

United Nations GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**1973rd
PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 21 October 1971,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Statement by the President	1
Agenda item 93: Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations (<i>continued</i>)	1
Statements concerning the incident that occurred at the Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Wednesday, 20 October 1971 (<i>continued</i>)	16
Statements concerning an incident that occurred in the General Assembly hall (<i>concluded</i>)	22

President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).

Statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT: I regret very much the unfortunate incident of this morning, and I understand that a complete report will be submitted by the Secretariat before the end of the day.
2. As I said at the previous meeting, I shall call first of all on the speakers whose names are on the list for the debate on agenda item 93. Then I shall give the floor to those who wish to exercise their right of reply.

AGENDA ITEM 93

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

3. Mr. IBINGIRA (Uganda): With your permission, Mr. President, I wish in passing to say how profoundly shocked we have all been by the incident that took place at the previous meeting; I mean the information which we had from Mr. Malik of the Soviet Union that his Mission had been attacked. When we come here, we do not come with armies or police forces to protect us; we come as messengers of peace, and people in search of a better world, and that is not the way such missions and representatives who seek peace should be treated in the host city of New York. But I do accept, for my part, the assurances which were given with obvious sincerity and concern by the representative of the United States [*1972nd meeting*], and we hope that—although it is said that no one can ever recall a sped arrow—such incidents for the purpose of intimidating, coercing or unduly influencing any one of us will occur in the future, whatever diverse views may be held in this august Organization.
4. I shall now proceed to the issue before the Assembly.

5. The central purpose of the United Nations as embodied in its Preamble is "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" and also "to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained". It is to this end that all our efforts are directed. All nations of the world must come into and be a part of this Organization so that, when there is a quarrel or a misunderstanding of any nature whatsoever, we can talk about it here instead of shooting it out.

6. It is for this reason that my delegation welcomes the efforts of all peace-lovers in the world to restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in this Organization. And I wish particularly, at this juncture, to congratulate the President of the United States for his courageous, imaginative and timely step in reaching out to establish meaningful contact with the People's Republic of China. The next logical step, in order to make the initiative of the President of the United States complete and meaningful, at this twenty-sixth session, must be to restore to the People's Republic of China the rights that by law belong to it under the Charter of the United Nations.

7. I have looked for guidance through the speeches of the representative of the United States [*1966th meeting*] and the Foreign Minister of Taiwan [*1967th meeting*], but have only found bewilderment. In the first place, we hold that the spokesman of Taiwan before this General Assembly is the most authoritative advocate of the case for his own régime. His speech delivered here on 18 October 1971 makes it abundantly clear that he, like the People's Republic of China, believes that there is only one China and only one Government for that China. Nowhere did the Foreign Minister of Taiwan assert the independent existence of that island. Throughout he maintains that there is, and can be, only one Government for the whole of China. In doing so, he by implication rejects the draft resolution designed to have two Governments represented here for a single Chinese State. It follows, therefore, that the Taiwan régime, through its spokesman here, rejects the efforts of those advocating a "two Chinas" policy in the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2. There is, therefore, no unanimity regarding what is sought in that draft resolution, since the people for whose benefit dual representation is sought reject it.

8. All of us, including the sponsors of that draft resolution agree that in restoring the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China we are not admitting a new Member State to this Organization. If we were, the General Assembly would have had to receive a recommendation by the Security Council in accordance with Article 4, paragraph 2, in order to seat the People's Republic of China. The absence of a reference to a Security Council recom-

mendation in that draft resolution plainly means that the People's Republic of China is an old Member of this Organization which does not require admission.

9. If, then, we all accept that the People's Republic of China is an old Member, the question must be asked: Who represents it in the United Nations? We all know the answer: No one represents it. It is for that reason that draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 has been introduced; that text is specifically designed to enable the People's Republic of China as an old Member of the Organization to fulfil its obligations and exercise its rights under the Charter by being represented in this Organization by persons properly accredited by it.

10. We are 131 States Members of this Organization, and each one—except one—is properly represented here through a single national Government for each State. If I cannot have the privilege, or the headache, of my country's being represented here by two rival delegations from two rival Governments at home, I must not wish it for any other State. We cannot therefore accept two Governments being represented here for a single State. Indeed, the Charter of this Organization precludes it. We must therefore all accept that there can be only one Government for China in this Organization.

11. It has been eloquently put forward here by several speakers that the mere fact that a State can change its name or that it can be governed by various Governments from time to time does not transform that State into a different entity. Its juridical personality remains the same, and it continues, despite the change in its name or its Government, to enjoy its rights as a State and to be subject to the obligations imposed by international law and custom. The same applies to the People's Republic of China. It is the State designated "the Republic of China" as a permanent member in the Security Council in Article 23, paragraph 1. The fact that the leaders of a Government which once ruled China, having been overthrown, ran away to an island province, still call themselves by the name that appears in Article 23 of the Charter cannot of itself entitle them to that seat or indeed to membership in this Organization. With the great English poet Shakespeare, we can truly ask, What's in a name?

12. It is the Chinese State, which Chiang Kai-shek once ruled, that is entitled to the United Nations seat, despite the succeeding changes in its designation and Government.

13. Let me briefly go through the arguments that have been advanced to retain Taiwan in the United Nations while at the same time restoring China's rights to its seat in this Organization.

14. First of all, it is argued by several Members that, Taiwan having been represented for nearly a quarter of a century and having been a law-abiding Member of this Organization, it would be wrong to deprive it of its seat. This, in our opinion, raises the fundamental issue of whether international law and justice would legitimize the usurper of a seat in this Organization belonging legally to another State simply because such a usurper had enjoyed a prolonged presence in the United Nations. I strongly submit it cannot. The law by which membership in this Organiza-

tion is acquired is spelled out without ambiguity in the Charter. It is clear that only States and not Governments *per se* are represented here. It is equally clear that the Government of Taiwan, having been overthrown in 1949, ceased to control or govern the sovereign State of China. It must therefore follow under the law of nations that Taiwan has no *locus standi* in the Organization. Its presence here, despite the impressive length of time of that presence, has derived its reality not from international law but from political convenience. Since that political convenience is getting unfashionable and since there has never been any legal basis for it, it must follow that Taiwan must get out of the United Nations to give way to those who are legally entitled to the seat that Taiwan now occupies.

15. With regard to the second argument, it is stated that because Taiwan enjoys such a high standard of living it is entitled to representation in the United Nations. This argument is, in the view of my delegation, utterly false. The mere fact that, for example, a province of any given State is exceedingly wealthy does not entitle it to representation here. If it were not so, most of the States in the United States of America and some States in Canada, Australia and the Soviet Union would be seated in this Organization by virtue of their wealth, because some are certainly more prosperous than Taiwan. But they cannot be here because, like Taiwan, they are not States within the meaning of Article 4 of the Charter.

16. The third argument that has been advanced is that Taiwan, consisting as it does of 14 million persons, is larger than many States represented in the United Nations and, by virtue of its size, should be represented here. Again, with respect, that is another red herring.

17. Nowhere does the Charter of this Organization make the size or population of a State a condition for membership. Indeed, in its preamble the Charter reaffirms the faith of us all in "... the equal rights of ... nations large and small". Statehood therefore is independent of size within the meaning of this Charter and it is therefore wrong to say that simply because there is a group of 14 million people they must constitute a State within the meaning of the Charter.

18. Although 14 million may seem a lot compared with the population of several States in this Organization, that is a wrong comparison. The 14 million people of Taiwan must be seen in the context of the Chinese State to which they belong; then we can have a proper perspective. If we take the population of the People's Republic of China, for example, to be 700 million, then together with the 14 million, the Chinese State has 714 million. As a percentage, the 14 million Taiwanese constitute 1.96 per cent of the population of the Chinese State. The People's Republic of China constitutes 98.04 per cent of this State. In this context it is clear that it would be utterly absurd for Taiwan to claim—having only 1.96 per cent—that it and not the Government that controls the overwhelming majority, or 98.04 per cent of the population, represents the totality of the Chinese State.

19. The fourth agreement is that we must accept Taiwan and the People's Republic of China as two political realities and therefore allow each of them representation in this

Organization. I have already made the point that we all agree that there is only one Chinese State and only one seat for that State. To have an additional seat would require as a prior condition the creation of a second Chinese State. That State, be it called Taiwan or any other name, would then have to apply for membership in the United Nations under Article 4 and its application would have to be considered on its merits. Alternatively, we must first amend the Charter to empower, under certain circumstances, this General Assembly, together with the Security Council, to permit a single sovereign State to have two or more seats in this Organization. Then China can have two seats, one for the People's Republic of China and one for Taiwan. Needless to say, no one among us could accept an amendment of the Charter directed towards this objective. Here I should say that the analogy of Byelorussia and the Soviet Union does not apply and is out of place.

20. There is otherwise no provision in the Charter as it stands today for accepting a single nation State to have two seats in this Organization. There is consequently no legal basis for draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, which affirms the continued right of representation of the Republic of China, that is, Taiwan. I must therefore conclude this point by stating that after careful consideration my delegation cannot accept those arguments reviewed above and others I have mentioned which have been advanced seeking dual representation by means of that draft resolution. We shall therefore vote against it.

21. Let me now touch further on the warning given by the Foreign Minister of Taiwan. He said that besides glorifying war, the People's Republic of China "fomented armed insurrection and promotes so-called 'people's war' against established governments. It is the world's most flagrant exponent and most assiduous practitioner of political infiltration and subversion" [1967th meeting, para. 43].

22. Here I only wish to observe that, throughout its quarter of a century of existence, the United Nations has been witnessing crisis after crisis fomented by its own Members represented here contrary to the basic principles of the Charter. One can recall the landmarks of crises at random: the cold war between the West and the East, the Berlin issue, which at one time threatened to unleash a third world war, the Suez crisis of 1956, the Cuban missile crisis between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, the Middle East War and the big Power involvement in it. With all these the People's Republic of China was not concerned yet they involved violations of the basic principles of the Charter. There are today among us States which have in their jails thousands of people detained without trial, there are colonialist and racist States here with us which shamelessly deny to the masses of their subject people their elementary rights to freedom and self-determination; there are States which, because they are powerful, throw their weight about and suppress smaller States so that they can firmly keep them in their sphere of influence. All this, and more, has been done by States Members of this Organization and the People's Republic of China was not here.

23. Let us therefore accept the reality that none of us is perfect, but let us also accept another and urgent reality, that if our planet is to survive the scourge of a nuclear war,

we must learn to settle our disputes by the methods set out in this Charter. Let us realize the urgent necessity of subjecting the People's Republic of China to the scrutiny and censure of this Organization, as we do with all the big Powers. While this Organization can impose its will on a non-member under Article 2, paragraph 6, of the Charter, it must be obvious to all that a State within this Organization is more legally and morally subject to the Organization's requirements than a non-member who would be bound to resent being required by this Organization to fulfil any obligations it imposes without enjoying corresponding rights or benefits in the Organization.

24. The People's Republic of China is a nuclear Power of increasing capability. Its active membership in this Organization would make more meaningful and valuable the efforts already under way by the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

25. My delegation will vote for draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2. In doing so we do not guarantee a certificate of cleanliness or innocence. We cannot possibly guarantee that the People's Republic of China will not at any time in future commit violations of the Charter. Nor can any State be required to give such a guarantee. But if it should commit any breach, or assuming—without accepting—that it has that propensity, then it is all the more imperative to restore its seat in this Organization so that we can all be available to discipline it through the pressures of world opinion that emanate from this great Organization.

26. We know that one of the main weaknesses of the League of Nations was the absence from it of some powerful nations like Japan and Germany. We must not repeat this mistake in our generation with the People's Republic of China, or with any other State, for that matter.

27. Finally, let me say that it falls upon us, representing the aspirations of the human race for a better and secure world, to make this Organization truly representative of mankind, by restoring the right of one quarter of humanity in this Organization.

28. In a real sense we are, at this stage of our lifetime, at the crossroads. If we allow our human nature to remain as it was millions or thousands of years ago, governed by the same emotions and the same fears and subject to the same ends, with the evil within us contending against our better part, we shall find it extremely hard to control the advance of our military technology which has far outstripped the change within our nature as human beings.

29. That is absolutely critical. When we trace the evolution of man from the cave through the millennia to the skyscraper, we find that every instrument from the stone to fire, steel and the steam engine, and everything he has so far used for his comfort, he has also used to destroy his fellow man. Not once has anything been put to the service of man that has not also been used for his destruction. We have now come to the glorious possibilities of putting nuclear power to constructive use by mankind. But we know too well of the costly and deadly preparations going on to make it available for human destruction at the same time. The critical question is this: Can we now, at this stage of human evolution and development, for the first time since we

became *homo erectus*, break with our past by using nuclear power for peaceful purposes alone? I believe we can. To do so, we must outlive some of our ancient prejudices and fears. We must view our selfish interests in a new and more constructive global perspective. Restoring the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China so that it can sit here with us in search of a better world would be a positive step towards that end.

30. My delegation will, as I have said, vote against any measure designed to frustrate the passage of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2. Consequently, we shall vote against draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and the amendments proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia [A/L.637] in so far as they seek to derogate from the substance of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2. We shall also vote against any move designed to bring draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 to the vote before draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2.

31. I am one of those who cannot easily dismiss the assertion recently made by a leading British scientist that there are thousands of other civilizations in the universe. But we must not expect order and peace to be established one day by a superior civilization from outer space. If from this earth we can reach out over hundreds of thousands of miles for the moon and beyond to the stars, we must surely be able to reach within ourselves, within the recesses of our own hearts, for peace and unity on our planet. That peace and order for which we all seek can come only if we make a concerted effort involving all the nations of our world.

32. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (Egypt): Mr. President, much as I should like to begin by very briefly stating our position on China, I think I cannot but ask your permission to spend a few minutes in expressing our indignation at what happened yesterday in New York and today in this Assembly.

33. Our delegation naturally shares Ambassador Malik's anger not only at the shooting in the night at the Soviet Mission, or the lack of effective action on the part of the authorities of the host country after similar attacks on his and other Missions, including mine, but also at allusions to the effect that such barbaric actions may be condoned if not actually encouraged.

34. The representative of Israel, instead of rightfully condemning it, has suggested that we really should try to trace the origins of such barbaric acts—as though anything, indeed, could excuse them. Such utterances can be understood only in the light of Zionist racist theory, which allows the representative of Israel to usurp the right to speak in the name of all Jews, whether living in Russia or in Syria or in my country, and to consider that they are all nationals of Israel, even when they are patriots living for their own countries.

35. Our delegation also heard Ambassador Bush earnestly apologizing, condemning such actions and promising to take meaningful measures in the future [1972nd meeting]. We hope that that will have tangible results.

36. It is a little ironic that the Mayor of New York will tonight give a reception in honour of all of us. Perhaps the Mayor may be given to understand by our absence from

that reception that we really cannot entrust our security to his hospitality—either at the reception or in the city.

37. To return to the item on the agenda, Egypt's position with respect to the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China is well known. We have repeatedly and consistently upheld the view that the Government of the People's Republic of China, as the sole representative of that State, should assume forthwith its rightful place in the United Nations. We have repeatedly pointed out the drawbacks of excluding from the world Organization a people amounting to a quarter of the world's population. Together with many delegations, we have not failed to underline the legal, political and moral considerations which militate in favour of restoring to the People's Republic of China its lawful rights in the Organization. We have made it clear that its participation will strengthen the authority of the Organization, enhance its role and ensure its effectiveness after a quarter-century of existence, when it is supposed to begin a new page in a better life.

38. Well, this year there are new circumstances. We note that the authors of draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, including the United States, now express their belief that the People's Republic of China should be represented in the United Nations, and again they express their belief—they affirm, indeed, the right of representation of the People's Republic of China and its right to sit as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council. It is almost a quotation from the draft resolution. We note that now the authors of the draft resolution, including the United States, plead the cause of universality, a cause that is one of the bases of our stand on the issue of China.

39. These are major and welcome steps. But it cannot escape us that they indicate that the previous United States positions have proved to be untenable. This indicates, we hope, that at the end of this evolution the United States will find itself expressing the same opinion which we express today, which is expressed by the authors of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2—the position we urge this Assembly to adopt now.

40. But also this year the United States delegation invoked the right of self-determination. So are we to understand the Ambassador of the United States to say that the people of Taiwan resent being controlled by the people from continental China; that they want to be independent, and as an independent State they seek to participate in the work of the United Nations? If he did not want to say that, then why did he invoke the right to "self-determination"? Because it is only if the Taiwanese want to determine their future separately from those who prevent them from this determination that there would be a case for applying the principle of self-determination to the people of Taiwan. But this pleading for the Taiwanese so-called right to self-determination is not reflected in the draft resolution presented by the United States or in the explanations given in the speeches from this rostrum. We are, on the contrary, told by the representative of the United States that there is only one China, not two Chinas or one China and one Taiwan. If there is one State of China, then this State is surely entitled to only one delegation. The issue now is really and simply which delegation should represent this one State.

41. The issue which we have before this Assembly is obviously not an issue of granting independence to a nation seeking self-determination. It is not an issue of sanctioning a secession on the island of Taiwan. It is not an issue of admitting a new State, and certainly it is not an issue of expelling an existing Member State. In discussing the item on our agenda, this Assembly is and has been simply seized for many years of one and only one issue—that is, who represents the State, the only State of China, which is a permanent Member of the United Nations representing a quarter of the world's population. To this issue, and only to this, we should limit our consideration. On this, and only on this issue, the General Assembly should act now at this session to restore to the People's Republic of China its rightful place among us.

42. That is why my delegation will vote for the draft resolution proposed by Albania, Algeria and other delegations [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2]; and this is why, like the representative of Uganda who preceded me, we shall vote against all other draft resolutions, as well as against any other motion that seeks to prevent the People's Republic of China from occupying its seat in this Organization.

43. Mr. ECOBESCU (Romania) (*interpretation from French*): Like the speakers who have preceded me, I would first of all wish to avail myself of this opportunity to express our sincere sympathy to the delegation of the Soviet Union because of the reprehensible terrorist act perpetrated against the Soviet Mission to the United Nations. Such acts are deeply damaging and inadmissible and they must be resolutely brought to an end.

44. For 22 years the General Assembly has been confronted with a most important question for the United Nations, namely the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and its organs. During 22 years the anachronistic policy intended to isolate the People's Republic of China on the international level, based on narrow interests which are alien to those of our Organization, has led to the perpetuation of a flagrant anomaly, that of having prevented the people of China from exercising its right to participate in the United Nations because it had chosen a superior form of social organization and a free and independent development.

45. The fact that the right of the People's Republic of China to exercise the prerogatives devolving from its membership in the United Nations was violated has adversely affected the authority of the Organization, has considerably reduced its ability to act effectively to solve international problems and to contribute to the strengthening of the peace and the security of peoples. This proves how very harmful contempt for the profound transformations which have taken place in the world can be. The true source of the prestige and effectiveness of this Organization resides precisely in its ability to reflect the mutations which occur in international life, to apply consistently the principles enshrined in the Charter, and to ensure that these principles will constantly govern the conduct of all Member States.

46. The United Nations cannot content itself with being a passive observer; it cannot limit itself to a mere contemplation of events. At present, when the trends to *détente* and

co-operation are gaining more and more ground in the international arena, it is more necessary than ever that the United Nations should be the faithful image of that positive trend and that it act resolutely so that the trend will continually develop,

47. The entire experience of the Organization proves that the real value of its decisions consists in their being adopted on time and in strict conformity with the Charter. Accordingly, we believe that it is imperative for the General Assembly to decide, at this session, to restore to the People's Republic of China—a founding Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council—all its rights. The adoption of such a decision would constitute an act of realism and of political wisdom; and, at the beginning of the second quarter-century of the existence of our Organization, when all peoples expect its role and effectiveness in the attainment of the objectives of the Charter to increase in a substantial manner, it would mark a historic moment, a turning-point in its activity.

48. China, a great socialist State, has won success and prestige in the development of its economy, science and culture, in consolidating and strengthening its country—eloquent proofs of the creative ability of the talented Chinese people. The People's Republic of China makes an important contribution to the cause of peace and international co-operation. It pronounces itself firmly in favour of the participation of all States, in conditions of complete equality, in the solution of the problems which concern mankind. The people and the Government of China have evinced active solidarity with the peoples struggling for their national and social liberation and for the defence and strengthening of their national independence and sovereignty against imperialism and colonialism.

49. The development of events distinctly brings to light the fact that, without the participation of the People's Republic of China, it will not be possible successfully to solve the major questions of the world we live in.

50. Undeniable evidence of the role of China in international life is the interest shown by an ever-growing number of States in normalizing their relations with the People's Republic of China. This is an eloquent illustration, among others, of the vigorous affirmation of the forces of socialism, as well as of its growing prestige and its influence in the world. The active presence of the People's Republic of China in the world arena will contribute to the strengthening of the anti-imperialist front, to the removal from international life of practices deriving from power politics and domination, to the establishment of relations between States based on equality of rights, mutual respect and esteem.

51. The Socialist Republic of Romania has striven and is consistently striving to put an end to the policy intended to isolate China, to eliminate the barriers that have prevented the People's Republic of China from occupying its lawful place within the United Nations. As in years past, our country pronounces itself resolutely in favour of restoring the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, in the Security Council and in the other agencies of the United Nations system, and for expelling the emissaries of Chiang Kai-shek.

52. We believe that the General Assembly has the lofty responsibility immediately to put an end to a situation in which the higher interests of peoples and of the United Nations itself are being frustrated by actions which are contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter. The course of restoring to the People's Republic of China all its rights in the United Nations, which would be just and in accordance with the Charter, would be a recognition by the General Assembly of the undeniable reality that there is only one China, Taiwan belonging to the People's Republic of China, and that the Government of the People's Republic of China is the only legitimate representative of the Chinese people.

53. The item we are discussing does not in any way refer to the admission or exclusion of any State from the Organization. It is a question of representation. It follows, then, that we must apply the rule which governs this subject. Accordingly, the solution requires a simple majority of votes. Any other approach to the question is not only contrary to the rules of the Organization and to the practice it has constantly observed but is also designed to sabotage the entry of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations.

54. Strict respect for the system of representation established in the Organization compels us to have the seat of China occupied by the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China. That is the only response which the criterion of legality gives us to the question we are discussing.

55. In this case, too, the application of the fundamental standard regarding representation has two inseparable aspects: that the seat of China should be occupied by the legitimate representatives of the People's Republic of China and that those who at present usurp the seat should be expelled from the Organization.

56. These two elements, which are indissolubly linked, are provided for in the operative part of a draft resolution similar to the one submitted at previous sessions, of which Romania has the honour to be one of the sponsors [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2]. In accordance with the operative part of this draft resolution, the General Assembly would decide, without any ambiguity,

“... to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations, and to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the place which they unlawfully occupy at the United Nations and in all the organizations related to it”.

57. The history of the debates of the General Assembly bears witness to the fact that the adversaries of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations have constantly had recourse to procedural tactics and artifices, the essential purpose of which has invariably proved to be the same: to prevent a just solution of this question. In recent years this has been expressed in particular in the so-called theory of “two Chinas” or “one China, one Taiwan”.

58. The United States of America and the countries associated with it have at the present session advanced an apparently new formula—“dual representation”—which is but a disguised form of the false conception concerning the so-called existence of two Chinas.

59. The advocates of that formula declare themselves to be in favour of the representation of the People's Republic of China in the General Assembly and in the Security Council, but at the same time maintain that those who now unlawfully occupy the seat of China should be kept in the Organization. That is what is proposed in the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2.

60. Furthermore, they affirm that this would be proof of a “realistic” and “constructive” attitude. But in fact the purpose sought thereby is once again to block the real solution, encumbering it with a condition which has no substance, and is therefore totally inadmissible. It is not by making an even graver error that one will remedy the error already committed, nor is it by an even greater illegality that an injustice will be corrected.

61. The theory of dual representation runs flagrantly counter to the basic principle of the Charter that every State has in the Organization only one seat which is indivisible and which cannot be occupied by anyone other than a representative of the legitimate Government of the respective State. The formula of “dual representation”, by deliberately distorting the spirit and the letter of the provisions of the Charter, tends to give credit to the idea that Members of the Organization are not States but governments. To admit such a theory would mean making it a statute that two Governments may speak on behalf of one Member State, and this would be a transgression of an essential rule for the activities of our Organization. Obviously, this is an attempt which, if it is not rejected with all the firmness required, could create a precedent which would have particularly harmful consequences for the proper functioning of our Organization in the future.

62. Only one China exists in the world—the People's Republic of China—and that reality must be consecrated here, too, in the United Nations.

63. Taiwan is an integral part of the territory of the People's Republic of China, a territory which is indivisible and inalienable. The *de facto* situation created in regard to Taiwan is a direct consequence of the illicit acts which have jeopardized the territorial integrity and indivisibility of the People's Republic of China and constitute a usurpation by force of its sovereign rights over a province which belongs to it. The Government of the People's Republic of China is prevented from exercising its authority over a part of the Chinese territory—Taiwan—because of foreign military intervention and occupation. The perpetuation of this illegal situation can in no way nullify the sovereign rights of the People's Republic of China over a part of its territory.

64. It is inconceivable that a country could be asked to renounce a part of its territory as the price for exercising a right which it has as a Member of the United Nations. The United Nations cannot be associated with such an action. The General Assembly is duty bound to refuse to lend its

authority to a measure which would engender a grave violation of international legality and justice.

65. The historical experience of nations here present, the resoluteness and ardour which they demonstrated in their struggle to win national independence and unity and the vigour with which they have acted whenever they have been placed before the danger of the division of their own territories has conferred on territorial inviolability and integrity the character of a fundamental principle in contemporary international law.

66. The "two Chinas" theory, whatever the form in which it is presented, cannot and must not be accepted at the United Nations, whose action must be based on the strictest respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of States.

67. In support of keeping in the Organization the representatives of a régime rejected by the people of China, the principle of universality is likewise invoked. However paradoxical it may seem, this is done precisely by those countries which, acting against the imperatives of universality, have in the past prevented, and now also endeavour to prevent, the participation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. This is another example of the deformation of a basic principle of the Charter. Attainment of universality means guaranteeing the right of all sovereign States—I repeat, sovereign States, not legal fictions—to be in the United Nations. The commandment of universality, therefore, also requires as the only legal solution the restoration without further delay of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and the expulsion of those who arbitrarily and improperly occupy the seat of China.

68. For all those reasons, the delegation of Romania categorically opposes the draft resolution on dual representation [*A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2*] and the one on the application of the two-thirds majority [*A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2*] and we shall vote against them. Similarly, we shall oppose any other proposal intended to prevent or postpone the just solution of the question.

69. At the same time, we express the conviction that the General Assembly, while rejecting proposals designed to sabotage the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, will pronounce itself in favour of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2, because this is the course that will cause legality to reign and will increase the prestige and effectiveness of our Organization.

70. Sir Laurence McINTYRE (Australia): As I have listened to the statements made in the course of this debate, with all their references to the United Nations Charter, I am bound to say that I have often wondered whether we were all in fact talking about the same Charter. But perhaps this is after all no more than a tribute to the basic flexibility of the Charter, which I think the representative of the United States reminded us of early in this debate.

71. The position of the Australian Government on the question of Chinese representation in the United Nations

has already been set out by my Foreign Minister in his statement on 4 October in the general debate [*1951st meeting*]. I should like at this time to restate my Government's position, directing my remarks to the item that is now before the Assembly, and to explain the reasons that have led my delegation to sponsor draft resolutions A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2.

72. The question of whether or not the People's Republic of China should be seated in the United Nations is no longer really at issue in the Assembly. The sponsors of both draft resolutions A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 look forward to the representation of the Peking Government in this Organization, and its assumption of the permanent seat allocated to China in the Security Council. The great majority of representatives who spoke in the general debate, and those who preceded me in the discussion of this item, also support the representation of the People's Republic of China. There can therefore be no doubt that the Assembly is virtually unanimous in its wish to see the People's Republic of China take its place in the United Nations and on the Security Council.

73. The decision by the Australian Government to sponsor and to work for the representation of the People's Republic of China flows from a realistic assessment of the developing world situation. It is above all a response to the recent encouraging evidence of Peking's interest in establishing normal relations with the international community as a whole. Australia has reacted to these promising signs by making clear, not only multilaterally but also bilaterally, its desire for the eventual normalization of its own relations with the People's Republic of China.

74. My delegation considers it both appropriate and desirable that the People's Republic of China should now be represented in the United Nations and should be given the opportunity to work in concert with all States, large and small, in promoting the purposes and principles of the Charter. The representation of the People's Republic of China will doubtless bring some problems of adjustment. But if our hopes are realized, it can advance the cause of international peace and security and enhance the prospects for peaceful and orderly solutions to many of the problems of the world and particularly those of the Asian and Pacific region.

75. I want to make it clear, therefore, that the Australian Government supports the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and the allocation to it of China's permanent seat on the Security Council. Let there be no mistake about this. That is why we have become a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2. The only question before us is how the representation of the People's Republic of China can be achieved without doing violence to the Charter, or to what the Charter calls "the principles of justice and international law", or to the realities of the current international situation.

76. By this I mean to say that, while the Australian Government has no wish or intention to impede the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, there are certain inescapable facts that cannot be ignored. We must acknowledge that the Republic

of China, a founder Member of the United Nations, no longer exercises *de facto* control over all of the territory it held before the Central People's Government's accession to power on the mainland. At the same time, it must also be recognized that the People's Republic of China does not control the island of Taiwan, which is governed indisputably by the Republic of China. Neither Government has relinquished its claims to the territory now occupied and ruled by the other, but these claims in no way qualify the realities of control. Faced with these realities, the United Nations must now try to find some way of giving practical effect to the changes that have taken place in China since the foundation of the United Nations. We should not refuse representation to the People's Republic of China simply because it does not control all of the territory of China. Equally, we must not deny continuing membership to the Republic of China because it, too, does not control all of that territory.

77. The fact is that since 1949 there have been two Governments, each exercising authority within different parts of the territory that was governed by the Republic of China in 1945. Each of these Governments has been recognized bilaterally, regionally and internationally. Both have an entitlement to representation in the United Nations, if they desire it. It seems to my delegation that the most practical, equitable and, if I may say so, honourable way for the General Assembly to meet the situation as it exists is to provide for the seating of both Governments. That is why, in draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, sponsored by my Government, we have adopted wording that we maintain accords with the present realities. The draft resolution notes that since the founding of the United Nations, fundamental changes have occurred in China and it affirms, having regard to the existing factual situation, the right of representation of the People's Republic of China, and recommends that it be seated as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council. But it also affirms the continued right of representation of the Republic of China.

78. The Australian Government maintains, indeed insists, that this proposal is in harmony with the essential substance and intention of the Charter. We believe that our proposal conforms to the existing political realities in preserving the international status of the Republic of China, as well as acknowledging the authority of the People's Republic over more than 700 million people, or more than a quarter of the world's population.

79. Draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 ignores, I submit, some of these important realities. It charges the Republic of China with unlawful occupancy—I repeat, unlawful occupancy—of a seat it has occupied responsibly and constructively for more than 25 years, and it calls for its expulsion from the United Nations forthwith.

80. Let me repeat what is surely self-evident: that the Republic of China continues to govern a substantial area of territory and to exercise full authority over more than 1.4 million people, which is a greater population than that of two-thirds of the Member countries of the United Nations. The Government of the Republic of China has shown great competence in managing its economy. It has led its people to the achievement of standards of living among the highest

in Asia, and, as the representatives of Japan and Liberia have pointed out, it has become a substantial donor of economic and technical assistance in many parts of the world. I emphasize this as a measure of its effectiveness as a Government exercising continuing authority.

81. Let me repeat, moreover, that the Republic of China became a founding Member of the United Nations by satisfying the requirements of Article 3 of the Charter, and that it is explicitly named in Articles 23 and 110 of the Charter. It has faithfully discharged all the responsibilities and obligations of membership. It has been a loyal, zealous State Member of this Organization and can be relied upon to uphold the purposes and principles of the Charter. If it lays claim to more territory than it controls, so do many other States Members of the United Nations; so indeed does the People's Republic of China. In short, the status of the Republic of China as an effective Government, and its record as a Member of the United Nations, give no grounds whatever for expelling it from the membership of our Organization.

82. It has been stated several times in the course of this debate, particularly by the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2, that no question of the expulsion of a Member State arises and that Article 18 of the Charter is thus not relevant. But the word "expel" is written clearly in that draft resolution and must surely attract the application of Article 18, which lists the expulsion of Members as an important question requiring decision by a two-thirds majority of the Members present and voting. The representative of Costa Rica has quoted [1966th meeting] from numerous statements made in the general debate underlining what we must all acknowledge—that the representative of China is indubitably an important question.

83. I believe that all Members would do well to look very carefully at any proposal for the expulsion of a Member from the United Nations. Expulsion in this case would set a highly significant precedent, and precedents, as we know, have a dangerous habit of becoming relevant in future situations which none of us might wish for.

84. Let us not imagine either that we can salve our conscience by saying that we are merely deciding a matter of credentials. We are not. It is still less acceptable to charge the Republic of China, as it has been charged here, with having sat in this Assembly since 1949 with credentials obtained and accepted under false pretences. This can only be a reflection on the Assembly itself. The fact is that the territorial claims of the two Governments are identical, even though the realities of territorial control are not. To deny representation to either Government is either to shut one Government out or to expel the other. I submit that neither is reasonable nor just. Neither is designed to promote those purposes that we are here to serve and to promote. That is why Australia, as well as sponsoring the dual representation draft resolution contained in document A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, has also sponsored the non-expulsion draft resolution contained in document A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2.

85. There is one further point I want to make. A good deal has been said, even in the course of this debate, about

universality. My delegation has listened with interest to the numerous statements made during this session that have given support to the need for universality in terms of United Nations membership. Though the concept of universality is nowhere enshrined as a principle in the Charter, it is one that many of us have come to consider as central to the future effectiveness of the United Nations. If universality is indeed to be accepted as a principal touchstone in judging future applications for membership in the United Nations, it would be odd, to say the least, for us to begin by expelling one of our present Members and thereby depriving its people, as we would be depriving them, of a representative voice in this world Organization.

86. I would ask the Assembly to approach the question of the representation of China in an unprejudiced and realistic way. If we do this, then I suggest that the considerable measure of agreement among us can be translated into a just and statesmanlike decision. This will mean—to sum up what I have said—a decision that meets the following criteria.

87. The first is the representation in the United Nations of the People's Republic of China and the allocation of the permanent seat of China in the Security Council to the most populous nation on earth. On this we have virtually unanimous agreement.

88. The second is the reaffirmation of the principle—protected in Article 18 of the Charter—that no Member of the United Nations should be expelled from membership unless it has shown itself unable or unwilling to discharge the duties and obligations of membership.

89. The third is the acceptance of present-day realities as they indisputably exist. Whether we like it or not, the realities lie not in claims, but in facts. The People's Republic of China controls the mainland; the Republic of China controls an area consisting mainly of Taiwan. We are not here to adjudicate claims, but to take account of the situation that is actually before us.

90. The fourth is that the ideal of the universality of United Nations membership will not be fostered by expelling peace-loving and industrious Governments that exercise effective authority. We should move instead towards greater universality by embracing in our membership Governments that are faithful to the United Nations Charter and are willing and able to give effect to the purposes and principles enshrined in it.

91. Finally, I would like to say that we hope that the decisions taken on this issue by this Assembly will mark a turning-point towards the path that we all earnestly want to follow—the path to peace and the peaceful settlement of disputes. We would hope that the representation of the People's Republic of China will result in greater understanding and better relations between that Government and the international community as a whole. We would also hope that the representation in the United Nations of both the People's Republic and the Republic of China might open the way towards a *modus vivendi* between them and perhaps even an ultimate accommodation of their present differences. Those are hopes to which, under our Charter, we not only can, but have a duty to, aspire, and it is in

these hopes that my delegation confidently commends the draft resolutions contained respectively in document A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2—for which we shall seek priority and for which we shall certainly expect to gain priority—and in document A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 for acceptance by this Assembly.

92. Mr. ÅLGÅRD (Norway): It has rightly been pointed out on many occasions during this debate that the question of Chinese representation is one of the most significant items before this session of the General Assembly. The debate this year is taking place in a changed atmosphere and in new circumstances, compared to earlier debates on this question. The rights of the People's Republic of China to representation in our Organization have now been practically unanimously accepted in this Assembly.

93. The Norwegian Government has consistently supported these lawful rights of the People's Republic of China and will continue to do so. Norway recognized the People's Republic of China 21 years ago and we have ever since maintained friendly relations.

94. The problem before us today does not concern the admission of a new Member or the expulsion of an old one. China is a founding Member of this Organization and will continue to be a Member. We are only asked to decide who shall represent that Member.

95. It is being argued that it would be unreasonable to expel Taiwan from a seat which it has occupied for such a long time. But it has been much more unreasonable that the People's Republic of China has been kept outside the United Nations during this period. And the situation will not become any more reasonable if the People's Republic of China, as a result of our deliberations, should find it necessary to remain outside the United Nations for another period.

96. It is clear that the People's Republic of China will not take its seat in the United Nations unless it is recognized as the sole representative of China in the Organization. This, I repeat, has been made absolutely clear by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

97. An acceptance by the General Assembly of some kind of a "two Chinas" solution would in fact imply the division of a Member State. Neither the People's Republic of China nor the authorities on Taiwan have accepted such a solution.

98. The future development of relations between the Chinese motherland and the island of Taiwan cannot be settled through a vote in the United Nations, but only through a process of accommodation.

99. There seems to be a general agreement that the People's Republic of China, with its growing influence in international affairs, is a reality which cannot be ignored in world affairs. My delegation would like to add that we expect the People's Republic of China to contribute to the work of the United Nations in a positive and constructive spirit. The participation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations will enable the Organization to deal more realistically with problems of world-wide importance.

100. To conclude, I should like to state the position of the Norwegian Government, which follows from the above-mentioned main principles. Norway will vote in favour of the draft resolution introduced by 23 countries on the "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations" [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2] and will vote against proposals which obstruct or imply a delay in the participation of the People's Republic of China in the work of the United Nations or make a solution to this question difficult.

101. Mr. KLUSÁK (Czechoslovakia) (*translated from Russian*): Before turning to the main subject of our meeting, permit me to express to the delegation of the Soviet Union and the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations our comradely sympathy and solidarity in connexion with yesterday's unprecedented attack carried out by criminal elements against the Permanent Mission of the Soviet Union, in which lives might have been lost.

102. We in the Czechoslovak delegation share the indignation expressed in connexion with this and with similar incidents which took place today in the General Assembly, as well as the concern already expressed from this rostrum by a number of representatives that active measures should be taken to prevent the repetition of such dangerous acts of provocation. This would undoubtedly be in the interests of all Members of the United Nations.

103. In approximately one month's time it will be 22 years since the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Chinese Central People's Government officially informed the United Nations of the historic changes that had taken place in his country.¹ The Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China had become the representative of the Chinese people, and the delegates of the Kuomintang had lost the right to represent China in the United Nations. Since that time, for almost a quarter of a century, the question of the exercise of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China has been on the agenda of the General Assembly and other United Nations organs. For more than two decades the People's Republic of China has been denied the opportunity to take its rightful place in our Organization. In contradiction to the Charter and the true state of affairs, this place is still occupied by private individuals who do not represent anyone.

104. From the very beginning, Czechoslovakia has always, irrespective of its relations with the People's Republic of China at any given moment, uncompromisingly upheld the position of principle that only the Government of the People's Republic of China is empowered to represent China in our Organization. History has borne out our point of view; other socialist States have also adopted the same opinion. History has also confirmed that attempts to hinder the People's Republic of China from taking part in the activity of the United Nations mainly hurt the Organization itself.

105. The present discussion of this matter at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly clearly illustrates once again what has already long been well known, namely,

who was and still is interested today in maintaining an abnormal state of affairs. It also shows whose policy is really preventing a decision on the question of the representation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

106. The fact of the matter is that variations of the same artificial obstacles are put forward year after year with the sole aim of halting, and now of attempting at least to slow down what is an inevitable development. The latest product of these aspirations is the transparent attempt to block the arrival of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations by imposing the idea of the so-called simultaneous representation of the People's Republic of China and Taiwan.

107. This approach, expressed primarily in draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, which was introduced by the United States delegation, is presented as a realistic one, despite or perhaps because of the fact that the official position of the Government of the People's Republic of China, stated in document A/8470 of 15 October 1971, is well known. The document shows that the People's Republic of China will not occupy its place in the United Nations until the Chiang Kai-shek régime withdraws from it. Plans for so-called simultaneous representation or membership of the People's Republic of China and Taiwan in the United Nations are being imposed on us by all possible means, but without the participation in the discussions of the People's Republic of China. Yet in essence these represent direct interference in the internal affairs of China.

108. These attempts are based here on the argument that the United Nations should not prejudice any future settlement between the People's Republic of China and Taiwan. If the attempts to introduce the concept of two Governments of China really represent an attempt to destroy the territorial integrity of a State Member of the United Nations, to wrest a part of its territory away from the People's Republic of China—as indeed they do—then of what future settlement can we speak? Perhaps the supporters of this resolution have forgotten the international agreements which were the consequence of the victory of the United Nations over the Axis Powers and the Cairo Declaration of 1943, confirmed in 1945 at Potsdam, in which it is quite clearly stated that Taiwan belongs to China.

109. It is clear that the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is not a matter of the acceptance or of the exclusion of a State. Taiwan is not a State but a Chinese province, returned to China after the Second World War. Consequently, it cannot have any lawful right to speak as the representative of a founder State of the United Nations. At all sessions of the General Assembly so far held, the question of the rightful representation of China in the United Nations has always essentially been for the Czechoslovak delegation a question of the recognition of the credentials of the lawful representatives of China, who since 1949 have been the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

110. The so-called "two Chinas" theory, in all its forms, was invented not to support the just representation of

¹ See document A/1123 (mimeographed).

China in the United Nations but in order to make it impossible, or to postpone it yet again.

111. The Czechoslovak delegation at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, as at all previous sessions, considers that the only acceptable solution to the question of the representation of China would be one which permitted the representatives of the People's Republic of China to occupy their lawful seat in the United Nations while the henchmen of the Chiang Kai-shek régime left the United Nations. We shall, therefore, vote for draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2. At the same time, the Czechoslovak delegation rejects and will continue to reject any manoeuvres designed to prevent such a solution.

112. Mr. ESONO MICA (Equatorial Guinea) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, this being my first statement in the General Assembly I wish my first words to be words of congratulation to you on behalf of my delegation on your brilliant election to the presidency of this twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly. We are fully convinced that your personal and professional qualifications are more than sufficient guarantees to ensure that our debates will be guided to a successful conclusion. On this occasion I also wish to express our admiration for the brilliant work done by your predecessor, Mr. Edvard Hambro, Ambassador of Norway, who with great skill and wisdom guided the debates at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly last year, when I had occasion to attend as a member of the delegation from my Government.

113. I should also like to avail myself of this opportunity to extend a welcome on behalf of my Government to the new Members of the Organization, Bahrain, Bhutan, Qatar and Oman. With these four new Members the United Nations now has a membership of 131 States.

114. The Government of the People's Republic of China has been prevented from representing its country as a *de facto* and *de jure* Member because of the intense rivalries of the cold war in the decade of the 1950s. It is lack of realism that this situation should continue in the era of peaceful coexistence. The "two Chinas" policy is totally devoid of realism since both the Government of the People's Republic of China and the governing clique in Taiwan maintain that there is only one China. It is therefore a grave error for this General Assembly to be the artisan of the division of the people of China.

115. Several complaints have been presented by the People's Republic of China to this General Assembly demonstrating that Taiwan-Formosa-is an integral part of the territory of China, such as the complaint of 28 November 1950 when the Security Council heard a representative of the People's Republic of China recalling the announcement of 27 June made by the President of the United States of America, who was then Mr. Harry S. Truman, who had ordered the United States navy to prevent any attacks being launched against Formosa.² The representative of China proved that this was aggression against China since, according to the Cairo Declaration of

1943 and the Potsdam Declaration of 1945, Formosa is Chinese territory.

116. On 31 January 1955 the Security Council adopted a decision to invite a representative of the People's Republic of China to participate in the debate. The invitation was not accepted because the representative of the People's Republic of China considered that the liberation of Taiwan was an internal matter and felt he could not participate in deliberations of the Security Council until its representative attended on behalf of China.

117. This intangible right of the State of China could not be exercised since 1949 since its legitimate representatives were prevented from occupying the seat which belongs to them alone. Nevertheless, such has been the policy of the United States of America, which was imposed on this Organization, together with its satellites which still try to confuse international opinion by uttering sophistries such as those proposed in draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 as well as the application of Article 18 of the Charter as presented in document A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2. It is regrettable that they do not realize that they have made a great leap to reach that famous Article 18 without mentioning at least the provision of paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the Charter which in my opinion is applicable to the case we are considering.

118. The delegation of Equatorial Guinea has concentrated all its attention on these essential purposes and, in order not to confuse this problem with procedural or other secondary matters, we have, together with 22 other delegations presented to the General Assembly the draft resolution which appears in document A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 entitled "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations", which its final paragraph, calls upon us to expel forthwith and finally the usurpers of the Government of Chiang Kai-shek.

119. It may be difficult for some to do that, if we consider that there does exist a republic christened Taiwan or Formosa or whatever one may wish to call it. But draft resolution A/L.630 does not speak of the expulsion of a nation, or of a Member of this General Assembly, but rather of the expulsion of some provincial representatives who, because they are represented here, cause great defamation to this Organization and great scorn to accredited nations who sit side by side with a province that is also accredited. This would occur were we to take into account the draft resolution submitted by the Washington Government and some of its satellites [*A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2*].

120. We must bear in mind that the Chiang Kai-shek clique still holds Taiwan not by consent of the great Chinese people, which expelled it from one of the earth's largest territories, but because of North American aggression against that Chinese province.

121. The colonial occupation of Taiwan is not and cannot be a source of law. The group of renegades remaining there at the service of and by the will of foreign occupiers cannot claim to represent the people that defeated them. To try to disguise that fiction with the titles of "sovereignty over a State" is an insult to all States, as I said earlier, and a

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, 527th meeting, p. 5.*

knowing mockery of the most elementary principles of international law.

122. I would draw the attention of all independent nations represented here by their legitimate representatives to the words of Ambassador Bush [1966th meeting] to the effect that they should carefully take into account whether at some time in the future they may not find themselves in a position similar to that in which, according to him, some are trying to place the so-called Republic of China. Those words reflect North American imperialism's idea of national sovereignty.

123. Independent States represented here are not comparable to a régime that is the product of imperialist aggression. They do not owe their sovereignty to movements of the Yankee Seventh Fleet. Accordingly, the General Assembly must energetically reject that false idea.

124. My country cannot lend its support to the idea of keeping outside this lofty international Organization a country with about 850 million human beings, nor can we support the idea that they are represented by a group of discontented exiles and maintained by a foreign Power. It is regrettable that the United Nations should be involved in continuing to accept a situation in which the provisions of the Charter are discarded or ignored out of self-interest and convenience.

125. The Government of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea, under the wise leadership of its President and great comrade, Don Francisco Macías Nguema, is not frightened by the frivolous argument that restoring the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China would imply the expulsion of one or several Members from this Organization and that that would set a dangerous precedent. The reasons I advanced earlier make it quite clear that that is a weak argument. It is not a matter of expelling a Member but of expelling some spurious representatives. A nation can in no way be represented by a clique that rebels against its legally recognized Government.

126. My delegation is categorically against voting first on draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2, which refers to the application of Article 18 or the Charter, because we consider that that Article is not applicable to the item under consideration.

127. My delegation is also against the draft resolution presented by the United States and its allies appearing in document A/L.633/Add.1 and 2 because we consider it reflects the idea of dual representation in this Assembly for the people of China. Its second operative paragraph reads: "Affirms the continued right of representation of the Republic of China".

128. My delegation is also against any amendment which may have been or will be proposed to the draft resolution contained in document A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2.

129. Were we to reminisce a little, in all the statements made during the political debate, we should find that almost all speakers referred to the application of the concept of universality at this twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly. Hence my delegation hopes that this

concept will be applied with the presence of the State having the largest population in the world, the People's Republic of China, whose Government speaks for a third of mankind.

130. My Government believes the time has come for this Organization to break the rigid mould in which its thinking has been enclosed in regard to the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. This rigid mould would be broken by the unanimous vote of all delegations in favour of the draft resolution proposed by Albania and of which my delegation is a sponsor.

131. Finally, I repeat, my delegation opposes the priority requested by the United States representative, Mr. Bush, for the vote on draft resolution A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2. My delegation not only objects to giving priority in the voting to that draft resolution but also requests it be rejected for the reasons I have stated.

132. If we unanimously vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2 we shall have abided by the concept of justice which is badly needed in this international Organization. Were we to do the contrary, we should fulfil the prophecy that "those who preach truth will shed bitter tears".

133. Mr. THAUNG KYI (Burma): The nature of the debate on the item under consideration shows clearly that the most pressing problem before the Assembly is the question of the proper and rightful representation of China in the United Nations. This problem has been before the world Organization since 1949, and this year the General Assembly has been presented with an opportunity of the utmost importance to remedy a situation whereby the People's Republic of China, representing about a quarter of the world's population, has been deprived of its legitimate right of representation in the United Nations and all the other rights that go with it.

134. It will be borne in mind that the Government of the People's Republic of China, as also the Nationalist Chinese, are unanimous in their view that there is only one China, and that Taiwan is a part of China. Thus it follows logically that the question of Chinese representation in the United Nations is not one of two Chinas but solely and simply who should occupy China's seat.

135. China is a founding Member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, and stripped of extraneous considerations, there can have been no question as to who should have been representing China in the United Nations since 1949.

136. If there is a belated admission today that the People's Republic of China has been unjustifiably deprived of representation in the United Nations for the last 22 years, and a belated recognition that it is urgently necessary to seat in the United Nations the representative of a quarter of the world's population in order to strengthen the prestige and authority of the world Organization so that it will more effectively serve as the centre for harmonizing the actions of nations, then the delegation of Burma feels strongly that the Assembly should set aside all other considerations extraneous to this crucial matter.

137. The delegation of Burma, consistent with the stand it has taken on numerous occasions in the past that the Government of the People's Republic of China is the sole legitimate Government representing the Chinese people and that, therefore, the Government of the People's Republic of China should be the sole representative of the Chinese people in the United Nations, has sponsored draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2.

138. As to draft resolutions A/L.632 and Add.1 and 2 and A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, the delegation of Burma will vote against them because the real issue before the Assembly is the assumption by the People's Republic of China of the seat to which it is rightfully entitled, and not of affirming its right of representation in the United Nations which is not now, or has ever been, an issue. Therefore, the above resolutions amount, in the opinion of the delegation of Burma, to a misrepresentation of facts. Moreover, although these resolutions call, in part, for the affirmation of the right of representation of the People's Republic of China, this call has been effectively negated by linking it to the seating of two Chinas in the United Nations and therefore has no merit.

139. Mr. GEGHMAN (Yemen): Many people are at loss with regard to the United States policy and intentions concerning China. On the one hand, the United States declares that there is only one China. On the other hand, it is pushing for two Chinas and dual representation for China. On the one hand, we are witnessing a new mood of initiative and flirtation and highly-placed people going and coming between Peking and Washington. On the other hand, we are experiencing here this intransigent stand where it has reached the point of threats and blackmail.

140. Some have suggested that the United States is in trouble. On the home front, besides all the other difficulties, there is the still-powerful China lobby—the so-called China lobby. On the Pacific front, things have not been going so well. The American position in Indo-China is deteriorating every day. Japan is regaining its islands, including Okinawa. Even in South Korea the Americans are not sure of their position. There remains Taiwan. It is the only and, indeed, the ideal place for a big military base in the west Pacific area. But the United States could ensure this American outpost only through the States members of the General Assembly. Only the United Nations could guarantee a permanent military base for America in Taiwan by slashing Taiwan from the wrist of China and giving it the status of a State with membership in the United Nations.

141. Plausible as this may be, this thesis could bear only a secondary importance in the American strategy, for in this day and age military bases on foreign soil, however important, can serve only limited and short-term purposes, in particular for local and limited wars. The policy of confrontation, containment, *cordon sanitaire*, which was the fashion of the 1940s and 1950s has little value in today's global strategy. What the United States primarily wants, going through all this trouble of paradoxical stands, self-contradictions, and puzzling self-defeating manoeuvres, is to have China for itself for just this one more year.

142. The Americans are a pragmatic people. They know that China cannot be kept out of the United Nations for

long, but they want to drive a hard bargain. For 20 years they have been saying "no", and it has been "no". Now they want to get something for their "yes" when they say it. Mr. Nixon, a shrewd strategist, wants to go to Peking next year with a nice little extra card up his sleeve. By adopting the 23-Power draft resolution known as the Albanian draft resolution, of which Yemen is a sponsor, [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2] the General Assembly will deprive Mr. Nixon of this little extra card. The American visitors will not be able to say to their Chinese hosts, "Look, it is not the Albanians, it is not those small Powers in the United Nations, however numerous they may be, who can admit you to the United Nations. It is we who can admit you or keep you out, and if the price is right, why we might even consider becoming a co-sponsor of the Albanian draft resolution. As for the Members who have been supporting us, we do not foresee any difficulties in convincing them to adopt our new stand. After all, in the past 22 years we have changed our position regarding China several times."

143. The United States is putting the United Nations in an awkward and even humiliating position by attempting to use it as a tool to serve its own policies and interests. The General Assembly must put an end to this situation by adopting our draft resolution and defeating all other drafts, amendments or manoeuvres, and thus disposing of this question once and for all. This talk about the expulsion of a nice, decent, law-abiding Member has no place in this house, and it has nothing to do with Article 18 of the Charter. After all, the island upon which this, our United Nations Headquarters is built, and which has a population in the millions would be as nice, decent and law-abiding a Member, though not quite as hospitable and peace-loving a one—as past and recent experience has proved—as any of us if it were granted membership in the United Nations. The problem here is that Manhattan would need a foreign military base to slash it off the continental United States and sponsor its cause in the United Nations. But with the United States proximity to Manhattan and with the vested interests of this super-Power in the island, I guess the drive to liberate the hardworking, decent law-abiding, freedom-loving people of Manhattan is a hopeless case.

144. I ask, for how long are we, the small countries, required to sway in any and every direction the United States wishes in this world Parliament in which one third of the world's population has been deprived of membership because the United States has thus far withheld its blessing? Even the major allies of the United States have deserted it, so far as the question before us is concerned, because those otherwise staunch and loyal allies and friends have found the United States stand on this question inexcusable and indefensible. We, the small countries which comprise the overwhelming majority of this Organization's membership, bear the responsibility for upholding the lofty principles of the Charter; we must reaffirm, again and again, the validity of the premises of universalism, collectivism and egalitarianism upon which this world Parliament is based.

145. We all know that the gentlemen sitting amongst us behind the sign of China do not represent China. We have known this simple fact for the past 22 years. We could have dealt with it as a simple procedural matter 22 years ago. We

cannot now correct that error, which the Americans led us to commit, by perpetrating another error at their behest. Nor can we wait until Washington gives us the green light, after Mr. Nixon's visit to Peking.

146. I appeal to the honourable representatives to let history record that it was here, in this General Assembly, through the collective will and action of all the Members of the United Nations—and not through the hard-driven bargain of American visitors to Peking—that the lawful rights of the Chinese people in the United Nations were restored. Let us restore the prestige and the dignity of the United Nations and of the small countries by adopting unanimously draft resolution A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2. That is the only appropriate course of action, and the time is now. Later it will be too late.

147. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): We meet this year in an atmosphere of hope, as a result of important developments which have altered the whole climate of this annual debate. I refer not only to the fact that last year a majority of States voted in favour of seating in the United Nations the representatives of the Chinese People's Republic [1913th meeting], but also to the initiative taken by President Nixon in seeking to bring about a new relationship between the United States and that country. Thus, for the first time, there is virtually a consensus in favour of seating the representatives of the People's Republic of China in our Organization, even though other aspects of this question remain a source of division.

148. My Government recognized the Government of the People's Republic of China as long ago as January 1950; and we have consistently voted for the so-called Albanian resolution, which calls for the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations and recognizes that the representatives of that Government are the only lawful representatives of China to the United Nations. We shall vote for that draft resolution [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2] again this year. We believe that the seating of the representatives of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations is long overdue and that the General Assembly must now act urgently and effectively to redress a situation which has debarred a nation of 800 million people from assuming its rightful place in our Organization.

149. As my Secretary of State said in his speech in the General Assembly on 29 September—and I should like to quote his actual words:

“In the Far East, we have seen that China has for too long isolated itself from the world community. That has its dangers. When it plays its full part here in New York, a mighty voice will be added to our counsels and a major step will have been taken towards the true representation here of the balance of world power and world opinion, from which consensus can be hammered out, however painful at times that process may be.” [1944th meeting, para. 105.]

150. As regards the other draft resolutions before us, at this late stage in the debate I do not propose to set out in detail the arguments on which my Government's position is based. Those arguments have been reflected in the state-

ments of many previous speakers. I myself indicated earlier, at the General Committee's 191st meeting, my delegation's doubts as to the compatibility with the Charter of any proposal providing for dual representation. I would simply say that the United Kingdom's attitude is governed by our view that the Government of the People's Republic of China is the sole legal Government of China and is, therefore, entitled to occupy the place which the Charter accords to that State. There is no question here of the expulsion of a Member State; it is, rather, a question of who should represent an existing Member State. In the light of that, my delegation will vote against any substantive draft resolution or amendment which provides for dual representation.

151. Moreover, as I have said earlier, it is the primary concern of my Government to see that the Government of the People's Republic of China take its place in our Organization with no further delay. It is clear—not least from recent statements of the Government of the People's Republic of China—that draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2 and the amendments contained in document A/L.637 would in practice involve further delay. Thus, for that reason too, we shall vote against them, as also against any procedural proposals which would have the same effect.

152. To sum up, my Government believes that the participation of the representatives of the People's Republic of China in our deliberations is a matter both of justice and of urgency. It is right that they should be enabled to take up the seat to which they are legally entitled; and it is imperative that they should do so without further delay, because to perpetuate the isolation of China and the exclusion of representatives of that great country from our Organization can benefit no one. We need the contribution that China can make to our search for solutions of the many desperate problems which confront us here in the United Nations. In particular, China, as a nuclear Power, should participate in our discussions on disarmament.

153. The United Nations cannot live up to its potential either as a world Organization or as a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations until the representatives of the People's Republic of China are able to come into our midst. For this, the time has surely come.

154. Mr. MANDI (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*interpretation from French*): In a statement made during the general debate [1942nd meeting], my Foreign Minister spoke at length in explanation of my Government's position on the thorny problem of Chinese representation in the United Nations. Our Organization, whose basic purpose is to serve international peace and security, must indeed, we believe, always take account of the realities of our time and of the world in which we live. It is our sincere belief that we would be lacking in political realism if, in considering the problem of the representation of China, we failed to take into account the changes which have taken place in China since 1945. It is, in fact, undeniable that following the civil war which broke out in that country there have been two Governments in China since 1949, one exercising its real and effective authority in Peking and the other in Taipei. This is a fact known to us all.

155. We also know—and this is incontestable—that the People's Republic of China exercises neither *de facto* nor *de jure* authority over Taiwan. This, too, is a reality of our times which impels us to advocate, for the solution of this problem, formulas which harmonize with the facts, if we truly wish to work for international peace and security.

156. All countries of the world, including the People's Republic of China, have an interest in respecting the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter if we wish world peace, which is the essential objective of our Organization, to be ensured.

157. It will soon be 20 years that we have been discussing the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. To those who today support the idea of a so-called restoration to the People's Republic of China of its lawful rights, I would be tempted to pose the question whether, in the case which is now before us, one can speak of any restoration of the rights of one who is a Member of the United Nations. Because the restoration of rights of a Member would, as we see it, clearly mean that we are seeking to restore to it the rights of which it had been deprived. But this is not the case of the People's Republic of China which has never formally adhered to the United Nations Charter.

158. There is, of course, a seat in the United Nations reserved for China, and to our knowledge, it is the China of Taiwan which has occupied that seat for more than 20 years. Is it possible, in view of this situation, to demand the expulsion of this Member of the United Nations because the other China wishes to enter it? This is a dangerous slope for our Organization to begin sliding down. This attitude is contrary to the spirit of the United Nations Charter.

159. If the expulsion of a Member of the Organization constitutes a grave violation of the Charter, the same is true of the attitude of a State which would set particular preconditions for its entry into the Organization. All Members of the United Nations being equal before the Charter, there can be no question of any of them having special prerogatives. If mainland China sets conditions on its entry into the United Nations, we cannot accept that, because we would run the risk of creating a dangerous precedent in the history of our Organization. In his statement on 28 September last before this august Assembly, my Foreign Minister said:

"It is necessary—I repeat this—for the Peking régime to adhere formally to the Charter. Otherwise, we might admit here representatives who would have only rights and absolutely no obligations because they had never committed themselves to any." [1942nd meeting, para. 193.]

160. My Government believes that those who wish to reduce the problem of Chinese representation to a simple problem of identity because the two Chinas have the same civilization and the same culture, are committing a grave error both politically and legally. In our view, the preservation of the international status of the Republic of China in the United Nations is intimately bound up with the present realities in that country. Any claim of either party to

exercise its effective sovereignty over the whole of the Chinese territory is false and contrary to reality.

161. Given all these considerations, my Government will oppose any decision to expel from this Organization the representatives of a Government which in law and in fact exercises its authority over a population of 14 millions and which is responsible for their destiny. Nevertheless, if this Assembly embarks upon a decision whose purpose would be to expel a current Member of the Organization, we believe this would be an important question and should be discussed as a matter of priority before the consideration of any draft resolution placed before this Assembly.

162. This leads me to explain my Government's view on the two draft resolutions one submitted by Albania [A/L.630 and Add.1 and 2] and the other by the United States [A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2]. In my Government's view, the Albanian draft resolution, which seeks accreditation for the Government of the People's Republic of China as the only legal Government of all China, is a Utopian vision of the reality of today's China. If this draft resolution were to be adopted by our Assembly, it would create a dangerous precedent and would have grave consequences. By adopting it, our Organization would be failing in its mission. For we are here to work for international peace and security and not to create situations which might dangerously jeopardize our own future. My delegation will accordingly vote against the Albanian draft resolution, because we refuse to betray our hope of seeing the international community develop in peace.

163. On the other hand, my delegation would emphasize that the Republic of China, a founding Member of the United Nations which has always faithfully discharged its obligations to the Organization for 20 years and whose conduct has remained irreproachable in its relations with other States, must keep its seat in the United Nations.

164. In regard to draft resolution A/L.633 and Add.1 and 2, submitted by the United States and supported by various countries, we understand the motives which impelled these countries to submit a draft resolution that seems to take account of the realities of the world in which we are now living. We commend the efforts made by the sponsors of that draft resolution, which, we believe, represents an acceptable compromise. However, despite this objective evaluation, my Government, for reasons peculiar to itself, is unable to support it, because it would bring into our Organization a country which, scorning the ideals of the Charter, makes domestic subversion the golden rule of its foreign policy and has openly interfered in the domestic affairs of my own country. True to its fundamental political options, therefore, and inspired by authentic Congolese nationalism, the Democratic Republic of the Congo will oppose the admission of the People's Republic of China to our Organization until such time as there is clear proof that the leaders of People's China are definitely resolved to change their foreign policy.

165. Mr. BETANCES (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): For two decades, the Dominican Republic has supported the Republic of China, for more than political reasons and in recognition of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. We firmly believe that it

has never been more necessary to avoid any weakening of the principles as the only means to maintain the confidence which Member States must have in the Organization.

166. My delegation wishes to place this statement on record. If the principles of self-determination for peoples suffer any reverses, then, far from moving forward toward the preservation of peace, we shall be taking a regrettable step backwards.

167. We are sponsors and we will vote in favour of the draft resolution for dual representation as a sacrifice to find a solution which can contribute to the continuity of the membership of the Republic of China in the United Nations. But we wish to place on record that, in taking that position, we shall continue to be faithful to the principles which the Charter recognizes as applying to all its Members. If the draft resolution on dual representation which will be put to the vote will guarantee a just peace, then the sacrifice we are making will be compensated for in part by the duty of our Organization to watch over the preservation of peace in all areas of the world.

Statements concerning the incident that occurred at the Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Wednesday, 20 October 1971 (continued)

168. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply with respect to this question.

169. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): On behalf of my delegation, I should like to express my deepest sympathy to the Soviet Mission in connexion with its horrifying experience yesterday. Indeed, everyone in this hall will sympathize with the members of the Soviet Mission and we all understand their deep anxiety about their safety and freedom from harassment. It was a pity therefore—and I confess that I was quite astonished—that in his second speech at the 1972nd meeting Ambassador Malik saw fit to bring in an entirely different matter. He chose to refer to my Government in the most derogatory terms, trying to suggest that the actions it took recently for the protection of our national defence interests were directed towards disturbing a *détente* in Europe. I reject such allegations categorically. Those actions have nothing to do with the recent deplorable incidents in New York. My Government was obliged to take counter-measures to defend my country from inadmissible activities directed against its security.

170. Mr. BUSH (United States of America): I should like first to exercise our right of reply, very briefly, in connexion with the item before the Assembly in the normal order of business.

171. I hate to take up the Assembly's time in mentioning this, but I must say that I regret and I deplore the remarks—which were, in my view, extremely personal—made against the Chief of State of the United States of America by the representative of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen [1970th meeting]. From the beginning of the United Nations, remarks against Chiefs of State have been considered out of place, out of order, and potentially destructive. Therefore, I respectfully must call to the

attention of the Assembly my disappointment and regret at what the delegation of the United States Government considered as the only personal attack on a Chief of State in the General Assembly debate, which we all will agree has been all-encompassing.

172. I asked for the floor in order to exercise the right of the United States delegation to reply to some of the comments made this morning [1972nd meeting] regarding the most regrettable incident for which I expressed my Government's profound regret. Ambassador Malik and Ambassador Tomeh, and others, responded and forcefully made their points.

173. I shall try to be brief because it is late and it has been a long day. I do not know how to make more plain the depth and the intensity of the regret that I tried to express this morning—the regret of the City of New York, the regret of the United States—at the firing yesterday on an apartment occupied by a family of a member of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations. None of the representatives here should have any doubts about our abhorrence of this insane act of violence. None of the representatives should have any doubts as to our intention to do everything within our power to bring to fair trial those who have perpetrated this lunatic act and other regrettable acts that have occurred today and that have occurred in the past. I have also tried to make clear, beyond any possibility of ambiguity, that we deplore these attacks and attempted attacks on any Mission to the United Nations, whether it is an Arab Mission—we heard some testimony about the attacks at such Missions—a Soviet Mission, or, indeed the Mission of any State represented here.

174. The abhorrence of violence felt by the City of New York and by the United States is not a partisan issue in our country, for violence certainly can threaten any of us. Representatives would not be surprised, I think, to know that our own Mission, the United States Mission, has received its share of threats for our effort to carry out our own policies, the policies of the United States Government.

175. Lest there be any lingering doubt, I want to say that we condemn the actions of the Jewish Defense League when, as so often, they have involved harassment, threats, abuse and violence. We condemn all organizations which advocate violence and harassment. I present my regrets to the Mission of Syria for the incidents to which Ambassador Tomeh referred this morning, and to the Mission of Saudi Arabia for the cases to which Ambassador Baroudy referred. I also regret that there have been further incidents today involving teen-agers who threw paint and tried to break up furniture and property in the lobby, as I understand it, of the Soviet Mission and in the offices of another agency here. We regret those shameful incidents as well.

176. But as I express our profound regret, I ask that all of us put aside any temptation to use this hall to raise again the ancient plague of discrimination, anti-Semitism. Let me give an example. In his long statement at the previous meeting—and I do not suggest that this was intentional, because I could see the sincerity in Ambassador Tomeh as he spoke—Ambassador Tomeh asserted that on Sunday, radio station WINS had an editorial, an inflammatory

statement urging attacks—I think he said—on diplomatic personnel in the New York area. The Ambassador said that he had been unable—and I respect his judgement—to get the transcript of the statement, of the alleged editorial.

177. In an effort to bring light to this heated and emotional discussion, we have obtained a copy of the statement made on WINS. It was not an editorial; rather, it was a statement of an individual, Rabbi Tannenbaum, who is the National Director of the Inter-Religious Affairs Department of the American Jewish Committee, speaking for his Committee, speaking as an individual. I have the entire script here, and certainly we would be glad to share it with any delegation.

178. It begins by noting concern on the part of a number of distinguished American citizens over what they believe is the condition of Jews in Syria, and I want to read in its entirety the concluding appeal because I think it is important to clarify these remarks. In our view, it does not contain a single word of violence and not the slightest suggestion of encouragement to violence, harassment, or verbal or physical attack, which was the subject we were on this morning. Rabbi Tannenbaum said:

“To protest these inhuman conditions and to arouse the conscience of mankind, synagogues and churches are being asked to devote their religious services this coming Saturday and Sunday to ‘Syrian Jewry Sabbath’. We would hope that all people of good will will join the Committee of Concern in this massive effort to help avert further tragedy and bring relief to the saving remnant of this ancient and once prideful Jewish community.”

179. Surely I can understand why the representative of Syria took exception to the statement if it did not fit his views, and certainly he is free to express his opinion—and this I might say, is not the United States Government speaking, but an individual. But the point in bringing it up is to put it in its perspective: first, it is not an editorial, and secondly, it is not an exhortation to violence. That is all he said.

180. It is not my purpose here to associate myself with or to dissociate myself from this statement, but I did want to clear it up. In our view, this individual was speaking in peace about something that he felt deeply, not in violence, and I hope that the representative of Syria will read the full statement by Rabbi Tannenbaum and see that it is not indeed an editorial.

181. I think that the personalization in this exchange of heated views went too far this morning, and I would close as I began by pledging again the determination of the United States, of our city—I am sure I speak for the city, and certainly for the United States Mission—and my own determination to do all we can to protect the community from violence. Violence begets violence; violence increases and exacerbates tension between nations; and we will do our level best in a troubled, confused world to see that Missions here are not unduly subjected to these kinds of tactics.

182. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): Let us recall what happened this morning because it has direct relevance to what will follow this evening.

183. The representative of the USSR, Mr. Malik, much to the dismay of the whole General Assembly, described the criminal act against his Mission last night: an apartment occupied by a family, including children, was fired upon during the night. Mr. Malik rightly described what actually did take place, and the event was recognized and apologized for by the representative of the United States. Now, the developments which took place afterwards were meaningful.

184. Mr. Malik was followed by Mr. Baroody of Saudi Arabia, who spoke about what his Mission had been subjected to at various times. Then Mr. Bush spoke in very courteous and rational terms. Then I took the floor to bring to the attention of the Assembly two acts to which our own Mission was subjected during this week: WINS, which I referred to as an editorial and which I shall come to later, and the scare bombs with which we were threatened yesterday and the day before, and as a result of which American policemen are in our Mission right now. I did not want to go into the long history of the occupation of our Mission when, in October 1966 and November 1969, it was twice occupied by Zionist hooligans and gangs from New York who were expelled by the police. Neither did I mention the fact that in March of this year there was a march on our Mission; there was no police protection, perhaps through our own fault, although I am sure the United States Mission is always much better informed than ours about what might happen, since we do not have its facilities. We are its guests; it is the host. So I had no choice but to close the Mission in view of that attack which, I must confess, was unequal. We do not have equal forces to meet such attacks. So the whole staff of the Mission was prevented from carrying out its own normal tasks.

185. Mr. Tekoah, the Permanent Representative of Israel, asked for the floor on a point of order. As was rightly pointed out during this morning's meeting by the representative of the United States, a point of order should not deal with substance, and this is in fact correct. Yet, as the record will appear tomorrow, it will show that Mr. Tekoah, who asked for the floor on a point of order, actually spoke for 30 to 40 minutes, raising all issues concerning Soviet Jewry, zionism 2,000 years ago, the situation of the Jews in Syria, in a derogatory, inflammatory, emotional attack which was, to say the least, despicable. And he went on with his harangue, claiming all the time that he was speaking on a point of order.

186. I want to put it on record that that was not a point of order, that it was an abuse of his permission to speak, an abuse which, I hope, will not be repeated. As I stand here now, after hearing the statement of Mr. Tekoah, I asked this morning for the floor in exercise of my right of reply.

187. Let us, however, try to connect all these threads together. Why was it that Mr. Tekoah, speaking on a point of order, went into a lengthy speech, as is his custom, about all the subjects that I have mentioned? It was simply to divert the attention of the General Assembly, to divert the anger of all delegations in this Assembly. Because of the hooliganism and criminality of Zionist gangs in New York, he went on to attack the Soviet Union, the Arab world, Syria, the situation of the Jews in Syria, etc., as all of you must have heard.

188. Therefore, the diversionary tactics, for which Mr. Tekoah is so well known now, were but part and parcel of what the hooligans now outside the United Nations are doing to divert attention. But they are also part and parcel of a concerted plan: when Mr. Tekoah attacked the Syrian Government in the ugly terms that he used this morning, his colleague at the Third Committee's 1845th meeting this afternoon was doing the same thing, and Ambassador Bush, station WINS was saying the same thing last Sunday.

189. Now, to set the record clear, I did say this morning that I did not have the text of what WINS said, but I did refer to it as an editorial and I was very careful in stating that I did not have the text, for which I had been asking since last Sunday without being able to get it. But thanks to the efforts of the United States Mission I was able to get it this afternoon when this plenary meeting of the General Assembly started, and I now have it in my hands.

190. First of all, before I comment on this text and on what the representative of the United States said, as well as answer the Israeli representative, Mr. Tekoah, I must apologize most sincerely to the representative of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Malik, because, really, we are playing into Ambassador Tekoah's hands by attempting to reply to him. Because the main issue remaining now is the criminal attack to which the Soviet Mission was subjected and, to a lesser extent, what other Missions, including our own, have been subjected to in the last three or four years until today.

191. The representative of the United States read out the conclusion of what was given on WINS on 17 October. But he did not read out all the contents. So, let us share together some of what I heard on Sunday, the exact text of which is in my hands now, a text that was given to me by the United States Mission. Among other things, WINS said, speaking about Damascus:

"Young Jewish girls . . . have been abducted, raped and thrown naked into the streets of the Jewish ghetto in Damascus, and, recently, Jewish homes there have been set on fire and businesses and property have been arbitrarily confiscated without compensation."

192. Among other things in what was handed to me by a member of the United States Mission is the following:

"All Jewish prisoners who have been released from confinement are physically ill, bodily maimed or mentally deranged as the result of their imprisonment. They had been subjected to electrical torture, the ripping off of fingernails and cigarette burns on various parts of their bodies."

Then this text goes on to speak about their abject poverty and pervasive fear.

"In the face of these cruel conditions and despite the certainty of severe penalties, it is little wonder that Syrian Jews are making desperate attempts to flee that country."

193. But I wish to ask Ambassador Bush; Why, Sir, did you not read out those paragraphs I have just read out? Are these not flimsy criminal accusations to incite and arouse the anger of everybody? Are you not taking things

out of context in order to help the Zionist propaganda machine? Why did you not read out the whole text? Why did you pick only the conclusion of the text?

194. I must say that all the things that have been mentioned therein are dirty lies, and there are no other words to describe them. Damascus is a city open to all visitors from all over the world. Syria is a country that can be visited by anybody who takes out a visa, and anybody can be there any time he wants. When things like "young Jewish girls have been abducted, raped and thrown naked into the streets of the Jewish ghetto in Damascus" are said, I think every American should be ashamed that his mass media should perpetrate lies of that sort.

195. The United States Mission also handed me another document, dated 7 October 1971, entitled "Statement on Jews in Syria", in which these same things are reported. But there are other things also, for instance, "a total ban on Jewish emigration", "Jews are also forbidden to leave the country for visits to relatives or for medical treatment".

196. Mr. President, I refer you and the members of the General Assembly to reports by the International Red Cross about the Syrian Government itself taking Jews from Syria—that is, Syrians of the Jewish faith—to hospitals in Beirut in order to have them treated. I can produce the text of a broadcast from Radio Damascus stating that Jews in Syria are Syrian citizens of the Jewish faith just as Christians, like myself, are Syrian citizens of the Christian faith. Then this statement says the following: "Distinctive Jewish identity cards marked with a red stamp: 'Member of the Mosaic faith'".

197. Mr. President, here is my Syrian identification card. I leave it to you Arab experts to translate it from Arabic. It cannot be forged because my picture is on it and it is very well sealed. If you turn on page 2, you will find this item—"Religion: Christian". But if you take the identification card of the Moslem citizens of Syria, you will also find—"Religion: Moslem". It so happens that this tradition has been carried on and that it is not restricted only to Jews. Here is my own identification card referring to me as a Syrian national of the Christian faith. I submit it as a document of the General Assembly.

198. It is stated in this document:

"Jewish schools have been taken over by the State. Moslem principals have been appointed and Jewish religious studies have been drastically reduced. General school examinations are now . . . held on Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath. Only a very few Jews are permitted to pursue university studies."

But in a law promulgated by the Government, all private schools in Syria, including Christian and Moslem ones—and the majority of them are Moslem schools—were asked to apply and follow the programme which the Ministry of Education, in agreement with the principals of those schools, had devised. To single out the Jewish schools is like singling out the identification card and saying that the Jews in Syria are referred to as persons "of the Mosaic faith."

199. There is another point. They say that "except for doctors and pharmacists, Jewish professionals are banned from practice".

200. Any visitor to Syria can see for himself that what has made Syria known as a Mycenae for its mosaics, inlaid wood, silver and so forth, is still the flourishing business of the Syrian-Jewish community in Syria. Every member of this Assembly is invited to go and see for himself and then to judge the allegations and the very flimsy and despicable accusations which were levelled by Mr. Tekoah this morning against my country, Syria.

201. What is the other purpose of Mr. Tekoah? The other purpose is not only a concern of mine but should be a concern of this whole General Assembly. For, by raising the problem of Soviet Jewry, by raising the problem of Jews in Syria, Mr. Tekoah's Zionist propaganda and that of the 566 Zionist organizations in the United States whose headquarters are in New York City are simply trying to divert attention from what Israel is doing in the occupied territories and what the Arabs are suffering inside Israel itself.

202. The second report of the tripartite Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories [A/8389/Add.1] has just appeared. It is there to judge and condemn Israel. But Israel wants to hide all these facts. How? By throwing at others the mud which is sticking to itself. I said that the General Assembly has the right to ask Mr. Tekoah for an answer. For between 6 June 1967 and today the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Commission on Human Rights, WHO and UNESCO have adopted exactly 54 resolutions each one of them affirming Arab rights and each one of them stating how Israel has trampled on those Arab rights.

203. I will mention a few. Resolution 237 (1967) of the Security Council calls upon Israel to facilitate the return of new refugees and calls upon Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the occupied areas. Let not Mr. Tekoah say that there are prejudiced members who vote against Israel: that resolution was adopted unanimously by the Security Council. It was followed on 4 July 1967 by Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) reaffirming the Security Council resolution and asking the same thing. Up to the last session of the General Assembly, in 1970, the same rights of Arab refugees, the new displaced persons, had been affirmed by resolutions adopted with an overwhelming majority—more than 100 votes with only Israel abstaining or voting against. What has happened to the will of the General Assembly? What has happened to the will of the United Nations?

204. Let us not forget that in 1969 in its resolution 2546 (XXIV) the General Assembly condemned Israeli policies and practices in the occupied territories and urgently called upon Israel to desist forthwith therefrom. Today there are still no fewer than 13,000 Arabs languishing in the gaols of Israel. All Israeli tactics are directed towards hiding Zionist bestiality.

205. One of the themes to which Mr. Tekoah refers time and again is the question of nazism and the victims of the Nazis. We have said time and again that no people can be made to pay for the crimes of another people. But if there was a people who acted well towards the Jews all over the world and opened their arms to them, it was the Arabs.

What has happened to the Arabs is proof of what Zionism really is.

206. In regard to Zionism and Israel there are certain pages of history which, no matter how much Israel and Zionist propaganda tries to hide them, prove beyond any shadow of doubt the co-operation that existed in the Second World War between Zionist leaders in Palestine, Europe and America and Nazi leaders, foremost among them being Eichmann. An American Zionist writer named Ben Hecht, well known to the American public, published a book called *Perfidy*.³ By *Perfidy*, as I shall show, he was referring to the perfidious behaviour of the Zionist leaders who co-operated with the Nazis. What was the book about? It tells the story of Malchiel Greenwald, an elderly Israeli Jew from Hungary, who attacked in a pamphlet Dr. Rudolf Kastner, spokesman for the Trade and Industry Ministry of Israel for having collaborated with the Nazis in their extermination of Hungarian Jews. The Attorney General, Chaim Cohen, on behalf of the Israeli Government, brought Greenwald to trial on a charge of criminal libel. The defence attorney was Shmuel Tamir.

207. Following are some of the highlights of the trial. Kastner, who was the head of the Hungarian Rescue Committee, made a deal with the Nazis to extract 600 Jews from Hungary, most of them being prominent Zionists—380 of them from his hometown, Kluj. He testified that he knew of the preparations at Auschwitz and admitted that he did not inform the Jews of the impending disaster; in fact he told the Jews in Kluj, the only Jewish town he contacted, not to resist the Nazis. Kastner testified at the Nuremberg trials on behalf of the SS General Kurt Becher, who was in charge of all extermination camps outside of Germany. It is a crime punishable by death in Israel to testify on behalf of an SS commander.

"There can be no doubt about it that Becher belongs to the very few SS leaders having the courage to oppose the program of annihilation of the Jews, and trying to rescue human lives. . . . I make this statement . . . in behalf of the Jewish Agency and the Jewish World Congress."

That is from page 78 of Ben Hecht's book *Perfidy*, and all that I shall now relate comes from the same book.

208. Walter Rapp, head of the Evidence Counsel of the War Crimes Council at Nuremberg, stated in his affidavit that it was Kastner's testimony which freed Becher. The Jewish Agency suppressed all news coming from its agent concerning the extermination in eastern Europe and Germany. The Jewish Agency was the world organization through which Zionism worked for the creation of Israel. Throughout May, June and July 1944, while Hungarian Jews were being gassed, not once did any Zionist leader mention the atrocities even though they knew that thousands were being gassed every day. Shmuel Tamir pushed for a trial of Kastner. Kastner was assassinated by Zeev Eckstein; a few months before, he had been "a paid undercover agent of the Israeli government's Intelligence Service." Too much had been exposed already. I could go on and on and on. But there were many people who were involved in this dirty story of the co-operation of the

³ New York, Julian Messner, Inc., 1961.

Zionist leaders and the Nazis. There were Lord Moyne; Count Folke Bernadotte, who was later sent to Palestine and assassinated by the Irgun Z'vai Leumi—the Security Council adopted a resolution condemning the gangs in Israel for his assassination; Kastner himself and, last but not least, Eichmann.

209. All that was done by the Zionists in order to hide the crime that their leaders co-operated with the Nazi leaders. But the Eichmann trial brought it out into the open, for while Eichmann was being questioned—and the records are there for everyone to see—he confirmed all those facts: that Kastner was entertained lavishly by the Nazi leaders, sat with them, ate with them, drank with them. And what was the deal? To be able to get, through Bernadotte, from Lord Moyne in Egypt, 10,000 trucks for the Nazis, who were in need of trucks.

210. There is another aspect; and let us settle once and for all this thing about nazism and zionism. There is no doubt, as I shall prove, that very close co-operation in all fields—military, financial, educational, commercial, aeronautical—exists between Israel and South Africa. But all these details would be meaningless if we did not pin down what co-operation with the racist régime of South Africa means.

211. It is a well known fact that Vorster, who at best is an unrepentant Nazi, was the first Prime Minister to visit the State of Israel in 1950 and that Moshe Sharett, as Foreign Minister and Prime Minister, visited South Africa. But the law of nationality of Israel, which gives Israeli nationality to every Jew in the world as soon as he sets foot on the land of Israel, denies that right to two or three categories: Jews outside Israel who speak against Israel; former Nazis; and those who co-operated with the Nazis. But is there any doubt that the Government of South Africa co-operated with the Nazis all through the Second World War? Is there any doubt that Vorster himself was interned and gaoled for his Nazi activities?

212. And yet the irony is that a man like Tekoah—Tekoah is a name—or any Zionist, would come to this rostrum and lecture us about morality, about law, about nazism, about religion, about prophecy, about the prophets of God, when this is their ugly reality.

213. Listen to this. The Jewish Telegraphic Agency is located here in the city of New York. This is an organ of the Jewish Agency that is part and parcel of the Israeli Government, charged with colonization of the Arab territories in the second half of the twentieth century, 26 years after the foundation of the United Nations. It says:

“The Jewish Telegraphic Agency on May 6, 1969, reported that a leading pro-government Afrikaans daily has urged closer relations between South Africa and Israel and declared that ‘Israel’s survival in the Middle East is a fundamental part of our own security’. Furthermore, the editorial in *Die Vaderland* hailed the forthcoming visit of Israel’s former Premier, David Ben Gurion, whose mission was to open the 1969 Israel United Appeal Emergency and Solidarity Campaign in Johannesburg. The same editorial went so far as to state. ‘If our fellow Jewish citizens would listen to what our important visitor has

come to ask—help for the building of Israel—then their contribution is also a contribution to South Africa’s security.’”

Those are not my words. They are the words of the organs that speak in the name of the World Zionist Organization. What do they say? A contribution to Israel is also a contribution to South African security.

214. This year, in a working paper on recent developments concerning relations of Governments and private interests with South Africa, a report submitted to the Special Committee on *Apartheid* in September 1971, we read the following:

“Effective 11 December 1970, El Al [the Israeli airline] increased its flights to South Africa from one to two a week.

“A South African trade mission visited Israel for 15 days in January-February 1971.

“The *South African Financial Gazette* reported on 22 January 1971:

“‘South Africa’s first trade mission to Israel leaves for the Middle East later this month to ensure that the R10m. line of credit extended to Israel by the Industrial Development Corporation last year is fully taken up, and to lay the foundations for further trade boosts between the two countries.

“‘The mission will be led by the Federated Chamber of Industries and the Industrial Development Corporation, and will include some of South Africa’s largest companies, operating in heavy engineering, construction, casting and foundry work and related fields.

“‘Also represented will be the Standard Bank and Barclays Bank International divisions. The mission has been organized by the Israeli-South African Trade Association, Isato.’”

215. Now, Mr. President, I would not tax your patience and that of the distinguished representatives. But for our brothers, for those who are concerned with humanity really and genuinely, for those who hate racism and fight racism, for those to whom principles mean something, I suggest that they read the full report submitted to this Special Committee on *Apartheid* and the three or four pages concerning the developing relations between Israel, the democratic State, and South Africa, another democratic State.

216. In Mr. Tekoah’s new approach to explaining zionism, he has resorted to a new line. I follow his thoughts very carefully. As we heard this morning, the people of Israel, according to the Bible, are the chosen people of God. But anybody who knows nazism knows that according to Hitler the German people was the chosen people of God who should rule the world from one end to the other. I hope that you will see in the record tomorrow whether or not Mr. Tekoah has affirmed that he represents the chosen people of God. In the twentieth century, after man has gone to the moon, we have to accept this contention from

Mr. Tekoah! We have to give up our territories to him, only to be satisfied, since the Jews are the chosen people of God. We should give them Damascus, and Cairo, and Amman and lots of other cities, and invite the Jews from all over the world, because they are the chosen people of God, and give them everything they want. Not only so, but also in prayer, kneel down and ask for their forgiveness because they represent the Word of God. However, there are among the Jews themselves—and it is not insignificant that after 1967 most of the greatest writers of Europe and some in America, like Max Rodinson in France, Menuhin here, Elmer Berger, and I could cite lots of other names—those who are among the first to oppose zionism because it is a false presentation of Judaism, a falsification of Judaism, because zionism is nothing but a colonial settler movement. And when we tried to prove to Mr. Tekoah that the zionism movement started with Herzl as the Jewish Colonial Trust for the colonization of Palestine, he just tried to forget about this, and he goes back to 2,000 years ago.

217. So, they say that they are the chosen people of God, but to do what? To show justice, to teach the world love, to show how the best world could be realized through the chosen people and their deeds and acts? The first answer to any such contention are the 54 resolutions which I mentioned, 14 of which condemn Israel and 19 of which either “deplore” or “strongly deplore” Israel’s violations of the human rights of the Arabs. If that is not enough, I shall read a paragraph from a very respected Jewish scholar, Moshe Menuhin, who is the father of a famous violinist, Yehudi Menuhin. He grew up in Israel with Ben-Gurion and all these other people, and he left Israel. This is what he said:

“I once belonged to the ‘gang’. After living a ‘full Jewish life’ in the Pale of Settlement in Russia and in Jerusalem up to the age of fifteen, I was further indoctrinated in the ‘full Jewish life’ of Jewish political nationalism in the *Gymnazia Herzlia*, in Jaffa-Tel Aviv, for five solid years, up to the age of twenty. The *Gymnazia Herzlia* was the nursery where Jewish political nationalism had its rebirth after the demise of its founding father, Theodor Herzl. One of my classmates there was Moshe Sharett, later to be the official Prime Minister of Israel during the short ‘retirement’ of Mr. Ben-Gurion in 1954.

“We, the first graduates of the ‘sacred temple’ of Jewish political nationalism, were dedicated and ‘ordained’ to redeem our ‘Jewish homeland’ at any cost and make Palestine ‘*goyim rein*’ (rid of gentiles, Arabs).

“I know whereof I speak, because I have followed the doings of my ‘gang’ all these years. It took me a lifetime, however, to divest myself of the primitive, harmful philosophy of rabid ‘Jewish’ nationalism, which I see as a neurotic form of collective egoism. This nationalism considers itself supreme, owing nobody anything but to whom the world owes everything.”

218. So, if we go back 2,000 years, Mr. Tekoah and myself cannot be on the same ground because the Bible is also my legacy. Did God in His infinite wisdom give a geographical area defined on maps—although Israel has not so far accepted any borders. Certainly not. But with the

coming of Christ all the prophecies of the Bible were fulfilled. Jerusalem, which was to be the capital of the Jewish kingdom, became, in Christianity, the New Jerusalem, namely the Church that was founded by Christ, founded not on crime, not on evicting people, not on putting thousands of people in gaols, not on torturing people, not on evicting population, not on committing crimes and more crimes against humanity, but founded simply on the love of humanity. Perhaps no greater illustration could exist for that than Tolstoy and his interpretation of Christianity. So, this is how we understand the problem of zionism as negated by Christ 2,000 years ago. For anybody who likes to know more about that, let him read St. Paul’s Epistles to the Hebrews. Now all this is really a smokescreen because the Zionist dream is a dream of domination, is a dream of subjecting people, is an ugly dream to say the least.

219. The following are not my words but are contained in the decisions of the Zionist General Council’s fifth session after the 23rd Congress held in Jerusalem from 21 to 29 July 1954, a copy of which is in the Zionist Archives and Library in New York City:

“In the event of there being legislation in any country hindering Jews from fulfilling their tasks towards the Zionist Movement, the Jews of that country must endeavour to have such legislation amended.”

There are more incredible pronouncements. Z. Shragai, Head of the Jewish Agency, said the following in February 1969:

“There is no Jewish nation today that is tied down to the land Of Israel exclusively. There exists in Israel a Jewish nation which takes in not alone the Jews of Israel but also the Jews living in the rest of the world. All of them are children of Israel, willingly or unwillingly, with or against their consent. They are all descendants of Abraham, and not sons of the French nation when living in France or sons of the American nation when living in America.”

That is zionism, a subversive movement not recognizing any loyalty except the loyalty to zionism and its expansionism. The world has already suffered a great deal from this.

220. In conclusion, let me ask these questions. Many people have spoken of their disillusionment with the United Nations. But what is the greatest punishment that the United Nations has suffered in the last 25 years? Is it the difference and the widening gap between the poor nations and the rich nations, about which the United Nations cannot do anything? Is it the disappointment and disenchantment of the peoples of the world that the United Nations has been unable to realize its ideals? Is the punishment of the United Nations its financial bankruptcy? Is the punishment of the United Nations its inability to deal with the greatest crisis of the world? Is the punishment of the United Nations its inability to take care of all the hungry children of the world and of the wretched of the earth? It is none of these, although it is all of these. The greatest punishment of the United Nations is that terrorists who formed the Palmach, the Haganah, the Irgun Z’vai Leumi, of which Mr. Tekoah is a member, the Stern

gang, as they called themselves, have gone through purgatory—and now I believe that purgatory does exist—to come here, former terrorists, former killers, former criminals and present criminals to lecture the United Nations about law, morality and justice.

221. The PRESIDENT: As President of the General Assembly, I am really shocked and concerned about the deplorable incident which occurred at the Soviet Mission. I hope there will be no repetition of such an irresponsible and criminal act.

222. In view of the late hour, I shall call on four more representatives to speak in exercise of their right of reply tomorrow, after the debate on the item which the Assembly has before it.

223. The Secretariat will now give the explanation of the incident this morning, as promised.

*Statements concerning an incident that occurred
in the General Assembly hall (concluded)*

224. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs): I would like to report to the General Assembly about the incident which occurred at this morning's meeting when an unauthorized person attempted to address the Assembly. The name of the person is Daniel R. McColgan. He is 27 years old, and he is a United States citizen engaged in public relations who lives in this city. When he was removed from the room this morning, he was interviewed by the competent Security officials and later

by the Director of the Medical Service. He stated that his motive in trying to speak in the General Assembly was to make known the attitude of the people of the United States on the question of Chinese representation. He said that it was his right as a citizen to speak. He denied all association with any organization or movement and said that no one else knew of his intention in regard to addressing the Assembly.

225. When he came to the United Nations this morning, he entered by the delegates' entrance and came directly to the floor of the Assembly Hall. He was a well-dressed man carrying a briefcase, and he apparently slipped past the United Nations security guards. He was placed under arrest this afternoon by the New York Police following a complaint by the United Nations.

226. The incident is most regrettable and I have to apologize on behalf of the Secretariat.

227. It must be recognized that the present security situation has proved inadequate and must now be tightened, especially as this is the second incident of the kind within a year. The present situation has resulted from the fact that every effort has always been made in the past to interfere as little as possible with the freedom of movement of delegations and their guests. Stricter security measures, however, will interfere with the convenience of delegations, and it is to be hoped that representatives will show understanding and co-operation, in the interest of greater security.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.