetan question.

90. The Soviet Union delegation suggests that the General Committee's proposal for the inclusion of the "Question of Tibet" in the agenda of the current session should be rejected as being designed to impel the United Nations into aggravating the relations among States—into the course of the bankrupt cold war policy.

91. Mr. ARTHAYUKTI (Thailand): My delegation strongly supports the inscription of the "Question of Tibet" in the agenda of the present session of the Assembly, as recommended by the General Committee in their report [A/4237].

92. Such decision is prompted by the desire to ensure that our Organization takes due interest in a situation which affects the basic principles of the United Nations Charter, that is, the respect for human rights to which we are pledged to observe. Furthermore, Thailand is a Buddhist country; and as you are aware, Buddhism is essentially a religion of peace and compassion. We would therefore fail in our duty should we ignore the tragic events in Tibet and utterly disregard the appeal of its people.

93. In the view of my delegation, the United Nations represents world public opinion. Its Charter reaffirms faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person. Each year, efforts are made to publicize the principles and purposes of the United Nations as well as the significance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Indeed, it is generally admitted that the harsh repression in Tibet has made a painful impression not only in Asian countries but in all continents of the world. The question involved in the issue is indeed of a humanitarian

nature with deep implication for the prestige of our Organization. Considered in this light, how can the Organization be indifferent to the kind of tragedy that has happened in Tibet? Should we forego our duty in this matter, we should not expect the ordinary man in the street the world over to understand our objectives and purposes. My delegation's decision to support the report of the General Committee merely reflects our genuine attachment to this world Organization.

94. In these circumstances, permit me to express my earnest hope that our intention will be well understood and appreciated by the other delegations in this Assembly, and thus meet with their approval and support. It is my belief that the decision of this Assembly to take up the issue of Tibet for discussion and deliberation will serve as a source of inspiration and thus help to strengthen the moral authority of our Organization.

95. Mr. BRUCAN (Romania): I have listened carefully to the speakers who have spoken in favour of the inscription of the item the "Question of Tibet", and I must say that their presentation of the case falls short of convincing. It seems to me that those who are pushing this item take this Assembly for granted so that they do not care too much to convince the delegations present here of the correct line of their action. Do they have reasons to take this Assembly for granted?

96. From the very outset, I should like to state that in our view this Assembly is faced today with an issue which calls both for our attention and vigilance. Only two days have elapsed since the request for the item "The Question of Tibet" was discussed in the General Committee. I have carefully followed the news coverage and the comments in the Press, and I can safely assert that the point we emphasized the other day in the General Committee [124th meeting] has proved to be right; briefly, in all these comments the emphasis was put on general political circumstances rather than on the intrinsic merits of the item proposed. One cannot expect the representatives gathered here to be less aware and less sophisticated than the press correspondents, who have seen the actual stakes involved in this debate. The timing of the request for the inscription of this additional item, the close interrelationship between this item and the major questions of the current session, the heavy impact of this highly-controversial request on the atmosphere inside the United Nations, as well as on world public opinion—all these inextricably-linked elements fully justify the conviction that something far more important is actually at stake here.

97. First, I shall touch upon the timing of this request. Since a request for the inclusion of an additional item on the agenda has to be motivated by important and urgent reasons, are there any such urgent last-minute reasons in this case? There are none which the sponsors of this additional item would care to disclose here. As a matter of fact, the decision to bring up the question of Tibet before the United Nations was made a long time before this session, and the only practical matter left was: who should take on the assignment? The question arises: why then did they not place this item on the agenda of the current session in due time? Why did they have to wait so long? Since no reason has been given to explain that obvious delay, we have to consider the facts relevant

to the question; I mean those facts which have been dealt with in the meantime by the General Assembly.

98. The first fact to be considered is the question of the representation of China. One can safely assume that the advocates of the Tibetan item have chosen to ask for its inclusion only after they felt safe that the question of the representation of China was rejected. In other words, they would rather challenge an opponent after making sure that he was missing. Fortunately for these brave challengers, the United Nations has rules of procedure but no code of ethics.

99. I turn now to another fact which has come forth in the meantime. I refer to the item "General and complete disarmament". It is perhaps rather premature to pass judgement as to the full significance of this strange coincidence in our deliberations. I refer to the fact that the request for the inscription of the Tibetan item happened to coincide with the opening of the debate on general disarmament. I have my own ideas concerning this. Yet, since the real test on this score will come up later in the First Committee, let us refrain from further comments for the time being. I would only say that I personally do not believe in coincidence.

100. To sum up this point, one cannot fail to make a clear distinction between a request to place on the agenda the item "The Question of Tibet" in due time, that is, prior to the opening of this session, and the same request made now, at this stage of our deliberations.

101. After the many protractions and tribulations this item has experienced, after watching how the Tibetan ball has been passed from one hand to another, and after witnessing the reluctance, the doubts, the resistance it has encountered, one feels entitled to ask the question: How is it that this trying item, delayed, protracted for so long, has suddenly turned into an urgent item? What has made it become all of a sudden so urgent, so pressing? What has caused its authors to be possessed by such frantic haste, precisely now when the General Assembly is about to debate the question of general disarmament?

102. For the United Nations the test is so serious that we cannot afford not to call things by name. The reason why "The Question of Tibet" has been delayed, has drifted off and on again, passed from one hand to another, the reason why this item has encountered reluctance, doubts, resistance is that it actually constitutes a cold-war issue. Nothing could be more convincing to that effect than the preventive notice given by the sponsors, to wit, that this item should not be interpreted as such.

103. All the features of this question, beginning with its ideological connotations, its timing, the synchronization of the action taken inside the United Nations with the activities carried on outside by famous specialized agencies and, last but not least, the way it is used by the cold-war propaganda machinery—in short, the whole set-up, definitely attaches the inglorious cold-war tag to this item.

104. If it is accepted, the debate on this item can have no effect but to embitter and poison the atmosphere in the General Assembly and render rather difficult co-operation among delegations in the endeavour towards a long-due solution of the major issues of the agenda.

105. Therefore, let us seriously ponder what people would say and how they would judge the United Nations if at the moment they expect us to approach constructively the question of disarmament, the General Assembly embarks on a bitter debate of a cold war issue. What would be the reaction of world public opinion if today press dispatches and radio broadcasts carry the news that the General Assembly has decided to take up a cold war issue? What a fine decision it would be at this juncture in international relations, at this moment of great expectations.

106. I would now like to say just a few words about the pretext invoked here in motivation of the inclusion of this item in the agenda. We are told in the explanatory memorandum [A/4234] of an attempt to destroy the traditional way of life in Tibet. Now, what is this traditional way of life? The answer is: serfdom, and one can easily understand why the sponsors have found it difficult to call it by name.

107. The question is: what has serfdom to do with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights? Surely, if there is any connexion between these two things, the only conceivable one is that serfdom is at variance with that Declaration. After all, freedom is precisely the opposite of serfdom and so are all human rights.

108. It is true that we have heard sometimes in this hall that a colonial yoke constitutes the traditional way of life of a given people, that people are very happy under it, and thus any attempt to destroy that yoke is contrary to the Charter and to the Declaration. Now, we learn that the abolition of serfdom as well is contrary to the Charter and to the Declaration. One cannot fail to notice that Western twentieth-century philosophy is in full swing. Should we take it that serfdom suits the Western concept of human rights and fundamental freedoms? However, the United Nations cannot adopt this interpretation and it cannot be used as an instrument for the preservation of serfdom.

109. Let us realize that nothing could be more absurd in our contemporary world than a United Nations resolution calling for the restoration of serfdom on behalf of freedom and human rights. I could not think of a more devastating blow to the prestige this Organization still enjoys.

110. As to the legal aspect of the problem, I want to state that I have no desire to dwell at length upon the illegality of this request. I feel it is of little impact in circumstances when power politics are prevailing. It is a sad conclusion indeed that in such circumstances law in the United Nations looks like a reversible coat—to be worn on either side, according to convenience.

111. Three weeks ago, this Assembly was pushed into endorsing a resolution [1351 (XIV)] strictly forbidding a debate on the question of representation of China. Today, the same driving force is pushing for a debate in the plenary meetings directed against that same country. In the first instance, when the lawful right of that country was raised—no debate. In the second instance, when that same country is slandered—full debate.

112. Even the ancient sophists who conceived success rather than truth to be the end of intellectual pursuits were more cautious in maintaining some kind of consistency in their activities. It is true, at that time the

reversible coat was not available. It has come out recently, as an American product.

113. Under such circumstances, what can one expect in terms of legality, since the very essence of justice is so defiantly denied? I am talking not about the lofty and highly intricate interpretations of the provisions of the Charter, which make white of black and black of white; I am talking about the deep-rooted sense of justice of the people, who will never reconcile themselves with a procedure that forbids a debate on someone's right, while allowing a full debate in order to charge and besmear him in his absence. This is a dire offence against justice. Therefore, I find it superfluous to demonstrate that this offence is committed against the Charter, since there is no other way of committing injustice in the United Nations.

114. I feel it is safe to state that whatever references are made to specific provisions of the Charter with a view to finding some legal basis for this item, the Charter of the United Nations cannot shelter such glaring injustice. In other words, I consider that an exchange of arguments, pro and con related to specific provisions of the Charter is useless as long as we have to deal with the technique of the reversible coat.

115. Take for instance Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter. Our opponents argue that they are working under the cover of another Article. If one refers to the fact that China is not here, they invoke Article 2, paragraph 6. But why is China not here? They answer that the General Assembly has decided not to consider this question during the current session. No, we cannot take up this problem piecemeal. The matters we are dealing with are interrelated and interwoven in such a manner that, if we are to be fair, we have to consider the problem as a whole.

116. The truth is that the injustice I have mentioned is being made possible by a chain of illegalities and that what is at stake is not one principle or another of the Charter, but the Charter as a whole. I mean that if the last link of this chain, namely the item "Question of Tibet" gets through, then the conclusion—a tragic conclusion indeed—would be that this Assembly has allowed the Charter to be distorted to the point of covering a most glaring injustice.

117. As to the political facet of the problem, such a decision would mean that the so-called "China policy" of a given country can have its way in the United Nations to such an extent that it can afford to do whatever it chooses and whenever it wishes, according to the aims and interests of that policy. In other words, this would mean that it could direct the General Assembly not to debate what does not suit that policy, while fully debating what does suit it. What about the Charter, the rules of procedure? They have to adjust themselves to that policy. If they do not or if they cannot, then so much the worse for them.

118. For all these reasons, the Romanian delegation considers that the request for this item should be rejected by the General Assembly.

119. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): We shall now vote on the recommendation of the General Committee to include on the agenda an item entitled "Question of Tibet". A vote by roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

In favour: Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Laos, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against: Yugoslavia, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Indonesia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Yemen, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Ghana, Guinea, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, Nepal, Peru, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sudan, Tunisia, Union of South Africa, United Arab Republic.

India did not participate in the voting.

The item was placed on the agenda by 43 votes to 11, with 25 abstentions.

120. The President (*translated from Spanish*): I call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

121. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): This is not time for harsh words, and I certainly shall not use them. However, I feel I must use my right of reply to comment on the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Kuznetsov, that the United States State Department has had a share in the Tibetan item in order to launch a malicious, slanderous campaign to impede better relations between the States.

122. When Chairman Khrushchev was in this country, he stated categorically, within my hearing, that he drew no distinction at all, in so far as the love of peace was concerned, between the United States Government and people, and he said that he knew that the United States people were in favour of peace. I make that comment in passing.

123. On Friday afternoon in the General Committee [124th meeting], Mr. Kuznetsov accused the United States of seeking to worsen the international atmosphere, poison the situation in the United Nations and perpetuate the notorious cold war. I cite this because, on this type of reasoning—if you can call it that—Mr. Kuznetsov tries to make the argument that we must ignore all of the crimes being committed in the world or else be accused of promoting the cold war. This is a dangerous misconception, and it is a fallacy to which I think my friend from Indonesia was not completely immune. The truth of the matter is that it is not the person who talks about crime, not the person who wants to do something about crime, who is promoting the cold war, but rather the person who commits the crime. If we turn our faces away from evil in the United Nations in order to avoid the cold war, the world will be in serious danger—and Heaven help the small nations if the United Nations ever

adopts that way of looking at offences against the letter and the spirit of the Charter.

124. Now, this is a regrettable moment. I have just completed a tour of the United States with Nikita S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The trip, I think, was a success. It resulted in useful conversations between Chairman Khrushchev and President Eisenhower. Indeed, when Chairman Khrushchev got back to Moscow he did me the courtesy to refer to me personally by name in a public address. So naturally I have returned to this Assembly with every desire to contribute what I could to improve international relations, but when I get back here I hear these unsupported charges made against my country. I hear the State Department being accused of launching a malicious and slanderous campaign to impede better relations between States. And who makes these charges? Why, it is none other than the Soviet representative. The language that he has used is not the language of Mr. Khrushchev as I heard it for twelve days in the United States. I can only hope that Mr. Kuznetsov's views about the State Department and about the United States Government do not represent the sober thoughts of the Soviet Government, and that they are merely a personal aberration which, let us hope, will soon be forgotten.

125. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): There has been a request for explanation of votes. To simplify matters, I would ask the representatives of Yugoslavia and Pakistan to be kind enough to explain their votes tomorrow, when we shall continue our meeting, so that I can now conclude the question of how this item is to be handled. If they insist on being allowed to explain their votes on the inclusion of this item in the agenda, I shall grant them the floor. However, I venture to point out to them that their explanation can be deferred until tomorrow and will receive the same or greater prominence in the records. I should therefore be grateful if they would allow me to conclude the question of how this item is to be dealt with, particularly as the General Committee has recommended that it should be examined in plenary. There appears to be no objection to this course.

126. I take it that my request is acceptable and that there is no objection to the item being examined by the Assembly in plenary, which of course does not mean that it will be dealt with immediately. The Assembly is master of its own procedure, and will decide by a proposal approved by the majority, when it will discuss the substance of the item. I take it then that the item will be examined by the Assembly in plenary session.

It was so agreed.

127. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I give the floor to the representative of the Soviet Union to exercise his right of reply.

128. Mr. KUZNETSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation considers it necessary briefly to reply to the statement made by the representative of the United States. We assumed, I must confess, that the discussion in the General Committee had concluded and that our exchange of views on this question had taken place in that Committee. It appears, however, that the representative of the United States feels it necessary

to revert to the Question of Tibet as a means of inflaming the atmosphere here in the General Assembly.

129. I should like to say first of all that the Tibetan question is undoubtedly one which was born in, and is being pushed by, the State Department. There are two documents I might mention at this point in proof of that fact. The first is a declaration issued by the State Department on 28 March 1959 in which, after repeating all kinds of improbable fabrications about the situation in Tibet it defends, not the Tibetan people, but that group which took up arms to preserve and support the feudal order. The second document is the statement of the United States Secretary of State here in the General Assembly. Dealing with the Tibetan question (I shall not give you the whole quotation), he said:

"This is a matter which is of deep concern to the United Nations. Certainly this Organization must speak out in clear terms in the face of such events."
[797th meeting, para. 43.]

You yourselves know what effect such an assertion by the United States Secretary of State is likely to have on the inclusion of such a question in the agenda.

130. I should now like to answer Mr. Lodge and say that the Soviet Union and the Soviet delegation believe in the development of co-operation with all States, including the United States. And the Soviet delegation not only fully endorses but carries out in practice the instructions given to it by the Soviet Government. But we ought not to take such a crude approach to specific issues. I have known Mr. Lodge for a number of years now; I have often exchanged views with him on international questions and on questions affecting the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. I must say, openly and frankly, that we are glad to see that recently, since his journey with the Chairman of our Council of Ministers, he has given us the impression in his speeches that he is beginning to believe in the sincerity of the Soviet Union's policy, which is aimed at the solution of all questions by means of negotiation.

131. We note this. We also note with great satisfaction that Mr. Lodge acknowledges the usefulness of the Chairman of our Council of Ministers' visit to the United States and of the forthcoming journey of Mr. Eisenhower. We agree with him on this.

132. But I should like to remind Mr. Lodge that in all the statements of Mr. Khrushchev—including even his last statements, made at press conferences and on his arrival in Moscow—he said that a change of policy was indeed coming about in the United States, that there was a process under way, you might say, of the reappraisal of values; that the idea was gaining ground in the United States that, at long last, some solution should be sought to controversial issues and some means found of enabling the two States to come together and to discuss international problems in a businesslike way, and that that would be of tremendous significance.

133. In this matter the visit by the Chairman of our Council of Ministers has undoubtedly played an extremely important part, and he himself has remarked in his speeches that he considered his visit to have been of great value.

134. But at the same time another circumstance should not be forgotten, which is that in the United

States the trends and groups in favour of continuing the cold war policy, of hampering the present turn of events, or preventing the approach of spring, so to speak, are still strong. Just as an occasional period of frost occurs in spring, so these people are trying artificially to delay progress towards an improvement in the international situation.

135. What I wish to stress is that the introduction of this Tibetan question in the General Assembly and all this commotion behind the scenes and elsewhere are evidence—and very clear evidence—that there are still tendencies towards the continuation of the cold war policy.

136. I would tell Mr. Lodge, therefore, that it is necessary to avoid generalizations. We can distinguish where there is a desire for co-operation;

we shall use every means to support it and shall endeavour to find a solution acceptable to all delegations on items on our agenda. But where there is a question of the cold war, where you are trying to inveigle us into supporting this cold war, your efforts will come to nought. We shall speak about this absolutely frankly, for we believe that the General Assembly should not follow such a course.

137. The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I am happy to inform the General Assembly that during the plenary meeting on Wednesday, 14 October 1959, at 10.30 a.m. sharp, we shall have the honour and pleasure of listening to His Excellency Mr. Adolfo López Mateos, President of the Republic of Mexico.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.