

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**1807th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 11 November 1969,  
at 11.45 a.m.

**NEW YORK**

**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 101: Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations ( <i>continued</i> ) . . . . .	1

*President:* Miss Angie E. BROOKS (Liberia).

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Jackman (Barbados),  
Vice-President, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEM 101**

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

1. The PRESIDENT: Yesterday afternoon [1806th meeting] the Assembly heard the last speaker in the debate on agenda item 101. I shall now give the floor to representatives who wish to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

2. Mr. YAZID (Algeria) (*translated from French*): We are now approaching the end of the general debate on the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. The sponsors of draft resolution A/L.569 have very carefully considered all the statements made in this forum. They felt it necessary to reply to some of those statements, and I intend to devote my reply—on behalf of the sponsors—to an argument which was constantly repeated in the statements made by the delegation which opposed our draft resolution. I might describe that argument as the one which brandishes Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Charter. I shall begin by quoting that paragraph:

"Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations."

3. It is fortunate that the determination of a State's peace-loving nature is left to the members of the United Nations. A certain picture was painted for us of the People's Republic of China. We are told, for example, that the People's Republic of China did not respect the principles of the United Nations and that it was not a peace-loving State, and it was urged to forego its policy of exploiting and supporting armed revolution and fomenting trouble abroad. In order to prove this, we heard arguments based upon quotations from Chinese leaders and the Chinese press. We intend to reply to those arguments by referring, in so far as possible, to unabridged and correctly interpreted texts of statements made by Chinese leaders.

4. Before doing so, I should like to recall that mankind has known many messages of a universal nature which, when they were given, were considered subversive or aggressive. A few hours ago, we had occasion to re-read the text of the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America. Never before have we read a text which refers so often as that Declaration does to the right of peoples to destroy, to break and to eliminate régimes based on tyranny, oppression and contempt for human rights.

5. From a historical standpoint, therefore, it is useless to try to pass final judgements on messages from one part of humanity to the rest of the world. Before judging, it is necessary to try to understand such universal statements, texts and messages, to place them in their proper context, and to see what feelings and motivations gave rise to them. During the discussion, a truly interesting fact emerged, namely, that although the People's Republic of China has not yet had its lawful rights restored to it, the little red book is, nevertheless, still widely read by the United Nations delegations. The problem is that the little red book is badly read and that attempts are purposely made to have Chairman Mao Tse-tung—who was quoted during the discussion—say things that are the contrary of what he actually stated. We have here a certain number of quotations. In the first, which is taken from the opening address at the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China on 15 September 1956, Chairman Mao Tse-tung states:

"Our country and all the other socialist countries want peace; so do the peoples of all the countries of the world. The only ones who crave war and do not want peace are certain monopoly capitalist groups in a handful of imperialist countries which depend on aggression for their profits."<sup>1</sup>

6. If we examine the present international situation we find that this is indeed the truth: we can see that the aggressor is not the People's Republic of China, but that the aggression in Viet-Nam, the aggression in Palestine, and the different forms of aggression in Africa and Latin America are the work of certain imperialist Powers, and not the work of the People's Republic of China.

7. I should now like to turn to a statement made on 18 November 1957 at the Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, and I quote:

"We desire peace. However, if imperialism insists on fighting a war, we will have no alternative but to take the

<sup>1</sup> Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung, Peking, Foreign Languages Press, 1966, p. 65.

firm resolution to fight to the finish before going ahead with our construction.”<sup>2</sup>

8. That is what the Viet-Nameese people are doing now, what the Palestinian people are doing now, what is being done by liberation movements in Africa, and what Algeria has been doing for more than seven years. Many delegations in this forum desire peace, but, when one desires peace, one must not forget that there are forces which can survive only through war. Therefore, if those forces commit acts of aggression against peace-loving peoples, the latter have the right and the duty to fight because, although in fighting they run the risk of destruction and the loss of human lives, they nevertheless preserve their chances of a future, their independence and their right to economic development and social progress.

9. On 6 November 1938, a work by Chairman Mao Tse-tung on the problems of war and strategy was published, from which I quote:

“We are advocates of the abolition of war, we do not want war; but war can only be abolished through war, and in order to get rid of the gun it is necessary to take up the gun.”<sup>3</sup>

10. Those are the words of a peace-loving leader at the head of a peace-loving State. We do not want war. That is the opinion of the majority of the Members of this Organization. The People's Republic of China does not want war, but if we desire peace, we must preserve it and we must be ready to fight for it. I believe that, in the First Committee and here in the plenary, many States which have the characteristics described in Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Charter have raised the problem of peace and security in justice. Like many peoples of the third world, the Chinese people favours peace and security in justice. To say that we are prepared to take up arms to defend our country against aggression and to defend its right to independence, economic development and social progress does not mean that we no longer meet the requirements laid down in Article 4 of the Charter, which has so often been invoked during the discussion.

11. In the Opening Address at the Eighth National Congress of the Communist Party of China on 15 September 1956, Chairman Mao Tse-tung stated:

“To achieve a lasting world peace, we must further develop our friendship and co-operation with the fraternal countries in the socialist camp and strengthen our solidarity with all peace-loving countries. We must endeavour to establish normal diplomatic relations, on the basis of mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty and of equality and mutual benefit, with all countries willing to live together with us in peace. We must give active support to the national independence and liberation movements in countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, as well as to the peace movement and to just struggles in all the countries of the world.”<sup>4</sup>

12. These same principles were expressed in the statements made by most of the Members of the Organization during the general debate, as well as in discussions in the Committees. They are proof of a peace-loving attitude. We are in favour of lasting peace, friendly co-operation and solidarity with peace-loving countries. We want normal diplomatic relations with other States, regardless of their internal systems, provided that these relations are based on mutual respect for territorial integrity, sovereignty and mutual advantage.

13. Naturally, there are many Member States which do not agree with the principle of active support for the independence and national liberation movements in countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, or for the peace movements and just struggles in all the countries of the world. My delegation is a member of the Organization of African Unity, and I could quote many OAU texts which reflect those principles. I could even quote texts which were adopted during this very session. I will quote paragraph 1 of resolution 2498 (XXIV), adopted by the General Assembly on 31 October 1969, on the question of Namibia:

*[The General Assembly]*

“Reaffirms the inalienable right of the people of Namibia to self-determination and independence, in conformity with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), and the legitimacy of their struggle against the foreign occupation of their country.”

14. That is a position of support for the struggle of the people of Namibia, and everyone knows full well that during wars of national independence and revolutionary war, many countries provide material, moral, diplomatic and political support for such movements. They do so, they make it known and they express it in their opinions. All Africa supports national liberation movements. All Africa supports movements which aim to eliminate imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism in Africa. We also stand by those who are fighting for justice, which is the only way to establish peace.

15. Many countries Members of our Organization share the same principles as the People's Republic of China in connexion with support for the people of Viet-Nam and the people of Palestine. If we wish to know who stands for peace, it is sufficient to ask the following question: who suffers most as a result of war? The Viet-Nameese people are for peace because they know what war is and have known it for 25 years. The Chinese people are for peace because they know what war is. It is always the victims of aggression who are willing to fight for their survival and who are most attached to peace, because they know the cost of war.

16. I should now like to quote something that is of some importance and concerns China's relations with the imperialist countries. I quote from a text published on 27 February 1957, entitled “On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People”:

“As for the imperialist countries, we should unite with their peoples and strive to co-exist peacefully with those

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 66.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 63.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 65.

countries, do business with them and prevent any possible war, but under no circumstances should we harbour any unrealistic notions about them.”<sup>5</sup>

17. Peaceful coexistence was referred to recently by the Chinese leaders in connexion with the anniversary of the assumption of power by the Chinese revolution. As the passage which I quoted indicates, China favours peaceful coexistence with those countries it knows to be imperialistic. It is ready to trade with them and prepared to prevent the possibility of war with them, but it does not wish to harbour any unrealistic notions about them. We have no illusions. We know that there are countries whose policy is to strengthen their power and their economy by limiting as far as possible the independence of other countries, by making the economy of those countries dependent on foreign economies and by blocking the emergence, development and organization of progressive ideas.

18. We know which those countries are. We, who have had experience of co-operation with the People's Republic of China, know that the Chinese concept of economic co-operation is the one which best reflects the concepts which we are upholding here and which we defended at New Delhi, although without making much progress. At a time when we are witnessing a coalition of certain great Powers for the improvement of terms of trade to the benefit of the highly industrialized countries, we see, on the other hand, that great country socialist China developing its economy and placing it at the service of sincere and equal co-operation with the countries of the third world.

19. When one has no illusions about imperialism, different methods of struggle are possible. These methods sometimes do not exclude peaceful coexistence, co-operation and trade, but there must be some slight desire on the part of the imperialist countries to understand what the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America want, namely, to receive a share of the technology, the material resources and the investments of the developed countries, but within the framework of a policy which respects their economic independence and enables them to emerge from their under-developed state and to establish themselves, not in economic dependence or neo-colonialism, but in national economic independence.

20. Yesterday we heard statements made by responsible United States officials on the subject of Latin America. For a few minutes Governor Nelson Rockefeller appeared on the television screen and we heard a message of intervention in domestic affairs and reference to the United States policy of using force of arms against progressive movements in Latin America, as is being done elsewhere.

21. In his address to the Preparatory Committee of the New Political Consultative Conference on 15 June 1949, Chairman Mao Tse-tung stated:

“The imperialists and their running dogs, the Chinese reactionaries, will not resign themselves to defeat in this land of China. They will continue to gang up against the Chinese people in every possible way. For example, they will smuggle their agents into China to sow dissension and

make trouble. That is certain; they will never neglect these activities. To take another example, the imperialists will incite the Chinese reactionaries, and even throw in their own forces, to blockade China's ports. They will do this as long as it is possible. Furthermore, if they still hanker after adventures, they will send some of their troops to invade and harass China's frontiers; this, too, is not impossible. All this we must take fully into account.”<sup>6</sup>

22. This last quotation is a most important one. It is the expression of a peaceful policy which does not ignore the realities of the international situation, namely, that there are forces whose primary objective is to stifle revolutions and try to eliminate them. We must recognize that, of all countries, China is the one most subject to pressure, provocation and attempts at aggression, and we must take note of the fact that it is only due to the peaceful nature of the policies of the People's Republic of China that it was possible to avoid events which would have been extremely serious for the future of peace and security in justice, events which would have served the objectives of the imperialist *provocateurs*.

23. Finally, while we are referring to Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Charter, we should ask ourselves who the aggressor is. The situations in Viet-Nam, Palestine, Africa and Latin America point to the aggressor. The aggressor is among us and is brandishing paragraph 1 of Article 4.

24. We must ask ourselves who it is that is interfering in internal affairs. For an answer to this question, it is sufficient to refer to reports in the United States press to see who is interfering in the internal affairs of other countries, and who has a system specially designed for that purpose. Who orders studies such as these? I am quoting excerpts from the United States Congressional Record of 25 September 1969:

“Secret Studies Ordered on Startling Questions.

“Washington. Henry Kissinger, White House national security advisor, has ordered some secret studies from the Rand Corporation on some startling questions . . .

“1. Circumstances in which American nuclear arms might be used in the Middle East.

“2. Circumstances in which the government of Brazil might be overthrown if it decides to expropriate American assets.

“ . . .

“4. Prospects for nuclear proliferation around the world in addition to the five existing nuclear powers.”<sup>7</sup>

Further on it is stated that when the United States Government asks for such studies, it is certainly not without the idea of some day making use of them.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 69 and 70.

<sup>7</sup> See *Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the 91st Congress, First Session*, vol. 115, No. 155, p. E 7853.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 66.



25. In commenting on Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Charter, to which many delegations have referred, and in furnishing some quotations—which we have done because we have heard many abridged and distorted quotations—we wish to explain that if we stand for peace and security in justice, we must restore to the People's Republic of China its lawful rights in the United Nations.

26. If there is perhaps an issue dividing us from the countries which are opposed to our draft resolution—although not all of them, because there are among them many States which we respect, whose motivations we do not wish to discuss and with which we maintain excellent relations that we would like to continue and develop—I would say that that issue is very clear. It concerns support for national liberation movements and revolutionary struggles. That is the basis of our divergent views in this debate.

27. The people of Algeria are peace-loving, and are headed by a Government which is also peace-loving. However, when we say that we are peace-loving, we take into consideration at the same time our duty to support Africans who are fighting for their independence and their right to economic development and social progress. We support them, and we are a peace-loving people and a peace-loving Government. We support them with all the means at our disposal, without any ulterior motive. We support the people of Palestine who are fighting against Israeli-Western colonialism. We do so without ulterior motive, because they are a people and a nation, and not because they are Arabs. We support them because they are being subjected to domination and occupation. This is a matter of principle.

28. In supporting the Viet-Nameese people, we are supporting a liberation movement which is fighting for its independence and for the unification of Viet-Nam. These are principles which are also expressed in the policies of the People's Republic of China.

29. Our policy is known, and it is the policy of many members of this Assembly. We have never been told that our behaviour is inconsistent with Article 4, paragraph 1, of the Charter.

30. The restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is an act of historical significance. We have many philosophical differences with our Chinese brothers, but, despite those differences, we agree on such questions as the concept of peace, support for national liberation movements and revolutionary struggles.

31. There are here among us countries which are interfering in the internal affairs of other countries. They are doing so in order to perpetuate colonization and economic exploitation. It is they that are the aggressors.

32. In conclusion, I should like to say that, in analysing texts, the most important point to consider is what they contribute to world development. They refer to the future, the future which is being shaped throughout the world, in the United States among its youth, as well as in other countries. It is the peoples of the world that make history, and the peoples are following this evolution. Governments should draw some lessons from this.

33. My delegation is not afraid of Chinese revolutionary thought. We have our own thought, and we are willing to have it compared with others. If anyone believes that our thought is dangerous to peace and security in justice, I would say to them that they are mistaken, and I know that many of us who do not agree with the draft resolution which we have submitted have given their views in all sincerity. We do not agree with them, and that is why we believe that, contrary to what has been said, this debate has been neither superfluous nor unnecessary.

34. The People's Republic of China will again occupy its seat. One day it will be here among us. It will come to strengthen the ranks of those who truly and sincerely wish to maintain peace and establish conditions of international security in justice. It stands with those who wish to make the Organization a great family of nations, and not a club for a few Powers.

35. Mr. LIU (China): The position of my delegation on the question before the Assembly has already been made clear in our Foreign Minister's statement of 3 November 1969 [1798th meeting]. I have asked for the floor merely to make a few remarks on some of the statements made in the course of the present debate.

36. I should like, first of all, to thank those fellow delegates who, with lucidity and eloquence, have exposed the true nature of Chinese communism. Basing themselves on the principles of the Charter, they have set forth the reasons why the Chinese communists should be barred from the United Nations.

37. As in years past, the representatives of Cambodia, Albania and certain other countries have taken upon themselves the task of championing the Chinese communist cause; and, as in years past, their statements are notable chiefly for their verbosity, half-truths and even wilful distortions.

38. The representative of Cambodia has this year outdone himself in taking liberties with the history of modern China. He has seen fit to besmirch my Government with unfounded accusations and vilifications. In so doing, he has quoted profusely from sources of doubtful objectivity.

39. It is not my intention here to enter into an examination of his distorted version of Chinese history. Suffice it to say that the nature of Chinese communism has not always been properly understood. During the war years, Mao Tse-tung and his followers would have the world believe that they were not communists at all, but were "mere agrarian reformers" determined to bring democracy and social justice to the masses of the people. And the world was gullible enough to be taken in by this kind of propaganda. The "agrarian reform" theory did much to distort the thinking of the "China experts", and to influence the course of events in China in the years that immediately followed World War II.

40. Just as communist propaganda formerly popularized the "agrarian reform" theory, so today the representatives of Cambodia and Albania are trying to convince us that Mao Tse-tung and his followers are not really expansionist and aggressive but are, on the contrary, firm believers in peaceful coexistence and international co-operation.

41. The representative of Cambodia said in his statement that

“the principles of peaceful coexistence adopted by the People’s Republic of China in its international relations are the very principles proclaimed and recognized in the Charter of the United Nations” [1798th meeting, para. 89].

42. The representative of Albania has gone one better than the representative of Cambodia. According to him, Peiping

“has followed . . . a policy of peace and friendship among peoples, of good neighbourliness and international co-operation on the basis of the principles of the sovereign equality of States, large and small; mutual interest; non-interpretation and mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty” [1800th meeting, para. 48].

43. It seems to me that those assertions are so palpably untrue that the Chinese communists themselves would have repudiated them with utter contempt. Mao Tse-tung has never concealed his firm commitment to force and violence. He has not hesitated to practise what he preaches. His heir designate, Lin Piao, regards war as “a great school” to “temper the people and push history forward” In his view, the sacrifice of human lives is nothing when the objective is to transform the world according to the Chinese communist blueprint. That is a far cry from the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

44. The Chinese communists, it is true, pay lip service to “peaceful coexistence”. But do they really believe in it? Peaceful coexistence means the repudiation of violence and war as a means of settling international disagreements and issues, the renunciation of interference in the internal affairs of other countries, and the peaceful competition of rival social and economic systems. But the basic tenet of the Maoist creed regards “the settlement of issues by war” as the “central and highest form of revolution”. The signing of the Pancha Shila or so-called “five principles of coexistence” did not deter Peiping from launching an armed attack on India. The fact is that the Chinese communists are past masters in the art of double-talk. In his book, *Red China: An Asian View*,<sup>8</sup> a well-known Indian authority on demography, Mr. Chandra-sekhar, after reviewing Peiping’s record in its relations with Asian countries, had this to say:

“This record deserves only one verdict: communist China is untrustworthy. Like a two-faced Janus, she talks of peace while she stabs her neighbour in the back.”

45. Thus, what the representatives of Cambodia and Albania have told us about Peiping’s commitment to peaceful coexistence is no more than the kind of upside-down language to which they are addicted.

46. Cambodia, as all the world knows, has gone to great lengths to cultivate the friendship of Peiping. Its territory, as the world also well knows, has served as a sanctuary for the communist forces in the Viet-Nam war. Yet, Cambodia has not been exempt from communist subversion and

infiltration. The Cambodian Chief of State, Prince Sihanouk, has made this clear on more than one occasion.

47. Last Friday, the representative of Pakistan had much to say about the alleged peaceful nature of the Chinese communists. According to him, the Chinese communists want peace in Asia and in the whole world. He cited the Bandung Conference of 1955<sup>9</sup> as evidence of this. The principles of Bandung, he said, were based on the United Nations Charter, and Chou En-lai expressed his full support of them. Therefore, he asserted, the Chinese communists had demonstrated their willingness to fulfil the obligations of the United Nations Charter as far back as 14 years ago.

48. I wonder if the representative of Pakistan was really serious about what he said. I should like to put to him a simple question: has Peiping ever carried out the much-publicized and much-vaunted principles laid down at Bandung? Was the abortive *putsch* engineered by the Chinese communists against Indonesia an expression of the “Bandung spirit”?

49. Only a few days ago a United Press dispatch from Rangoon, published in *The New York Times* of 8 November 1969, carried this report:

“The Burmese Government has reported that fighting on the border with communist China this year has left 133 Burmese soldiers dead, 250 wounded and 42 missing.

“The Chief of State, General Ne Win, told the Socialist Party yesterday that the fighting was with what he termed communist forces. Although he did not identify them as Chinese, it was clear that he meant Chinese communist troops as well as Burmese guerrillas trained and armed by the Chinese.

“Border skirmishes between Chinese and Burmese forces, which have been going on in northern Burma since mid-1967, have become particularly intense since January. General Ne Win made it clear that at least eight of these clashes involved heavy fighting.”

Is this, I ask, another illustration of Peiping’s peaceful coexistence?

50. Indeed, the threat posed by Peiping need not be one of military invasion, though such danger cannot be ruled out. More often than not, it takes the more subtle form of incitement to subversion and support to insurgency. As we know, Peiping’s propaganda machine has from time to time blared out “victories” scored by the communists in Burma, India, Laos, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines and even Japan.

51. I would invite the representative of Algeria, who has just left this rostrum, to ponder over those facts. Recent history is replete with instances of States which sought the friendship of Peiping and came to be easy targets of infiltration and subversion. He may well remember how the agents of Mao Tse-tung wrecked the so-called “Third Bandung Conference” which was scheduled to take place in Algeria in 1965, and how Algeria itself was subjected to insults and abuses at the hands of those same agents.

<sup>8</sup> S. Chandra-sekhar, *Red China: An Asian View* (New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1961), p. 227.

<sup>9</sup> Asian-African Conference, held at Bandung from 18 to 24 April 1955.

52. Asian countries located on the periphery of the Chinese mainland, as the representative of Thailand so eloquently put it, should be more than aware of Peiping's aggressive proclivities and expansionist tendencies. If I may, for the sake of emphasis, quote from his speech yesterday:

"A guerrilla war was declared against Thailand almost five years ago, and it was not a mere threat. Since the Ninth Congress of the Communist Party convened at Peking in 1969, the policy of carrying on 'wars of national liberation' against the neighbouring countries has been reaffirmed, to judge from the bellicose pronouncements of the leaders in Peking" [1806th meeting, para. 44].

53. I may perhaps also recall the speech of the representative of the Philippines last week, in which he made it clear that, in the face of the threat posed by Peiping, his country is frankly concerned with its national security, its survival and the maintenance of its democratic institutions. He went on to say:

"We have to contend with the reality of events that happened not long ago and the reality of continuing and current developments. We recall the subjugation of Tibet and the oppression of its gallant people, the military adventure on the borders with India, armed intervention in Korea, and subversion in South-East Asia, including my own country, the Philippines" [1800th meeting, para. 10].

54. Yet, there are still those who seem to have a romantic faith in Peiping's professions and promises. Notwithstanding all evidence to the contrary, they persist in believing that the Chinese communists can somehow be induced to follow a policy of peaceful coexistence if the world should stop ostracizing them. That, I am afraid, is an illusion. But illusions die hard. Even some supposedly hard-headed diplomats continue to believe the best of the Chinese communists. I can only say that they lack a basic appreciation of the nature of Chinese communism. Or, for that matter, do they really have any understanding of the hopes and aspirations of the enslaved millions on the mainland of China? Or have they paid any heed to the expressed wishes of the 17 million overseas Chinese in various parts of the world, who are still free to voice their concern for the fate of their motherland?

55. Over the years, my delegation has more than once told this Assembly that the Chinese communist régime does not have the moral consent of the Chinese people. Lest there be any doubt on that score, let us remember that the Peiping régime has been sustained not by popular support but by mass trials, mass purges and mass liquidation of opposition. During the first decade of its existence alone, the régime exterminated, according to its own published figures, some 20 million innocent people in the name of suppressing counter-revolutionaries, landlords and other elements of society suspected of ideological opposition. Today, the trials, the purges and the liquidations go on unabated, though the régime no longer publishes statistics on such matters. But the world cannot be unaware of the fact that anti-Mao and anti-communist movements have been gathering strength and momentum since the so-called "great proletarian cultural revolution".

56. Moreover, tens of thousands of people flee the mainland every year to escape the oppressive communist rule. So desperate are they to seek freedom wherever they can that they have been willing to run the risk of crossing barbed wire, stepping on minefields, being hounded by police dogs or fired upon by machine-guns, and drowning in the waters near Hong Kong and Macao. Is this not proof enough that the communist régime does not have the moral consent of the Chinese people?

57. Those who advocate the seating of Peiping are forever telling us that the United Nations needs the Chinese communists more than they need the United Nations. The principle of universality has become more of a slogan than an argument. It seems to be the fashion even for well-intentioned people to invoke it. To them, universality is an end in itself. They are in favour of admitting Peiping simply because they consider that would be consistent with the idea of universality. Some go a step further and argue that universality will strengthen the United Nations and enable it to resolve a number of intractable problems.

58. My delegation cannot accept that argument as valid. We are convinced that, far from strengthening the United Nations, Peiping's admission would give that régime the long awaited opportunity to destroy it. At any rate, the concept of universality, appealing as it is in theory, is not an integral part of the Charter. It was suggested by some participants in the San Francisco Conference, but was rejected by the majority, who favoured the provisions of Article 4 of the present Charter.

59. The idea of universality is, of course, not new. It was mooted almost a half-century ago in the League of Nations. Last year [1722nd meeting], I had the occasion to quote what Litvinov, the then chief delegate of the Soviet Union, said about universality at the time of the rape of Ethiopia by Mussolini. I may be permitted now to read just one more extract from Litvinov's forceful pronouncement:

"I say that we don't need a League which, with all its universality, is safe for aggressors, since such a League, from an instrument of peace, will turn into its very opposite."<sup>10</sup>

Are we, then, in the name of universality, prepared today to make the United Nations safe for aggressors by admitting a régime that has made war, overt or disguised, an instrument of its global policy?

60. No item on the agenda of the Assembly is so fraught with fateful consequences for all mankind as this so-called question of Chinese representation. The representative of Japan has rightly stressed the crucial importance of this problem, in which his country is vitally interested. Indeed, all of us have a vital interest in it. My delegation would, therefore, urge all members of this Assembly to vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.567 and Add.1-5, submitted by Australia and 17 other countries. It is a reaffirmation of General Assembly resolution 1668 (XVI), adopted at its sixteenth session and reaffirmed at successive sessions, declaring that any proposal to change the representation of

<sup>10</sup> *League of Nations, Official Journal, Special Supplement No. 151 (1936)*, 20th plenary meeting, p. 35.



China is an important question within the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter.

61. At the same time, we urge that draft resolution A/L.569, submitted by Albania and other countries, be decisively rejected, as at previous sessions of the General Assembly. Upon the Assembly's decision depends the fate of the Chinese people, the maintenance of international peace and security, and the future of the United Nations itself.

62. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia) (*translated from French*): Certain delegations, including the delegation of the United States, have alleged that the purpose of draft resolution A/L.569, which I had the honour to introduce on behalf of the sponsors on 3 November [1798th meeting], is, in the words of the spokesman of the United States delegation, "...to expel a Member of the United Nations ...", and that this "...would set a most dangerous precedent" [1800th meeting, para. 77].

63. However, the facts are quite different. Draft resolution A/L.569, which is now before the General Assembly, does not call for the expulsion of a State Member of the United Nations; it calls for the expulsion of the representative of Chiang Kai-shek from the place which they unlawfully occupy in this international Organization and in all the organizations related to it.

64. It is possible that the Government of Chiang Kai-shek may once have been the Government of China. However, since 1949, that is to say since the victory of the Chinese people's revolution and the rejection by the Chinese people of the corrupt and reactionary Chiang Kai-shek Government, the latter has sought refuge on the island of Taiwan and has lost all right to represent China and the Chinese people, much less to speak on their behalf and any authority to do so. In this connexion, it should be noted that, on 18 November 1949, immediately after the victory of the Chinese people, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China sent a note to the President of the General Assembly informing him that the delegation headed by Mr. Tsiang no longer had any authority to speak on behalf of the Chinese people in the United Nations.

65. The island of Taiwan is one of the Chinese provinces and comes under the sovereignty of the Government of the People's Republic of China. The fact that this Chinese island is administered by a so-called nationalist Government, thanks to the military protection of a great foreign Power, obviously does not confer upon it the status of an independent and sovereign State. The problem of the Chinese province of Taiwan is a purely domestic Chinese matter and it would have been solved long ago had it not been for the illegal military intervention of the United States.

66. Even one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.567 and Add.1-5, which aims to delay China's return to the United Nations for one more year, Mr. Scott, the Ambassador of New Zealand, has recognized the fact that China, a founding Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, is absent, when, from this very rostrum, on 3 November, he said:

"China's absence intensifies the already grave difficulties of securing the ultimate goal of general and complete

disarmament ... the effects of isolation on China are severe ...

"We dare to hope that the leaders of communist China, having subscribed to the principles of the Charter, might come to realize that the interests of China, as well as those of its neighbours, would be better served ..."  
[1799th meeting, paras. 27 and 28.]

67. For his part, Lord Caradon, whose country is one of the founding Members of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, declared in his brilliant statement on 5 November 1969, that:

"To perpetuate the exclusion of the representatives of the immense country of China from this international association can benefit no one; it may do great harm. It should be ended. It is time that the People's Republic of China should be brought into the international community." [1801st meeting, para. 62.]

68. Thus, as Lord Caradon and Mr. Scott, the Ambassador of New Zealand, have noted, China has not been represented in the United Nations for 20 years, although it is a founding Member of this world Organization and a permanent member of the Security Council. Those who claim to be the representatives of China, and who have been among us for 20 years, are, therefore, purely and simply impostors.

69. That is why the 17 Member States, including Cambodia, which sponsored draft resolution A/L.569, have called for the expulsion of these impostors who are unlawfully occupying China's seat at the United Nations and in all the organizations related to it, and have urged their replacement by the true representatives of China and of the Chinese people, namely, the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

70. The issues of the expulsion of the impostors who represent Chiang Kai-shek and the restoration of the lawful rights of the representatives of the People's Republic of China, who are the legitimate representatives of the Chinese people and of China in the United Nations, cannot be separated because there can be only one China.

71. The question before the General Assembly is therefore merely a question of procedure, and, as laid down in Article 18 of the Charter, does not require a two-thirds majority.

72. To accept the theory that these impostors, the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek, who cling to the Chinese province of Taiwan, represent China in the United Nations would mean agreeing to legalize the military intervention of the United States in Chinese internal affairs. It would also mean approving a violation of the principles of the Charter of this Organization, something which no peace-loving and justice-loving Member State which truly respects these principles could possibly tolerate.

73. The Charter of the United Nations confers upon the Security Council and, in particular, upon its permanent members, certain responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security. In this connexion, may I be allowed to quote some excerpts from the statement made at the meeting of the First Committee on 22 October

1969 by the representative of Mexico, who had the privilege of participating in the drafting of the Charter:

"But I nevertheless do think it desirable to explain why we are convinced that the responsibility of the great Powers should be described as 'primary responsibility'.

"The reason is first that since their resources, both economic and military, are infinitely superior to those of most Members, so likewise is their capacity to act to maintain and consolidate international peace and security. As was explained on the eve of the San Francisco Conference by one of the draftsmen of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals that were to serve as a basis for the wording of the Charter, the system that was to be embodied in the Charter places the direct responsibility for international security on the shoulders of the nations most capable of bearing it.

"That obviously is the only justification that can be adduced to support the privileged situation that the Charter has granted to the permanent members of the Security Council.<sup>11</sup>

74. The explanations given by the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Mexico are plain and clear, just as it is equally plain and clear that the Chiang Kai-shek Government no longer represents anything but itself and for the past 20 years has not been in a position to assume the responsibility which the Charter gives to a permanent member of the Security Council, because that responsibility is given not to a Government, but to a State, China. And that China is the China which is represented by the Government of the People's Republic of China, which controls a vast continent of 10 million square kilometres with a population of 800 million inhabitants, and which is now one of the five nuclear Powers.

75. In their statements, certain delegations which are opposed to the return of China to the United Nations have continued to claim that China is a warmonger. Yet the truth is that China has no military bases and not a single soldier outside its own territory, whereas certain so-called peace-loving Powers, Members of the United Nations, have military bases in different parts of the world and have sent and still send their troops, to use the words of the representative of Venezuela in the First Committee:

"...on the pretext of protecting the lives and property of the nationals of the intervening State; on allegedly humanitarian grounds; or in order to maintain, impose or replace régimes or systems of government on the argument that the régimes or Governments in question reflect or do not reflect the wishes and the interests of the people of the State encroached upon."<sup>12</sup>

76. The representative of Brazil, for his part, declared bitterly in the First Committee on 13 October 1969:

"It is almost unbelievable, but nevertheless a fact, that on requesting all other nations to forgo for ever the manufacture of nuclear weapons, the nuclear Powers

adamantly refused to insert into the non-proliferation Treaty a simple clause whereby they would commit themselves not to use nuclear weapons against the non-nuclear nations. Such a non-aggression pledge is the very minimum one would reasonably expect on being requested to disarm."<sup>13</sup>

77. China, which is the only nuclear Power within the Afro-Asian family, has always declared—solemnly and repeatedly—that never at any time or in any circumstances would it be the first to resort to nuclear weapons, and that, as in the past, the people and the Government of China, together with all the revolutionary peoples of the world and with all countries which are defending their independence and are peace-loving, will pursue their efforts and persist in the struggle to attain that noble objective, the complete prohibition and the total destruction of nuclear weapons. This declaration—or, more correctly, this solemn commitment—was reiterated by the Chinese Government after the success of its first underground nuclear test on 23 December 1969 and after the success of its explosion of a new hydrogen bomb on 29 September 1969.

78. The representative of Haiti, whose country is some 10,000 miles from South-East Asia, made the following allegation in his statement on 6 November 1969:

"Thus, in our time Peking is one of the main forces of evil. That régime has contributed more than its share to the sufferings of the world. As long as it continues to exist, there can be no peace in the world nor true security for the peoples of South-East Asia" [1802nd meeting, para. 60].

This statement is rather simplistic and does not correspond to the truth. It is even a call for murder made by a State Member of the United Nations.

79. The General Assembly recently heard testimony by the representatives of Nepal [1803rd meeting] and Pakistan [1804th meeting], which are close neighbours of China. They both confirmed that in their bilateral relations China had shown respect for the principles of peaceful co-existence with regard to their respective countries.

80. I, too, am a representative of a South-East Asian country, and I should like to quote some excerpts from the message which Samdech Norodon Sihanouk, the Head of State of Cambodia, addressed to Prime Minister Chou En-lai on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China, and which give a clear and true picture of the relations between the Kingdom of Cambodia and the People's Republic of China:

"I wish to reaffirm the brotherly friendship between Cambodia and China and our unfailing solidarity with the People's Republic of China, to which we owe deep gratitude for its firm support for our struggle to safeguard the national independence and the territorial integrity of our country. We shall never forget that this support has enabled the Khmer nation victoriously to resist aggression, threats and oppression by the imperialists and their Asian lackeys."

<sup>11</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, First Committee*, 1661st meeting, paras. 113, 114 and 115.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 1666th meeting, para. 59.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 1653rd meeting, para. 14.



81. The white paper recently issued by the Royal Government of Cambodia revealed that, between 1962 and May 1969, Cambodia suffered 1,864 land violations, 165 sea violations and 5,149 air violations committed by United States and South Viet-Nameese forces. These acts of aggression caused 293 deaths and 690 wounded in the Cambodian national defence forces and the Cambodian civilian population, in addition to considerable material damage and the destruction of plantations and wealth, as well as losses of livestock.

82. China is spreading its revolutionary ideology, but no foreign country is compelled by force to accept it. Like Cambodia, any country may refuse it without being subjected to any military or other pressure. In this connexion, Han Suyin, a journalist who is the daughter of a Chinese father and a Belgian mother, properly interpreted the article entitled "Long Live the Victorious War of the People" written by the Chinese Minister for Defence, Lin Piao, and dated 3 September 1965, when she wrote in her book, *China in the Year 2001*:<sup>14</sup>

"However, 'revolution is neither an export item nor an import item'. Every nation and every country follows its own path and fights for its own liberation by relying on its own population. Peking has often emphasized this point and has stressed that China will never send soldiers 'to carry out another country's revolution'."

83. Han Suyin's interpretation coincides, incidentally, with the conclusions of a study made on the same subject by experts of the Rand Corporation of Santa Monica, California—an organization which works for the United States Air Force. I will place this study by the Rand Corporation—which was at one time considered confidential—at the disposal of anyone who truly and seriously wishes to study the Chinese problem.

84. During the meeting of the First Committee on 17 October 1969 the representative of Chile explained the causes of the wave of violence which is spreading throughout the world today:

"... gap between the rich and the poor nations instead of closing is widening daily. The worst aspect of this is that the contrast between the hard and at times brutal facts and the fine words and sacred principles is often directly or indirectly the work of those who in this forum utter those words and proclaim those principles.

"Nothing can be more demoralizing or destructive than this paradox. When people realize that the facts do not tally with the words, they become discouraged despairing; and this leads to violence. When man loses faith in the way of reason to obtain justice, he tries to take justice into his own hands. When man loses faith in spiritual values, he becomes brutish."<sup>15</sup>

85. Instead of seeking, as was recommended by the representative of Chile, "the explanation for the wave of

violence that today sweeps over this world of ours",<sup>16</sup> some representatives, who are opposed to the return of China to the United Nations, find that it would be simpler to blame everything on China and to hold it responsible for all the difficulties encountered by their Governments.

86. And yet, the historical document known as the Consensus of Viña del Mar,<sup>17</sup> which was mentioned on 30 September 1969 by the Chilean Minister for Foreign Affairs when he spoke from this rostrum in the general debate [1771st meeting], provides a remarkable illustration of the reaction of the peoples and Governments of Latin America to the increasingly intolerable pressure and interference of a foreign Power in their internal affairs. And that foreign Power is certainly not China!

87. The representative of the United States went so far as to declare:

"It (Peking) has indicated clearly that it opposes the negotiation of a peaceful settlement in Viet-Nam" [1800th meeting, para. 89].

Everyone knows that China is not a participant in the war in Viet-Nam and that the only means for a peaceful solution in Viet-Nam lies in the total and unconditional withdrawal of United States and foreign troops from South Viet-Nam and in respect for the rights of the Viet-Nameese people to full independence.

88. The representative of the United States also stated: "President Nixon has called for an era of negotiation to replace confrontation; yet Peking has thus far spurned our efforts to negotiate." [Ibid., para. 90.] It is just and equitable to recognize that the Chinese people never, after its victory over the corrupt and reactionary Chiang Kai-shek régime, sought any confrontation with the United States. On the other hand, according to the testimony of United States leaders themselves and according to historical fact, it was the United States which, from the very first and even well before the founding of the People's Republic of China, was hostile to the new Chinese Government and the Chinese people.

89. As I stressed in my statement of 3 November 1969, Chairman Mao Tse-tung declared on 1 October 1949, the day of the founding of the People's Republic of China, that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China was ready to establish diplomatic relations with any foreign Government that was prepared to observe the principles of equality, mutual advantage and mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty.

90. I do not need to point out that these are principles which are also recognized and referred to in the Charter of the United Nations. They cannot be the subject of negotiation because an independent and sovereign State cannot agree to negotiations concerning either its territorial integrity or its sovereignty.

<sup>14</sup> *China in the Year 2001*, Han Suyin, New York, 1967, Basic Books Inc., Publishers.

<sup>15</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, First Committee*, 1657th meeting, paras. 39 and 40.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 41.

<sup>17</sup> Latin American Consensus of Viña del Mar, approved at Viña del Mar, Chile, by the Special Commission on Latin American Co-ordination, held from 15-17 May 1969.

91. In a letter of 24 August 1969 addressed to Samdech Norodon Sihanouk, the Head of State of Cambodia, Prime Minister Chou En-lai wrote:

As far as relations between China and the United States are concerned, as Samdech knows, the Nixon administration, as well as previous United States Governments, is pursuing a policy of aggression towards China by displaying hostility towards the Chinese people and by occupying by force the Province of Taiwan, which is Chinese territory. If Sino-American relations are what they are today, this is solely because of the action of the United States Government."

92. In his statement, the representative of the United States also said that the People's Republic of China had isolated itself. How can we speak of the isolation of China when it has diplomatic, economic and trade relations with almost all the countries of the world? Despite the embargo imposed on trade with China by the United States Government, China is still the best client of certain countries, which are, moreover, the most faithful allies of the United States.

93. Finally, it should be recalled that of all the great Powers which are permanent members of the Security Council, only the United States has not yet wished to face the facts and recognize that the only legitimate representatives of the Chinese people and of China at the United Nations are the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

94. The PRESIDENT: I now give the floor to the representative of Ghana who wishes to explain his vote.

95. Mr. KUFUOR (Ghana): Once again the General Assembly has gone through the tedious and frustrating motions of a debate on the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China. For about 20 years now this drama has dragged on and frankly, in our view, has yielded nothing new or encouraging to those like Ghana, whose sole objective is to make this Organization more effective by enabling it to reflect more truthfully the state of the world.

96. Realism and accommodation largely govern my Government's attitude to this question. We have come to realize that if this world Organization is truly desirous of solving this great problem, it will not succeed if it fetters itself by taking the cleverly complicated legal and procedural approach that Australia and other countries propose in draft resolution A/L.567 and Add.1-5. Ghana cannot agree to affirm the former decision of the Assembly, that the seating of the People's Republic of China should be determined by a two-thirds majority vote, a procedure which serves only to perpetuate negative results to the substantive question of seating China. Ghana does not believe that the China

question will be solved by a policy of drift or by indulging in clever arguments that must have served their time.

97. In these days when the principle of universality is gaining ground fast, we see in such procedures mere rationalization of political prejudices against China. We cannot condone these prejudices and we must, therefore, vote against the draft resolution sponsored by Australia and others. There must be other procedures available to the United Nations without unrealistically restricting its capacity to recognize the principle of multiple succession in international law. And if sponsor countries are well intentioned on this issue, my delegation craves their indulgence to redirect their great efforts towards finding easy and forward-looking procedures that will go a long way in solving this problem.

98. With regard to the substantive aspect of this question, as set forth in the draft resolution sponsored by Albania and others [A/L.569], we hold the view that, by all the tenets of the law of State succession, the People's Republic of China is the legal successor State to that which joined the United Nations as a founding Member; because it is an irrefutable fact that the Government, which is in *de facto*, effective, reasonably permanent control of the Chinese mainland and the bulk of its people, is the one in Peking and not that in Taipei and it has been accorded diplomatic recognition as such by some States Members of this Organization. We maintain, therefore, that as a successor State, the People's Republic of China should have been allowed as of right to occupy a seat in the General Assembly. By this application of the same law of State succession, we also find that the effective ruling Government over that part of former China—now called Taiwan—is the Government of Chiang Kai-shek. Taiwan is, therefore, entitled to continue its membership in the United Nations General Assembly.

99. Although we support fully both States having seats in the General Assembly we do not, however, deem it realistic or proper in the circumstances to give them two seats in the Security Council. Here we support the idea that the People's Republic of China—due to its size in terms of population and power, its undoubted cardinal role in world affairs for now and the future, and in consonance with the obvious criteria for permanent membership of the Security Council—should be the one to occupy the seat in the Security Council.

100. For the last three or four years my country has abstained from voting on this rather complex question. My delegation will now vote with Albania and the other countries co-sponsoring draft resolution A/L.569 on the first part, which calls on the General Assembly to recognize and seat the People's Republic of China. But we must repeat that this recognition and seating should be without prejudice to the continued membership of Taiwan.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*