

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTEENTH SESSION

Official Records



**1070th
PLENARY MEETING**

*Monday, 4 December 1961,
at 3. p.m.*

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda items 90 and 91:</i>	
<i>Question of the representation of China in the United Nations (continued)</i>	} 913
<i>Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations (continued)</i>	
<i>Agenda item 19:</i>	
<i>Question of disarmament (continued)</i>	922
<i>Report of the First Committee (part II) . . .</i>	922
<i>Agenda item 81:</i>	
<i>Prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons</i>	922
<i>Report of the First Committee</i>	922

President: Mr. Mongi SLIM (Tunisia).

AGENDA ITEMS 90 AND 91

Question of the representation of China in the United Nations (continued)

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

1. Mrs. LINDSTROM (Sweden): The question of which of the two Chinese Governments is entitled to represent China in the United Nations and to a permanent seat in the Security Council stretches like a long serial story through the debates of the General Assembly during the past ten years. Ever since Sweden gave its *de jure* recognition to the People's Republic of China in 1950, we have voted for that Government as the lawful representative of the Chinese people.

2. Recently, the régime to which 600 or 700 million people on the Chinese mainland adhere celebrated its fifteenth anniversary. The Red Republic itself is twelve years old; it is, therefore, a well stabilized Government in a stable Republic. Whatever the world around may think about its qualities, it should have been recognized long ago by other sovereign States as one of them in accordance with long established international practice. As we all know, that has not happened. A majority still sticks to the fiction that the Government residing in Formosa is the legitimate Government of China. We refrain from evaluating the claim that the régime of Formosa is more peace-loving than Communist China, against which Article 4 of the Charter, with its stipulation that a Member State must be peace-loving, has often been invoked. But we do find it unreasonable that approximately 10 million people on Taiwan and their Government should be looked upon as being more representative of the Chinese people than the People's Republic of China and able to occupy a position of power as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council.

3. The time is now ripe for renouncing attempts to attach to the concept "peace-loving" in the above-mentioned Article of the Charter—which deals with the election of new Members, not of existing ones—the meaning of a general criterion for representation. Moreover, it is more than doubtful whether the General Assembly is competent to define through some sort of majority vote those who are worthy and those who are not worthy of United Nations membership, and whether such a definition could later serve as a kind of standard for appraising other applicants. The attempt that was made in the initial stage of this question, to seek counsel from the International Court of Justice concerning the correct interpretation, did not lead to greater exactitude as to this concept.

4. It is no longer a remote or absurd possibility that a Member State might be expelled from membership on the basis of Article 6 of the Charter, if a majority of the Governments of Member States accused it of violating its international obligations. This calls for greater caution and deliberation than has been exemplified in the treatment of the China question, when the moral provision in Article 4 is referred to. Nor is it valid to maintain, year after year, that the time is inopportune for a change from a political or practical point of view. The difficulties of adjustment will be no less for being postponed. The Swedish delegation is fully aware of the existence of such difficulties and that it might be desirable to examine the purely practical side of the question of how to facilitate a change in the legal status between the two Chinese Governments. If the United Nations were to recognize Communist China—something which the Swedish delegation deems desirable and is going to vote for—then the question of Formosa would still be left open.

5. Accordingly, the Swedish delegation is not without understanding for the difficulties that the United States is facing when it comes to breaking off old ties of loyalty to the Government of Taiwan or when it comes to a change in the policy that the United States has for so long persuaded itself to be the only right one. A provisional arrangement might be justified and could certainly be brought about, for instance, by letting the General Assembly at this session take a decision in principle, but leaving it to the Credentials Committee at the next session of the General Assembly to examine the credentials of the representatives. In the meantime one could manage to work out recommendations for certain provisional arrangements. Sweden is willing to support every fruitful proposal in this direction. In any case, if the Government of the People's Republic of China is now admitted to represent China in the United Nations, it ought to be made clear in one way or another that such a decision does not have the consequence that the dispute over Formosa would be regarded as automatically settled. The very long time that has passed since Formosa was surrendered in 1945 to the Chinese authorities of that time, has brought about many problems concerning Formosa and

its status, and also concerning the Chinese Army stationed on the island. Those problems cannot be solved simply through debating and voting in this Assembly.

6. The Chinese question is certainly a question with wide political implications. It has always been so. But it is a question of credentials and has always been treated as such, that is to say, it has been settled in the General Assembly by a simple majority. The representative of the United States introduced on 1 December 1961 a draft resolution [A/L.372], which it was sponsoring jointly with four other Powers, concerning the procedural matter of the majority which would be required in a vote on the representation of China. The sponsors of the draft resolution have found now, at long last, that any proposal to change the representation of China is an important question in accordance with Article 18 of the Charter and should need a two-thirds majority to be decided upon. But if keeping the People's Republic of China outside the United Nations is important in this sense, then it must be just as important to keep the other Republic of China inside; and it would be logical to request a two-thirds majority when approving the credentials of the Formosa Government too. However, my delegation can see no need for any change at all in the voting procedure. If, after all these years, the simple majority was to be changed to the two-thirds rule when the General Assembly voted on the China question, this could be interpreted in no other way than as one more attempt to delay a decision that will be inevitable sooner or later and which, in the view of my delegation, ought to be taken now.

7. Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland): Most delegations at the present session of the General Assembly and at previous ones, have spoken up to voice their concern for reinforcing the role and prestige of the United Nations and for turning this Organization into a truly universal platform for international co-operation, but one of the sources of the weakness of this Organization is to be sought in the arbitrary refusal to restore the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. The situation has really become absurd: a country that has been barred from participating in the United Nations work is one of the major Powers and represents one-fourth of the world's population. It is one of the founders of this Organization. Its weight in international relations is growing, and will continue to grow whether one likes it or not.

8. Ever more impressive are the economic, social and political successes achieved by the People's Republic of China, and ever greater is the respect it is gaining the world over. From what it was in days of yore—a country with a primitive economy, chained to the wheel of feudalism and suffering the tyranny of corrupt war-lords, exploited perhaps more ruthlessly than any other under-developed area by colonial adventures, its people dying by millions year in and year out as the result of famine or of flood—from that kind of country the People's Republic of China has emerged as a nation quickly developing towards a better morrow, with better and brighter prospects in store for the hundreds of millions of its population.

9. Does it encounter difficulties and obstacles on the path of its advancement? Of course it does. Is there a single country among those represented in the United Nations that finds no hindrances on its way? Certainly not. But few are the ones that could match the pace of their progress with that of the People's Republic of China.

10. Since the historic Conference in Bandung in 1955 the People's Republic of China has contributed a great deal to the peaceful coexistence of States with different social and political systems. In this it has based itself on the principles of the Pancha Shila, of which it was one of the authors. Ever since its birth, the People's Republic of China has had diplomatic relations with several score of nations in Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America and economic and cultural relations with a still greater number of countries all over the world.

11. Within the last few years, People's China has concluded treaties of friendship, or pacts of friendship and mutual non-aggression, with a great many countries of Asia and Africa, including—with the permission of the States concerned I shall quote them—Burma, Indonesia, Nepal, Yemen, Afghanistan, Cambodia, Guinea and Ghana. Not only has the signing of those treaties consolidated the friendly relations between the People's Republic of China and the other countries concerned, but it has also added a valuable contribution to peaceful co-operation between nations. Owing to the participation of China in the Geneva Conference in 1954, it was possible to settle the complex problems, involved in the breakdown and abolition of the colonial system in Indo-China. The People's Republic of China is now taking part in the Geneva negotiations on Laos^{1/}—and I think that everyone in this Hall will rejoice to hear the news that these negotiations are approaching a successful end. China has initiated the concept of a non-aggression pact in the Pacific area, and the plan of a nuclear-free zone in the Far East. Does one need more examples of the presence and significance of the People's Republic of China in international life?

12. But the People's Republic of China is not present in the United Nations. It is absent owing, as we know, to the insistence of one single Power, the United States. For years and years, in its fight against the People's Republic of China, the United States has not shrunk from using any argument, be it the most remote from facts, nor from exerting any diplomatic pressure, be it in the most obvious defiance of the sovereign decisions of nations.

13. So far, the United States has managed to press the United Nations into agreeing to postpone not only the solution of the question of China's legitimate representation in the United Nations but even the debate on the issue. However, recent years have witnessed a steady and visible decline in the number of States willing to support these practices; for, indeed, the world balance of forces is changing and so is the membership of this Organization. Accordingly, it has now become possible to consider the question of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, in all its aspects.

14. First comes the legal aspect of the issue. What is being considered now is not the admission of a new State to the United Nations, but the representation of a full-fledged Member of this Organization. According to law and to the established practice, a change in the political system or in the form of government of a certain State can in no way affect its status as an object of international law. This is fully valid in the event of changes in the political system and in the form of government; it is no less valid in the event of the establishment of a new type of State.

^{1/} Conference for the Settlement of the Laotian Question, opened on 16 May 1961.

15. In so far as the issue before us is concerned, the rule to be followed is, in keeping with the doctrine and practice of States, that the right to represent a State at international conferences or in international organizations can belong only to the Government which exercises effective and stable authority over the entire territory or the greater part of the State concerned. To dispel any possible doubts, may I quote the great authority on international law, a former judge of the International Court of Justice, Hersch Lauterpacht? In his "Recognition of Governments" II, published in The Columbia Law Review in January 1946, he says:

"A government enjoying the obedience of the bulk of the population must be regarded as representing the State, and, as such, to be entitled to recognition."

16. All these conditions are obviously met by the People's Republic of China. Accordingly, no valid legal reason can possibly be found to substantiate the refusal to seat the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

17. The United Nations Charter, just like the statutes of all other international organizations, entrusts its Members with diverse duties which can be discharged only by Governments exercising effective control of their respective States and by representatives entitled to the disposal of the resources of their respective States. This is, indeed, of particular import in the case of China, which, under the United Nations Charter, is a permanent member of the Security Council and hence is charged with special obligations with regard to the entire international community and to world peace.

18. But in actual fact we have tolerated for years a situation in which the legitimate place of the representatives of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is occupied by a handful of men representing nobody at all. The presence of the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique amounts to supporting a fiction which this Organization can no longer afford. Chiang Kai-shek's figureheads are unable to carry out any international obligation in relation to the huge continent of China. No, they cannot even take the responsibility for the proper delivery of letters or the maintenance of communication lines. Nonetheless, the majority of delegations here have for years agreed to be lulled into believing that the Chiang Kai-shek group could carry into effect the great tasks envisaged in the Charter and the resolutions of the United Nations.

19. As I said before, the present state of affairs is the result of pressure exerted by one Power; this brings us to an analysis of the political aspect of the issue of China's lawful representation in the United Nations.

20. The other day [1069th meeting] we heard the representative of the United States implying that his Government resisted the legitimate representation of China in the United Nations on account of United States opposition to communism. Blind anti-communism is a bad adviser. It befogs the issues at stake. Blind anti-communism is also fraught with threats to peace, for by obscuring the facts it might lead to consequences dangerous for peace. That is why we ought to, and we shall, oppose the anti-communist frenzy of the United States and its allies as a danger to peace.

21. The history of socialism and communism is now more than 100 years old. If I may be allowed to give the United States representatives a piece of advice, I would tell them to count the members of the first

communist movement who, as immigrants from Europe, fought in the Civil War in the United States in support of the cause of progress, in support of the North, on the side of Abraham Lincoln. Some of them were given high command posts in the Civil War—communists they were. Socialism and communism are here to stay, all the more so in the present era. Therefore, to coexist with communism and socialism is indispensable—indispensable, as we representatives of the socialist States say, for countries with different political and social systems to coexist in peace and to co-operate in peace.

22. The fiction in Taiwan, the fiction of the delegation of Chiang Kai-shek's clique here in the United Nations, would cease to exist if it were not for the support accorded to this fiction and this clique by the United States.

23. The United States has its naval and air force bases on Taiwan which, linked with the network of the Philippines and Okinawa bases, form an elaborate system of American military establishments in the Western Pacific. The sums allocated in American military and economic aid cover some 50 per cent of Taiwan's annual expenditure. It is clear that this is a policy which hinders the peaceful stabilization of the situation in Asia and constitutes a constant source of tension.

24. Nor is the cause of peace enhanced by the presence of the United States Navy in the Taiwan strait and—since Taiwan is a part of China—in the territorial waters of the People's Republic of China; no good service can be done to peace either through the violation of Chinese air space by military aircraft, which has occurred. It requires a good deal of contempt for facts to be able, in the face of these actions, to slander the People's Republic of China for its alleged bellicosity. After all, China cannot be blamed for occupying a part of the United States, nor do Chinese men-of-war and aircraft violate United States territorial waters and United States air space. It is the United States which is trying to interfere in the internal affairs of China and infringing upon its territorial integrity.

25. I regret to be compelled to add, in all frankness, that the arguments presented to warrant these strategic and political concepts of the United States are sometimes insincere and, I am sorry to say, sometimes even simply dishonest, because American experts know better than anybody else the path of development of the historical phenomenon of the Chinese revolution. In 1949 the United States Department of State published a fat volume on United States Relations With China. Mr. Dean Acheson, the then Secretary of State, in a letter introducing the volume, mentioned Chiang Kai-shek's Government in the following terms:

"The Government of China [Chiang Kai-shek's Government], of course, had always been a one-party rather than a democratic government in the Western sense... The mass of the Chinese people were coming more and more to lose confidence in the Government..."

"These observers [meaning the American officials] were already fearful in 1943 and 1944 that the National Government might be so isolating itself from the people that in the postwar competition for power it would prove itself impotent to maintain its authority... 2/

"A realistic appraisal of conditions in China, past and present, leads to the conclusion that the only alternative open to the United States was full-scale intervention in behalf of a Government which had lost the confidence of its own troops and its own people".^{3/}

26. Mr. Acheson could not fail to note that the revolution in China "was the product of internal Chinese forces".^{4/} Hence, the United States Government has lent its support, and tries to continue lending its support, to the clique which "Lost the confidence of its own... people",^{5/} against revolutionary forces which are "the product of internal Chinese forces". Is this not one more evidence of attempts at interfering in the internal affairs of China and at involving the entire United Nations in this meddlesome game?

27. Senator Wayne Morse—we remember him very well as a United States representative to the General Assembly at its fifteenth session—said last June, 1961, on the same subject:

"Let us not forget the record of history. Let us not forget that Chiang Kai-shek was driven off the mainland of China before the Chinese Communists came into real control of China. Let us not forget that its own people failed to support Chiang Kai-shek and that he was driven out of China in spite of very large amounts of American aid. Let us remember that the Nationalist Chinese are no models of democracy in the world. Let us remember that in a very real sense their remnant in Formosa is both an economic and military colony of the United States."

28. It would stand to reason that all the necessary conclusions should be drawn from such a realistic appraisal of the situation. We wish that the Americans would draw these conclusions.

29. Judging from Mr. Stevenson's statement last Friday, it appears that, as far as the question of China is concerned, common sense can hardly be expected to triumph in Washington, at least not in the foreseeable future. The Chinese lobby is still alive. Governments change in Washington, but reason does not seem to prevail and a realistic appraisal of the issue is still lacking. And this in spite of the fact that the United States Government itself for several years now—I understand for quite practical reasons—has felt that it had to hold bilateral and multilateral talks with representatives of the Central Government of People's China. It is therefore up to the General Assembly to tackle the issue with due courage and to chase out fiction from this Organization. We cannot afford to have fiction here. The reasons why we must act in this way are clear enough. In conclusion, here they are.

30. The first point: since the inception of this Organization China has been a Member of the United Nations and, in compliance with Articles 3 and 23 of the Charter, was given the status of an original Member and of a major Power. A change of political systems, such as the one undergone by China, is an internal affair of a sovereign nation and an independent State; in no event can it be the object of deliberations in this Organization, because, and I shall quote Mr. Amadeo's words of last year:

"Foreign Governments and international organizations would thus become veritable courts of appeal,

with the power to annul, or at least to withhold, recognition of domestic events which actually occurred in a State. If that theory were strictly applied, no revolutionary government could ever seat its representatives here..."^{6/}

31. A great many States represented here have undergone internal revolutionary developments and changes of government and nobody questions, nobody can question, their right to a seat in the United Nations.

32. Second, in no case can we acquiesce in accepting the formula of "two Chinas", or China and Formosa. The Chiang Kai-shek clique has been heaved overboard by the Chinese people. Not even the might of its protectors can invest it with governmental authority which it does not possess. And the fact that Taiwan is part of China cannot be altered by foreign military occupation or by Washington's strategic and political concepts.

33. Third, the issue that we must resolve now does not require a two-thirds majority. No qualified majority is required to recognize the credentials of a delegation. I repeat, a great many nations have changed their political systems and their Governments during the lifetime of this Organization, but in not a single case has the question of who is to represent the State concerned been considered to be a substantive question requiring a two-thirds majority.

34. Starting from these premises, the Polish delegation is fully in favour of the Soviet draft resolution [A/L.360], which invites the General Assembly to resolve to remove immediately from all United Nations organs the representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique" and which invites us to decide here that the Government of the People's Republic of China be invited "to send its representatives to participate in the work of the United Nations and of all its organs". Therefore, we are firmly against the procedural manoeuvres envisaged in the five-Power draft resolution [A/L.372].

35. The United Nations needs the presence of the representatives of the People's Republic of China. The United Nations cannot function properly unless it keeps pace with developments in the international situation. The United Nations must also faithfully reflect the existing pattern of forces in the world. Without the participation of legitimate representatives of the great Chinese nation, this Organization is not capable of playing its full part in the final solution of international problems. The United Nations was brought to life in order to serve all nations, not only the ones which, guided by shortsighted selfishness, oppose the improvement of this Organization and obstruct the elimination of cold war relics from its work.

36. The active collaboration of the People's Republic of China is necessary for the final solution of crucial international problems, such as the easing of international tension, general and complete disarmament, assistance to countries on their way to development, international trade and international economic co-operation and others. And, of course, should we ever consider amending the provisions of the Charter, it would hardly be feasible without the People's Republic of China, one of the original Members of this Organization.

^{3/} Ibid., p. XV.

^{4/} Ibid., p. XVI.

^{5/} Ibid., p. XV.

^{6/} See Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Plenary Meeting, 913th meeting, para. 57.

37. The Polish delegation would like to believe that all Member States that really cherish the principles and purposes set forth in the Charter will resist the attempts at further torpedoing the settlement of this issue. The United Nations is about to pass through a serious test. In the present international situation the restoration of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is of more vital importance than ever before. A favourable decision on the issue may be of paramount importance for this Organization and, as a matter of fact, for peace.

Mr. Djermakoye (Niger), Vice-President, took the Chair.

38. Mr. MALALASEKERA (Ceylon): The views of my Government, my people and my delegation on the issue before us are already well known. We hold, as we have always held, that a people must be represented in the United Nations by its effective Government. I stress the word "effective", because when we use it we mean that representation, which affects the daily lives of the people through the economic, social and political efforts of the United Nations, can be carried out only by the day-to-day partnership and hourly collaborations of a people and its Government.

39. This is obviously what the then Secretary-General had in mind when he wrote his letter of 8 March 1950 to the President of the Security Council.^{7/} Here is a part of what he said:

"This Article"—meaning Article 4 of the Charter—"requires that an applicant for membership must be able and willing to carry out the obligations of membership. The obligations of membership can be carried out only by governments which in fact possess the power to do so. Where a revolutionary government presents itself as representing a State, in rivalry to an existing government, the question at issue should be which of these two governments in fact is in a position to employ the resources and direct the people of the State in fulfilment of the obligations of membership. In essence, this means an inquiry as to whether the new government exercises effective authority within the territory of the State and is habitually obeyed by the bulk of the population.

"If so, it would seem to be appropriate for the United Nations organs, through their collective action, to accord it the right to represent the State in the Organization, even though individual Members of the Organization refuse, and may continue to refuse, to accord its recognition as the lawful Government for reasons which are valid under their national policies."

40. These things are well known. Equally well known are the arguments for and against which are adduced in this controversy. Indeed, we all know them by heart after twelve years of their being aired on a procedural level.

41. But now for the first time we are discussing this issue on a substantive level. There is a danger that in the next ten days to two weeks we shall expend much time and energy rehashing the old arguments. I shall try my best to avoid this and to deal with the new aspects, with whatever new factors can be extracted.

42. Among these new factors, there is a new American administration and, of course, there is its dis-

tinguished representative of the United States, Mr. Adlai Stevenson for whom, personally, I have great respect and, may I be allowed to add, even affection. I followed him with great attention when in a somewhat formidable manner he presented his case against a positive solution of the China issue.

43. Mr. Stevenson's statement, I must confess to my regret, I found a little puzzling, because there are apparently not only two Chinas but two streams of thinking in the United States delegation. There seem to be those who supply the brilliant premises and also, alas, others who insist on arriving at the same old conclusions, the wrong conclusions. Take for instance, these brilliant words, sweeping and majestic in their scope. Speaking of the ever-expanding family of nations, the United States representative said:

"This very Assembly, in its majestic diversity, is both a physical symbol and a practical embodiment—however imperfect—of that transcendent vision" [1069th meeting, para. 2].

Further on, the United States statement resumes this theme of "majestic diversity" and says:

"So diverse is that community in traditions and attitudes, so small and closely knit together is our modern world, so much do we have need of one another—and so frightful are the consequences of war—that all of us whose representatives gather in this General Assembly must more than ever be determined, as the Charter says, 'To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours'." [Ibid., para. 12.]

44. These are noble words and excellent arguments. They are especially good arguments for the universal representation of all peoples in the United Nations and they are an eloquent interpretation of the Charter which the United States representative quoted with such approval.

45. Now let us imagine to ourselves that some day in an age of Utopia and reason the same delegation is instructed by its Government, as a result of some strange and unforeseen development, perhaps through an alliance against another mighty communist State, to plead for the seating of mainland China. Could it find words better fitted to speak in favour of the admission of the People's Republic of China? I do not think so.

46. But then the United States statement embarks on a long journey to nowhere when it sets forth upon its discussion of régimes. Where in the Charter, I ask, is the United Nations described as an Organization of régimes? The United Nations Charter in its first three words, "we the peoples", establishes at once the hegemony of peoples. There is no mention here of régimes, but only of peoples.

47. The United Nations programmes also are for peoples. The great revolution of our time, which the United States statement so eloquently described, is the revolution of the common people. The United Nations programme for under-developed areas, the United Nations social programme, the United Nations programme for children, the various agencies dealing with health and food and culture—all these are for people, not for régimes.

48. Therefore the paramount question we must consider is the question not of régimes but of people. In China there are 650 million people, one-quarter of the human race. These 650 million people are not repre-

^{7/} Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, Supplement for 1 January through 31 May 1950, document S/1466.

sented in the United Nations. It is true that somebody in Taiwan claims to represent them. The United States statement claims that that somebody does in fact represent them. We cannot and do not agree with this claim. Let us make it clear that we have no personal quarrel with the representatives from Taiwan. We have no desire at all to refer to them except in terms of great courtesy and correctness. Neither do we approve, therefore, of some of the unfortunate phraseology used with reference to them in the Soviet draft resolution [A/L.360].

49. But we are forced by the realities of the situation to ask a question: has the régime in Taiwan, which makes that claim, implemented any of the programmes that I have mentioned earlier, for the benefit of these 650 million people who live on the mainland of China? The answer is an emphatic "no". How then can we morally justify a world Organization which denies to so many millions of people the ordinary benefits of existence?

50. I am not speaking here of any abstraction alien to the United States Government, a Government which speaks so much of "people-to-people programmes". The United States Government is very intelligently aware of the difference between régimes and peoples.

51. In this connexion the statement I refer to has struck off a clever bit of counterpoint. It says, in so many words, "Let us not bring the Chinese People's Republic into the United Nations, but rather let us bring the United Nations to the Chinese people." Good. But how does the United States propose to do this? By sending them a United Nations flag? Or shall we send them 650 million copies of the Charter, or perhaps 650 million copies of the United States statement?

52. I submit, there is only one way to bring the United Nations to the Chinese people or to any other people, and that is by admitting them to membership of this world Organization. Then we shall have a United Nations literature in China. We shall have—as we have in the Soviet Union—a Chinese Association for the United Nations. We shall have United Nations agencies in China.

53. Let me cite an illustration. Throughout the life of the League of Nations the United States Government kept the American people out of the League. Then came the Second World War. The most intelligent and enlightened Americans—Mr. Stevenson among them—rightly pointed out the danger to the American people of being isolated from a world community. It was even said at the time that this isolationism may have actually contributed to the coming of the Second World War. The problem was how to win over the American people to this great co-operative enterprise after years of isolationism. Well, eventually the United Nations was brought into the United States and that is where we are now. But before this happened it was found necessary for the United States first to become a Member of the United Nations, and through being a Member of the United Nations the American people made this brilliant and historic transition from isolationism to internationalism, one of the most brilliant and constructive evolutions effected by any people anywhere.

54. Now, the United States, having abandoned isolationism, preaches the doctrine of enforced isolationism for the Chinese people. If the isolationism of a big Power like America probably contributed to the Second World War, could it not be deduced, by the

same thinking, that a similar isolation of a big Power like China might well become a contributing factor to a Third World War?

55. Beyond this, there is really not much more to say. All else—this discussion of how good or how bad certain régimes are; this talk about "dictatorship"; this talk about the system of communes in China—seems to my delegation a heap of irrelevancies. Dictatorships indeed! If the United Nations, in 1945, and thereafter, had kept out all the peoples who lived under one dictatorship or another, who but a handful of nations would be here today? The United States has friendly relations with many Governments controlled by dictatorial power, and some of the allies of the United States that started out with parliamentary experiments have later turned to dictatorship, some of them, strangely enough, on the excuse that dictatorial régimes could make better use of American economic aid. Is the "good" Chinese régime in Taiwan a model of democracy? There have been four Presidents in the United States during the reign of Chiang Kai-shek. It is worth recalling that Chiang Kai-shek has been in power much longer than Mao Tse-tung.

56. We shall get nowhere at all if we get lost in the bewildering jungle of passing judgement on political régimes as a qualification for membership in the United Nations. It would not be difficult at all for my delegation or any other to produce a list of dictators enjoying the friendship and even the aid of the United States. Let me add that in saying this I make no criticism of any Government before this Assembly.

57. Then of course, there is the very much worn-out and dog-eared catalogue of China's aggressions. The United States statement mentioned Korea, Tibet, South-East Asia. Let us take Korea because that is cited as a flagrant case.

58. The Korean War broke out in 1950. The People's Republic of China was set up in 1949. The United States statement cites Chinese intervention in the Korean War as a reason for not admitting the People's Republic of China to this Organization. Did the United States express great enthusiasm in support of the Chinese demand for a seat in the United Nations before the Korean War broke out? I have no such recollection. The truth is that United States opposition was due, not to China's intervention in Korea, but rather to China's socialist system—and that remains true even today. All the other reasons are so much new cellophane wrapping on the same old package.

59. Speaking of the Korean War, perhaps that war need never have broken out at all if the People's Republic of China had been in the United Nations at that time. Some of the older Members here may recall how at Lake Success the United States, aware of China's fears, sought through various United Nations agencies to allay those fears with unofficial assurances that the United Nations armies in Korea would not cross the Yalu River. But China was not at the United Nations to accept those assurances. On the other hand, non-recognition tended to keep China's fears and suspicions alive. Perhaps the United States Government could have saved its people all those terrible casualties if the true representatives of China had been around the Security Council table and in the Assembly Hall, where rising tensions leading to the war might have been anticipated, discussed, reduced and blunted, as they frequently are here.

60. It might be pertinent to ask, would the United States be more afraid or less afraid if the Soviet Union were not in the United Nations? There are scores of speeches made by various United States officials to the American people explaining why it is better that the Soviet Union is in the United Nations. The American people are told, for instance, that it is better to have the Soviet Union in the Organization here where the United States can keep an eye on it—or, as it is sometimes said, "Better a war of words than a war of bullets"; or as it is also said, at the United Nations the Soviet system could be "exposed"; or, at the United Nations this "bad" Soviet Union can be made amenable to benevolent influences; or, at the United Nations, informal consultations could be had, such as solved the Berlin crisis in 1949.

61. Mr. Stevenson himself has sometimes used these arguments to explain why it is better for an allegedly warlike nation to be in the United Nations, rather than out of it. Why can we not apply the same arguments to the Chinese People's Republic? The United States statement speaks of the warlike aims of the Peking Government. This argument is based on two things; on China's pronouncements with regard to war and peace in the cold war and on certain directives issued in the training of guerrilla units.

62. On this point, I must note that Mr. Kennedy, the President of the United States, recently announced a new training programme for guerrillas. I am certain that the manual of arms which is issued to them is not a memo on passive resistance. Mr. Mao Tse-tung allegedly spoke of using nuclear bombs. Can we say in this connexion that we have an outright commitment from those Members of the United Nations which possess nuclear bombs that they will never use them? And it is they that have them, while Peking does not have any. Surely we have more reason to fear Governments which have the bombs and will not say that they will never use them than we have to fear Governments which say they would use bombs but who, in fact, have no bombs to use.

63. Reading the United States statement, one gets an impression of a Hollywood script, long out of fashion, in which everybody is good except the villain. At this very moment I see before me here the faces of a number of delegations whose governmental policies and actions in certain parts of the world have been described by other delegations as warlike. I need not call the roll of the territories, particularly in Africa, where full-scale wars are now being conducted by Western nations, some of them democracies, not against régimes but against people. I refer to Algeria, Angola, Oman, South Africa, Bizerta. Who attacked in Suez? Does the United States delegation therefore want us to expel all of these warlike Governments? Then there are other Governments which I would not call warlike although Mr. Stevenson would. Would we expel them? These Governments, in turn, call the Government of the United States warlike. Should they, then, ask for the expulsion of the United States?

64. Who is going to be the judge? Who is to judge? We do pass judgements on each other on various issues—sometimes much too freely—but we do so because we know that as long as we do it in the United Nations, as Members of the Organization, there is a chance that warlike policies, words and actions can be turned to the ways of peace.

65. This is not only a house of peace; it is the school of peace where all nations come to learn the lessons

of peace. None, therefore, should be kept out of it. The United States statement has expressed fear of making what it calls an irreversible decision. As I understand it, the thinking of the present Administration on the question of China was not as positive on the issue as the United States statement would seem to convey, according to United States press reports themselves. The Administration, it was once reported, was inclined to reverse its policy on China and then it was reported that, under great pressure, the reversal was reversed. At what stage in this pondering were the arguments advanced in the United States statement correct?

66. Let me turn back to the major issue, which is whether a Government can be so judged as to affect either its membership or its desire for membership in the United Nations. It so happens that while Mr. Stevenson was talking in this Hall on the China issue, two floors below in the Fourth Committee, at exactly the same time, the United States representative strongly denounced the apartheid policies in the Republic of South Africa. The United States representative had some harsh words to say about the policies of South African Government. Some representatives called the policies genocidal; I think that this is the highest form of destruction and the lowest form of war. But when certain representatives suggested that these policies disqualified the Union of South Africa from continued membership in the Organization, did the United States representative support that stand? He did not even support less drastic sanctions. Yet in the case of the Peking régime, the United States would apply the hardest sanction of all—excommunication from this world community. I use the word excommunication in its harshest historic meaning, which amounts to a death sentence.

67. Let us assume that the United States, as Mr. Stevenson says, abhors the régime but is concerned with the plight of the Chinese people. Then why keep the Chinese People's Republic out of the specialized agencies, most of whose programmes are humanitarian? Much is said about the lack of food in China, a sad plight in which the Food and Agricultural Organization could have been of assistance. The same could be said of the World Health Organization. But the United States has fought every attempt to give the People's Republic of China membership even in those agencies.

68. What the United States is waging is not a war against a régime; it is a war against the Chinese people. This is a blockade, an embargo. It is a Western-imposed iron curtain.

69. The United States statement cites the failure of Peking to conclude negotiations at Panmunjom, at Geneva, and at Warsaw which, it says, proved futile although, Mr. Stevenson says, "My country's negotiators have done their best". This is a strange admission for a country that has a fabulous reputation for doing its best—a best which invariably ends in success. Is it possible that these negotiations might have made a little more progress and even ended successfully, if both negotiating States had been Members of the United Nations?

70. Let me turn for a moment to the four reasons given in the United States statement for not making a decision now. The first reason is that the decision would be "irreversible". I fail to understand this argument, I must confess. I hope, in the name of the universality which we all desire, that all membership in

the United Nations is irreversible and that, unlike the League of Nations, the United Nations will never cease to exist as a result of "reversible" membership.

71. The second argument is that the Peking delegation here might be "a most disruptive and demoralizing influence". In answer to this argument, we might consider the record of the United Nations. It seems to me that the question of China's representation here has been more disruptive and demoralizing than anything any new State could do. It is a strange theory and, to me, utterly contradictory to the philosophy of a world organization that representation, rather than non-representation, could undermine the United Nations. The United Nations, we should have thought, was by common acceptance the world's answer and antidote to the disruptive forces which begot two world wars.

72. We could go further and state that this cold war between the United Nations and the People's Republic of China which the United States statement seeks to promulgate, is today one of the most dangerous challenges to the peace of the world—so disruptive, so demoralizing that tomorrow it could be one thousand times as great as the threat of Berlin.

73. Let us look at things a little more closely. There are other disruptive elements in the United Nations. We have representatives here who refuse to take their seats when their interests are under discussion. We have many States which refuse, at least temporarily, to accept Assembly decisions. Who is disrupting the United Nations in the Congo? Will those who are responsible be expelled? We have heard the United States representative tell the General Assembly that his Government could not accept the resolution [1648 (XVI)] on the moratorium on test explosions, that it would not accept the resolution [1652 (XVI)] on the denuclearization of Africa, that it could not accept the resolution [1653 (XVI)] leading to a ban on the use of terror weapons in wartime. Is that attitude constructive, or disruptive? There have been charges of disruption in the selection of the Acting Secretary-General, in the assessments on the Congo. The United States statement bristles with moral judgements and self-righteousness.

74. How are we to judge? Who is to pass judgement? Obviously, no Government in the world is without sin. Judgement, it seems to me, should be reserved to the world community, and then exercised only with the greatest caution. Unilateral judgements, apart from being unobjective, are too frequently regarded as acts of hostility.

75. The third reason given in the United States statement is that the seating of the Peiping delegation would seriously shake public confidence in the United Nations. If public confidence in the United Nations were shaken every time some Government offended it in one way or another, the United Nations would have been dead long ago. Fortunately, the moral strength of world public opinion is a hardier plant than the Governments which represent it. It is part of the glorious chapter of modern times and a supreme expression of true faith in the future that world public opinion has stood by the United Nations through thick and thin and in its darkest moments. World public opinion, if it is to be defined, means the public opinion of all the peoples of the world, and not of a world divided.

76. Why do some people wish to perpetuate an indefinitely protracted situation of bitterness, of harsh

words, pitting the great people of the United States—175 million of them—against 650 million people of China, an ancient people of glorious achievements, a people who have seen and lived through many régimes and who do not need the United Nations to give them a lesson in the ways of peace? Experiments in peace were made in China centuries ago, culminating in the doctrines of Lao-Tze and Confucius. These are hopeful traditions in the great history of China. These traditions will emerge here in this great laboratory of peace with a new vigour and a rediscovery.

77. The United States statement wishes the General Assembly of the United Nations to pass a judgement on Peiping's claim to Taiwan. Well, for ten or twelve years we have heard about Taiwan and Korea and other places as reasons for avoiding a positive decision. But let us ask: have we succeeded in settling these problems with the Chinese People's Republic outside the United Nations?

78. To complete its lurid picture of an "unregenerate" Government in Peiping—that was the word used—and of a Government which cannot get along with anybody, the United States statement says: "They"—meaning the People's Republic of China—"apparently do not even get along very well with the USSR". I should have thought that, given the United States attitude to the USSR, it would welcome that Government of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations if only for that very reason. At any rate, if the USSR is worried about it, if Moscow is afraid of Peiping's future might, the USSR is taking another course—it is the Soviet Union which is leading the campaign to bring Peiping into the United Nations.

79. I have mentioned the wall of hatred which, it seems to me, the present United States policy on China is building between the American and Chinese peoples. It is my delegation's sincere conviction that such a policy cannot add to the security of America. This is the nuclear and missile age. The people who were the first to invent gunpowder will not lose too much time in becoming a nuclear Power—even without outside aid. When that day comes, the United States will be confronted by two mighty nuclear Powers, and that two-front war which was America's nightmare in the Second World War will re-emerge as the double nuclear front of the future.

80. The General Assembly is now trying desperately to hold the dissemination and spread of these nuclear weapons. If the People's Republic of China is seated here now, at this session, there is a good chance that we may head off such a development in one of the world's largest areas. China is building its economy and its social system with national plans which will require decades and which will tax all the national resources which it can muster. Thus engaged, it cannot afford now to divert billions in order to match the existing nuclear Powers. But if China is pushed to the wall or isolated from the forces of peace in the United Nations, it will be forced to build for itself a mighty fortress against those who make themselves its enemies. Does anyone doubt that mighty China will meet that challenge? When that day comes, China will be the only nuclear Power outside the United Nations. That, we submit, would be positively dangerous. If the United States Government really believes all it says about the warlike attitude of China, then it seems to me that it should do everything in its power to scotch this cold war and hatred as quickly as possible. Six hundred and fifty million people isolated from the world com-

munity of nations and compelled to build themselves a might fortress, soon to be armed with nuclear and missile weapons, goaded by harsh words, taunts and insults, can never add to the security of the world. The strongest single reason for seating Peiping now is that it may spare the world another big nuclear Power. And this would be a contribution to world peace worth working for.

81. But if we miss this opportunity—and in the present high-speed armaments race, next year may be too late—the United Nations and world peace itself will be not only disrupted, but wrecked, and the way will be opened for one quarter of the world, fully armed, to remain outside the United Nations. Against that mighty war machine, this puny procedural paper resolution, which five Powers have sponsored jointly, will become the comedy of history and the tragedy of mankind. My delegation would like to say, with all respect but with the utmost seriousness, that this procedural obstructionism is unworthy of a delegation representing the wonderful American people, and that we most sincerely hope it will be brought to a halt.

82. We have talked of the United Nations can do for China. But this Organization is not a one-way street. There is much that China can do for the United Nations. The Chinese people have much to offer in science, in culture and in industry. Its great strides in these fields have been a loss to the specialized agencies. Economically, China is a mighty laboratory experiment in the way in which a nation can pull itself up by its own bootstraps from under-development; politically, it is a giant in the rising tide of nationalism which has given birth to many new States and will produce many more as our decolonization programme accelerates. Both in terms of production and consumption, China's mighty population will always be an important factor in world trade.

83. The important resolutions adopted on the reports of the Second Committee of the Assembly, on the promotion of world trade, on industrialization, on the opening of new markets for one-commodity nations and the building of a world planned economy, on the building of regional autonomy through the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East—all these resolutions must remain only partially implemented while the present and potential economic forces of China are left out.

84. One of these resolutions [1702 (XVI)] speaks of making available the benefit of central planning to under-developed countries. Regardless of ideologies, the great experiments and achievements of China in this respect cannot be ignored. They are too valuable a lesson to many, new, smaller nations desperately hunting for blue-prints for planned economies.

85. Many nations are now receiving such aid from the Chinese People's Republic. China is highly developed medically, socially and scientifically. It is a country whose people and whose leaders are consumed with an unceasing ambition to build a nation from the remnants of colonialist fragmentation into a nationalist unity, seeking a social order based on justice and self-sufficiency.

86. I could go on indefinitely listing the great benefits which China can provide in the fields of technical assistance, engineering, land reform, flood control, the building of dams, irrigation, literacy and education.

87. When the West says "no" to all these, let us recall the great contribution which China made to the early

history of western civilization. The caravans moving from the Italian cities to China for its textiles, its art, its culture, is one of the most dramatic chapters in the history of modern civilization.

88. The nations of the world are being asked to ignore, to slight, that daring vision and imagination of the Italian and Arab traders who built a golden bridge across oceans, mountains, and deserts to bring China to Europe. In other words, we are being asked to set progress back by 1,000 years.

89. Is this the time to move backward in the world which Mr. Stevenson so eloquently described as revolutionary? The United States is the country of the revolution of 1776, and China is the country of the revolution of 1948. In the perspective of history it is the same revolution in different forms. All modern revolutions—the French, the Russian and those of other countries—are part of the same great tidal wave of humanity, increasing in vast numbers, advancing across the globe and filling it with hundreds of different cultures.

90. In this vast and complicated panorama of change, these revolutions have developed into different and sometimes opposing patterns. The League of Nations was born to resolve the clashes of nations. The United Nations is being challenged to resolve the clashes of revolutions. They can be resolved only if they are all represented in this world Organization, and they must be resolved not only through the settling of disputes but even more through those positive and creative elements which arise from co-operative effort. Peace in our time can be secured not so much by stopping the aggressor as by organizing a community of peoples in which no nation will find aggression desirable, necessary or even possible.

91. Therefore, we say that it is essential to bring the United Nations to China and China to the United Nations so that their joint co-operation, not only in the economic field, but in other matters, can become the epic of peace in our time.

92. For these reasons the issue under discussion here is not a procedural issue, except in so far as it concerns a simple matter of credentials. It is an issue which strikes at the deepest roots of the question of war and peace in Asia and in the whole world. We have made a correct decision in abandoning petty procedural tactics in dealing with this great problem, and we are now for the first time dealing with it in a substantive manner. Let us have the courage to take the next bold step and dispose of this issue once and for all. Representatives seated here, whose countries have an effective and a *de facto* relationship with the 650 million people of China, could make one of the greatest contributions to the universality of this Organization by admitting China. Such action could make the Assembly emerge from its present session with splendour. It would make the biggest contribution to peace which the United Nations can make today. Let us, here and now, resolve to make that contribution with vision and unflinching courage.

Mr. Slim (Tunisia) resumed the Chair.

93. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): We have now come to the end of the list of speakers who asked to speak on agenda items 90 and 91 at the present meeting. The Assembly will now turn to item 19 (Question of disarmament) on which the First Committee has submitted a report (second part) [A/4980/Add.1].

AGENDA ITEM 19

Question of disarmament (continued)*

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (SECOND PART) (A/4980/ADD.1)

Mr. Enckell (Finland), Rapporteur of the First Committee, submitted the report of that Committee.

In accordance with rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the First Committee.

94. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I invite the Assembly to vote on the draft resolution which is contained in the second part of the First Committee's report [A/4980/Add.1] and which it recommends for adoption.

The draft resolution was adopted by 58 votes to 10, with 23 abstentions.

*Resumed from the 1067th meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 81

Prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/5002)

Mr. Enckell (Finland), Rapporteur of the First Committee, submitted the report of that Committee.

In accordance with rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the First Committee's report.

95. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I invite the Assembly to take a decision on the draft resolution contained in the First Committee's report [A/5002]. Since the Committee adopted this draft unanimously, I shall, if there are no objections consider that the General Assembly has also adopted it unanimously.

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously.

The meeting rose at 5.5 p.m.