

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):
S

FOIA Number:
S

FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an
administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential
Library Staff.**

Record Group/Collection: Donated Historical Materials
Collection/Office of Origin: Bush, George H.W., Collection
Series: Personal Papers
Subseries: United Nations File

OA/ID Number: 25861
Folder ID Number: 25861-012

Folder Title:
Chinese Representation [5]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	5	1	5	2

Let us be clear as to what the real issue of this debate was. There was virtual unanimity that the PRC should be represented in the UN. Certainly the US from the outset not only agreed that the PRC should be seated but sponsored a proposal to achieve that end. The only issue before the Assembly therefore was whether the General Assembly would expel the Republic of China, the functioning authority of 14 million people in the process.

The decision to deprive the Republic of China of representation in our opinion a serious mistake. At the same time, no one can escape the fact, unpleasant though it may be, that the votes which have just been cast do, in fact, represent the views of the majority of UN members. Let us hope that the action of depriving the Republic of China of representation will set no dangerous precedent for this organization.

It goes without saying that nothing that has happened here today will in any ^{way} affect the ties which the US has with the Republic of China, which remains an honored and valuable member of the international community.

CONTINGENCY STATEMENT - WIN

~~ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT DEBATES~~

~~THAT HAS EVER TAKEN PLACE IN THE UNITED~~

~~NATIONS HAS NOW ENDED.~~ THE UNITED STATES

IS ~~DEEPLY~~ GRATIFIED THAT THE GENERAL

ASSEMBLY HAS REFUSED TO EXPEL THE REPUBLIC

OF CHINA. WE BELIEVE THE ASSEMBLY ACTED

rejecting the so-called Albanian Re.
WISELY IN UPHOLDING THE PRINCIPLE THAT

NO ONE SHOULD BE DEPRIVED OF REPRESENTATION

UNLESS AT LEAST TWO-THIRDS OF THE MEMBERS

OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONCUR.

CONTINGENCY STATEMENT - WIN

THE UNITED STATES IS GRATIFIED
THAT THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY HAS REFUSED
TO EXPEL THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA. WE
BELIEVE THE ASSEMBLY ACTED WISELY IN
REJECTING THE SO-CALLED ALBANIAN RESOLUTION.
WE ALSO BELIEVE IT ACTED WISELY IN
UPHOLDING THE PRINCIPLE THAT NO ONE SHOULD
BE DEPRIVED OF REPRESENTATION UNLESS
AT LEAST TWO-THIRDS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE
UNITED NATIONS CONCUR.

CONTINGENCY STATEMENT - DR PASSES AND

PRC ISSUES STATEMENT REFUSING TO

PARTICIPATE IF ROC CONTINUES IN U.N.

OUR POSITION ON THIS MATTER IS
CLEARLY ON THE RECORD. WE BELIEVE
THAT THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
MUST MAKE ITS OWN DECISION.

Not heard ~~the~~ but the vote
had begun ~~that~~ in
any event we are entitled
to a separate vote under
rule 91

Mr. ~~Clinton~~ ^{Pruside}
We accept

one Obstruction -
solve a working against
He calls our I call it principle
exclusion -
The mood of the mob -

clearly not
announced

Point of order rule 90
— on explication clause
a separate vote, under
rule 91

1 Tunisia ✓

2 Cyprus ✓

3. Qatar ✓

4 Ireland ✓

CONTINGENCY STATEMENT - WIN

One of the most important debates that has ever taken place in the UN has now ended. The US is deeply gratified that the GA has refused to expel the ROC. We believe the Assembly acted wisely in rejecting the so-called Albanian Resolution. We also believe it acted wisely in upholding the principle that no one should be deprived of representation unless at least two-thirds of the members of the UN concur.

CONTINGENCY STATEMENT - WIN ON IQ, DEFEAT AR, LOSE ON DR.

PARA 1 same as PARA 1 above, with additional PARA as FOLS:

At the same time our satisfaction at the rejection of the Albanian Resolution is tempered by the fact that the GA did not adopt the so-called Dual Representation, designed also to assure the seat for the PRC in the UN. The US urged this year that the PRC be seated not only in the GA but as a permanent member of the SC. We continue to believe that the DR Resolution offers an honorable, just and reasonable basis for a solution.

CONTINGENCY STATEMENT (IF ASKED)

Our position on this matter is clearly on the record. We believe that the PRC must make its own decision.

CONTINGENCY STATEMENT - LOSE

Let us be clear as to what the real issue of this debate was. There was virtual unanimity that the PRC should be represented in the UN. Certainly the US from the outset not only agreed that the PRC should be seated but sponsored a proposal to achieve that end. The only issue before the Assembly therefore was whether the General Assembly would expel the Republic of China, ~~the functioning authority of 14 million people in the~~ process.

The decision to deprive the Republic of China of representation ^{is} in our opinion a serious mistake. At the same time, no one can escape the fact, unpleasant though it may be, that the votes which have just been cast do, in fact, represent the views of the majority of UN members. Let us hope that the action of depriving the Republic of China of representation will set no dangerous precedent for this organization.

It goes without saying that nothing that has happened here today will in any ^{way} affect the ties which the US has with the Republic of China, which remains an honored and valuable member of the international community.

CONTINGENCY STATEMENT (IF ASKED)

Our position on this matter is clearly on the record. We believe that the PRC must make its own decision.

CONTINGENCY STATEMENT - WIN

~~One of the most important debates that has ever taken place in the UN has now ended.~~ The US is ~~deeply~~ gratified that the GA has refused to expel the ROC. We believe the Assembly acted wisely in rejecting the so-called Albanian Resolution. We also believe it acted wisely in upholding the principle that no one should be deprived of representation unless at least two-thirds of the members of the UN concur.

CONTINGENCY STATEMENT - WIN ON IQ, DEFEAT AR, LOSE ON DP.

PARA 1 same as PARA 1 above, with additional PARA as FOLLOWS:

At the same time our satisfaction at the rejection of the Albanian Resolution is tempered by the fact that the GA did not adopt the so-called Dual Representation, designed also to assure the seat for the PRC in the UN. The US urged this year that the PRC be seated not only in the GA but as a permanent member of the SC. We continue to believe that the DR Resolution offers an honorable, just and reasonable basis for a solution.

5/5/16

CONTINGENCY STATEMENT - WIN ON IQ,
DEFEAT AR., LOSE ON DR.

PARA 1 SAME AS PARA 1 OF WIN STATEMENT
WITH ADDITIONAL PARA AS FOLS:

AT THE SAME TIME OUR SATISFACTION
AT THE REJECTION OF THE ALBANIAN RESOLUTION
IS TEMPERED BY THE FACT THAT THE GENERAL
ASSEMBLY DID NOT ADOPT THE SO-CALLED
DUAL REPRESENTATION, DESIGNED ALSO TO
ASSURE THE SEAT FOR THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC
OF CHINA IN THE UNITED NATIONS. THE
UNITED STATES URGED THIS YEAR THAT THE
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA BE SEATED NOT
ONLY IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY BUT AS A
PERMANENT MEMBER OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL.

WE CONTINUE TO BELIEVE THAT THE DUAL
REPRESENTATION RESOLUTION OFFERS AN
HONORABLE, JUST AND REASONABLE BASIS
FOR A SOLUTION.

THE CONTINGENCY STATEMENT - LOSE

LET US BE CLEAR AS TO WHAT THE REAL
ISSUE OF THIS DEBATE WAS. THERE WAS VIRTUAL
UNANIMITY THAT THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF
CHINA SHOULD BE REPRESENTED IN THE UNITED
NATIONS. CERTAINLY THE UNITED STATES
FROM THE OUTSET NOT ONLY AGREED THAT THE
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA SHOULD BE SEATED
BUT SPONSORED A PROPOSAL TO ACHIEVE THAT
END. THE ONLY ISSUE BEFORE THE ASSEMBLY
THEREFORE WAS WHETHER THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
WOULD EXPEL THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA, ~~THE~~
~~FUNCTIONING AUTHORITY OF 14 MILLION PEOPLE~~
IN THE PROCESS.

THE DECISION TO DEPRIVE THE REPUBLIC
OF CHINA OF REPRESENTATION^{is} IN OUR OPINION
A SERIOUS MISTAKE. AT THE SAME TIME,
NO ONE CAN ESCAPE THE FACT, UNPLEASANT
THOUGH IT MAY BE, THAT THE VOTES WHICH
HAVE JUST BEEN CAST DO, IN FACT, REPRESENT
THE VIEWS OF THE MAJORITY OF UNITED
NATIONS MEMBERS. LET US HOPE THAT THE
ACTION OF DEPRIVING THE REPUBLIC OF
CHINA OF REPRESENTATION WILL SET NO
DANGEROUS PRECEDENT FOR THIS ORGANIZATION.

IT GOES WITHOUT SAYING THAT NOTHING
THAT HAS HAPPENED HERE TODAY WILL IN ANY WAY
AFFECT THE TIES WHICH THE U.S. HAS WITH

3

THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA, WHICH REMAINS
AN HONORED AND VALUABLE MEMBER OF THE
INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY.

#16-D

Motion ^{TO DELETE} ~~the AR~~
expulsion clause.-----

Mr. President:

I raise on a point of order under
Rule ⁸⁰ ~~80~~ to move ^{to DELETE} ~~a separate vote on~~ the
expulsion clause contained in the Albanian
resolution ^{IN DOCUMENT A/L.630.} I refer to the concluding
words of the operative paragraph of the
Albanian resolution which read, and I quote:

// "and to expel forthwith the
representatives of Chiang Kai-Shek
from the place that they unlawfully
occupy at the United Nations and all

the organizations related to it".

Mr. President, Secretary of State Rogers and I have repeatedly sought to make clear the conviction of the United States that the General Assembly should not expel the Republic of China. But that is ~~precisely~~ what the expulsion clause would do. I therefore move to delete the expulsion clause.

Mr. President, if the General Assembly agrees to delete the expulsion clause, the Albanian resolution will have the effect of welcoming the People's Republic of China

#16-3

to this Assembly and the Security Council while, at the same time, not affecting the representation of the Republic of China in this Hall.

TO DELETE

To repeat, I move [^] ~~(a separate vote on)~~ the expulsion clause of the Albanian resolution.

I hope all friends will join in supporting ^{DELETION OF THE EXPULSION CLAUSE,} ~~this motion for a separate vote,~~ and we ask that all will join in voting ^{IT.} against [^] ~~the expulsion clause.~~

Thank you.

☒ ROLL-CALL
☐ RECORDED
☐ NON-RECORDED

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SIXTH
 REGULAR SESSION

YES - ABSTAIN - NO

Afghanistan
 Albania
 Algeria
 Argentina
 Australia
 Austria
 Bahrain
 Barbados
 Belgium
 Bhutan
 Bolivia
 Botswana
 Brazil
 Bulgaria
 Burma
 Burundi
 Byelorussian SSR
 Cameroon
 Canada
 Central African Rep.
 Ceylon
 Chad
 Chile
 China
 Colombia
 Congo (Dem. Rep.)
 Costa Rica
 Cuba
 Cyprus
 Czechoslovakia
 Dahomey
 Denmark

YES - ABSTAIN - NO

Dominican Republic
 Ecuador
 Egypt
 El Salvador
 Equatorial Guinea
 Ethiopia
 Fiji
 Finland
 France
 Gabon
 Gambia
 Ghana
 Greece
 Guatemala
 Guinea
 Guyana
 Haiti
 Honduras
 Hungary
 Iceland
 India
 Indonesia
 Iran
 Iraq
 Ireland
 Israel
 Italy
 Ivory Coast
 Jamaica
 Japan
 Jordan
 Kenya
 Khmer Republic

YES - ABSTAIN - NO

Kuwait
 Laos
 Lebanon
 Lesotho
 Liberia
 Libyan A. R.
 Luxembourg
 Madagascar
 Malawi
 Malaysia
 Maldives
 Mali
 Malta
 Mauritania
 Mauritius
 Mexico
 Mongolia
 Morocco
 Nepal
 Netherlands
 New Zealand
 Nicaragua
 Niger
 Nigeria
 Norway
 Oman
 Pakistan
 Panama
 Paraguay
 P.D.R. of Yemen
 People's Rep. of Congo
 Peru
 Philippines

YES - ABSTAIN - NO

Poland
 Portugal
 Qatar
 Romania
 Rwanda
 Saudi Arabia
 Senegal
 Sierra Leone
 Singapore
 Somalia
 South Africa
 Spain
 Sudan
 Swaziland
 Sweden
 Syrian Arab Republic
 Thailand
 Togo
 Trinidad and Tobago
 Tunisia
 Turkey
 Uganda
 Ukrainian SSR
 USSR
 United Kingdom
 Un. Rep. of Tanzania
 United States
 Upper Volta
 Uruguay
 Venezuela
 Yemen
 Yugoslavia
 Zambia

Subject of vote: Amendments in A/L. 637, para. 2
1976th meeting PL

(rejected) 51-61

2	64	62
YES	ABSTAIN	NO
100	100	100
0 0	0 0	0 0
1 1	1 1	1 1
2 2	2 2	2 2
3 3	3 3	3 3
4 4	4 4	4 4
5 5	5 5	5 5
6 6	6 6	6 6
7 7	7 7	7 7
8 8	8 8	8 8
9 9	9 9	9 9

AGENDA ITEM	VOTE NUMBER	DATE
100	100	1
0 0	0 0	Jan. 2
1 1	1 1	Feb. 3
2 2	2 2	Mar. 1
3 3	3 3	Apr. 2
4 4	4 4	May 3
5 5	5 5	June 4
6 6	6 6	July 5
7 7	7 7	Aug. 6
8 8	8 8	Sept. 7
9 9	9 9	Oct. 8
		Nov. 9
		Dec. 0

UNITED STATES DELEGATION
TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FOR RELEASE ON DELIVERY
CHECK TEXT AGAINST DELIVERY

Press Release USUM-168(71)
October 25, 1971

Statement by Ambassador George Bush, United States Representative
to the United Nations, in Plenary, on Chinese Representation,
October 25, 1971.

Mr. President:

Very shortly our debate on the representation of China will be over, and we will be proceeding to vote on the proposals before us. We have already debated this question for a week -- as well we might, because it is a question of great importance and the decisions we are about to take will be historic, momentous decisions for the United Nations.

Let me now sum up the strongly held view of the United States.

We in the United States Delegation have listened most attentively to all the statements made here, representing all shades of view. Within the immense variety of arguments we find one dominant theme throughout this debate, one dominant issue. That issue is not over the seating of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations.

In fact, for the first time in the history of the United Nations there is something close to unanimity behind the proposition that it is time for the People's Republic to be seated in the United Nations, including taking its seat as a permanent member of the Security Council. That is a major and historic development here. It is not at issue in the United Nations any more.

No, the issue before us can be stated very simply:

Shall the Republic of China be "expelled forthwith" from the United Nations, or shall its continued representation be affirmed?

-more-

BUSH

-2-

That is the heart of the matter. It is the only question in the debate; it is the only question in the resolutions we are about to vote on; and it is the question on which I intend to concentrate in this statement.

There may be a thousand shadings in the answers to this question, and I don't deny that shadings can be important.

But when we come to the heart of the matter, there are only two possible answers: either the Republic of China will continue to be represented in the United Nations or it will be expelled. And between those two stark alternatives the United States very deeply and earnestly believes that one is right and the other wrong.

The Republic of China should not and must not be expelled or deprived of its U.N. representation. It should and must continue to be represented in this Organization.

In the terms of our resolution, the Assembly should affirm "the continued right of representation of the Republic of China."

Let me sum up our reasons for this position as simply and clearly as I can.

First: This solution is realistic. To retain the Republic of China in the United Nations, while seating the People's Republic in both the General Assembly and the Security Council, is the most realistic solution open to us.

It reflects the plain facts of who governs in Taiwan as well as who governs the Chinese Mainland.

-more-

BUSH

-3-

For 20 years the United States has been accused of ignoring reality. Today I submit it is the sponsors of the Albanian Resolution who are ignoring reality. It is amazing to what lengths some of the supporters of the Albanian Resolution have gone to disguise these facts or distract attention from these plain facts.

Mr. President, the representatives of the Republic of China speak for the government of a population numbering 14 million.

Many governments in this debate have indicated that including the actual governments of the world in the United Nations is a wise step, a creative step that ought to be taken wherever it is feasible. That is what we think is meant by that much-used and much-abused word "universality."

Any action that would lead to the first expulsion of a member in the 26-year history of the United Nations would be a blow to the principle of universality.

So that is our first reason -- realism and universality.

Second: We believe the evolution of this reality is for the parties concerned to determine. The United Nations has no need to prejudge or predetermine or pass judgment on the conflicting claims-- except to help insure that the dispute is resolved only by peaceful means. The United Nations should not, and our resolution does not, attempt to write the future history of China, or to influence the evolution of that part of the world.

I submit that we should leave those matters to history, as determined by the people directly concerned, and stick to the real issue before us the issue is this: how all the people of China should be represented in this organization.

This leads me to my third point. The representation of both these Chinese governments in the United Nations, in accordance with the terms of our resolution, is a perfectly practical plan. It contains nothing prejudicial to the position of either party -- and indeed it has been most carefully written to avoid doing so. It does not prejudge any ultimate solution of this matter.

I have heard many speakers speculate on what might or might not happen if this Assembly adopts the resolutions which we have presented.

But I submit, Mr. President, that our task is not to speculate but to find a valid, equitable and realistic solution. Let us in the United Nations have the courage of our own convictions and do what we believe is right and necessary -- what is truly in the interests of this organization and of world peace.

-more-

If we act in that spirit, we will want to make sure that the decision we are about to take benefits all the people directly concerned, not just the majority.

It must be a decision that will not just satisfy some debatable technical requirement but will serve a major objective in keeping with the broad purposes and principles of the United Nations. That objective is to see to it that there is real, meaningful, effective representation in these halls for all these people -- including those 14 million on Taiwan. And how is such real representation to be brought about at this point in time, except through the actual governments that effectively govern.

How else can we resolve this great issue in a way that does not violate our collective conscience?

In my Government's extensive consultations with almost all members of the United Nations on this question, we heard one view expressed more consistently than any other. It was that the Republic of China ought not to be denied representation here as the price for opening the door to the People's Republic of China.

Some expressed strong opposition to expulsion. Some expressed a profound aversion to such a prospect; others, at least, a deep regret. But however this view was stated, it became clear to us that a large majority of the members of this Organization insist, or at the very least strongly prefer, that the Republic of China should continue to be represented here along with the People's Republic of China.

That, Mr. President, is the real underlying conviction of the majority of members in this Assembly. Let us act and vote on that conviction.

And now my fourth point: The question of legality. I am frankly surprised that some of the supporters of the Albanian resolution should have argued against our resolution on grounds of legality, of conformity with the Charter and the rules of due process, and so on.

If there is a resolution before us which is arbitrary and which flies in the face of justice and due process -- which are the real concern of the law -- it is most certainly the Albanian resolution. No wonder it has been rejected so many times, year after year, by this Assembly. In total disregard of the Charter it proposes to "expel" -- that is the word, and that is the act it describes -- to "expel" the Republic of China from the United Nations and all its organs without regard for the people concerned.

It would do so by a majority vote of this Assembly, and without any reference to the law of the Charter concerning expulsion. Where is due process here? Has anyone presented a shred of evidence that the Republic of China, in the words of Article 6, has "persistently violated the principles contained in the present Charter"? There is no such evidence. The Republic of China has no stain on its name here, no Charter violation of any kind. It is a member in excellent standing.

Many members here have cause to know of its constructive service, both to the purposes of this Organization and to the developing countries.

The supporters of the Albanian resolution would have us believe that they propose to expel some amorphous group of people who represent no one at all. Presumably they are a group of private individuals who somehow have secured delegates' badges. Nothing could be further from the truth.

-more-

What the proponents of the Albanian Resolution propose is the expulsion of the representatives of 14 million people. It should be clear to all in this room that if the Albanian Resolution should pass in its present form, those people will be deprived of their only representation in the United Nations.

By contrast, the dual representation resolution is straightforward, non-contentious -- studiously impartial in its language -- and fully within the law of the Charter.

Some may ask where and when the Charter has been used before in precisely the way our resolution proposes. The answer of course is, nowhere -- because in 26 years the United Nations has never faced precisely this situation. But we have demonstrated in other actions that the Charter is a flexible document. It was written by wise men to cope with the unforeseeable. Within the Charter's limits two members are present here that are governed by the Soviet Government in Moscow.

Within its limits India, even before full independence, became a full voting member. Within its limits Egypt and Syria joined, became one member, divided again, and resumed their separate seats. Within its limits two members, Tanganyika and Zanzibar, joined and became one. Within its limits Indonesia, having renounced its membership, after some years changed its mind and -- amid general rejoicing -- resumed its seat without any formality of readmission.

In every such case the United Nations has faced a reality, not a theory -- and has acted accordingly, finding new solutions for new problems.

We are in a similar situation now. We face a reality not a theory. Our proper concern must be to do justice to the complex reality that exists today in the form of effectively governing entities, and the Charter gives us the room to innovate to satisfy that concern.

Finally, a word about the first proposition that will come before us in the voting: the resolution deciding that any proposal to exclude the Republic of China from the United Nations is an important question.

This "non-expulsion" resolution will have the effect of requiring that the Albanian Resolution, which contains such an expulsion proposal, will fail unless it receives a two-thirds majority.

To decide such a question without a two-thirds majority vote would be unthinkable. The proposal to expel the Republic of China is, as I said at the outset of this statement, the heart of the matter before us. If it were to be adopted it would be the first expulsion of a member -- by any procedure, legal or illegal -- ever carried out in the history of the United Nations.

BUSH

-6-

If this is not an important question, what is?

To take such a decision by a bare majority would expose this organization in future times to ill-considered attempts to railroad other members out of the United Nations as soon as a majority of members should decide -- possibly on quite transitory and emotional grounds -- that such and such a member does not truly represent its people or that some other group represents them better.

If members in this way, by a simple majority vote in this hall, could impugn before the world each other's legitimacy and each other's right to be called states -- what a sore temptation that would be toward the promoting of instability and confusion in the United Nations and in the world. Such a development would inevitably raise new and grave questions in many countries as to whether the United Nations had become a cockpit for dissension rather than an instrument of peace.

Fellow delegates, the issue is clearly marked -- inclusion, or expulsion; impartiality, or one-sided and arbitrary punishment.

If this is not an important question, what is?

Let the United Nations take the affirmative road -- not the road of exclusion. Let it take the constructive road -- that which assures equal rights as between large and small -- not the ancient, discredited, and utterly sinister road that leads to the rule of the strong over the weak.

Let this decision, fellow delegates, be made not in Taipei or Peking, but here in New York. Let it be made not according to the demands of either party but according to the interests and the spirit of the United Nations.

And having made our decision in that spirit, then we can in good conscience say to both parties: the halls of the United Nations are big enough for you both; the doors of the United Nations are open to you both for the urgent and creative work of building a more peaceful world.

* * * * *

SAVE
CHIEF
FILE

Get samples of
rhetoric

1) Albanian - pg 41-51
pg 227-

2) Iraq on night of vote
pg 186

(not PDR)

3) Yemba's speech to
DOCUMENT 1973
GA - pg 62-66

4) any other - pg 186 - Iraq -
pg 187 - Tanzania
pg 200 - Sierra Leone

Newsday - Oct 29, 1971
Viewpoints

The Ouster: 'Let's Keep Our Cool'

By Charles Yost

While it is natural for the administration and some members of Congress to express disappointment at the outcome of the UN vote on Chinese representation, the reactions are excessive and in some cases disingenuous. They taste more of sour grapes than of bitter tea.

When a simple majority of the general assembly in November, 1970—a year ago—approved the Albanian resolution [attempting to substitute Peking for Taipei], it was quite clear that, whatever the United States might do, the days of Taiwan in the UN were numbered. It would clearly be impossible for the United Nations much longer to ignore that Mao, not Chiang, governs China.

President Nixon, presumably for this and other reasons, decided that a dramatic new departure in United States policy toward the People's Republic was in the United States national interest. That was a wise decision.

However, from the moment he announced his trip to Peking, it became extremely unlikely that a seat for Taiwan in the UN could be preserved. The final blow to the American attempt to preserve it through a "dual representation" formula was Henry Kissinger's second visit to Peking at the very moment the UN vote was about to be taken.

Prominent members of Congress are now reproaching some of our friends for having "deserted" the United States on the vote, and are threatening in consequence either to cut aid to them or to the UN or both. Particularly at a time when an unhealthy trend toward "neo-isolationism" is appearing in the United States, members of Congress would do well to look at the other side of the picture.

What do our friends who voted "against us" say? First, they point out that the United States had for 20 years insisted that only one Chinese government should sit in the UN. Others had repeatedly proposed a "dual representation" formula, and we had repeatedly rejected it. Our sudden conversion to it in August, 1971, was simply too late.

Nor were our protestations that it would be outrageous to exclude the representatives of the 14,000,000 people on Taiwan very persuasive, when we ourselves had for two decades been excluding the representation of the 700,000,000 people on the mainland.

Second, it was clear that "dual representation" would not bring the People's Republic into the UN, as the United States now professed to desire, because Peking considered that its acceptance of such a formula would admit the existence of a rival Chinese government, which Chiang Kai-shek still unshakably claims to be.

Third, and most important, as the representative of a NATO ally said to me, at the moment you are re-establishing your relations with Peking by setting up the President's visit, you are asking us to jeopardize ours by this vote. And you are exerting the crudest sort of pressure on us and others to do so. Is that a proper way to treat your allies?

If the United States wishes the support of its friends and allies in a matter of major importance, it must hammer out with them a policy of common interest to all.

In this case a substantial majority of our allies had decided that it was in their interest to bring Peking into the world community and the UN, whatever might be the effects on Taiwan of doing so. They interpreted President Nixon's decision to visit Peking, over the strong objections of Taiwan, as a recognition of the wisdom of that policy.

From their point of view, therefore, it was the United States, not they, which by its last-minute introduction of the dual-representation proposal was deviating irresponsibly from a policy in the interest of the alliance as a whole.

It seemed to them, moreover, that the administration was behaving in this contradictory way primarily for domestic political reasons—in an attempt to appease right-wing Republicans who had been outraged by the President's intention to visit Peking and to deflect their rage from him to the United Nations.

It is heartening that the administration has opposed "retaliation" against the UN through cutting our contributions to it, but unfortunate that the administration and some members of Congress have suggested that cuts

might be appropriate because United States contributions to the UN are "disproportionate."

Of course, the real sense in which our contributions are "disproportionate" is that they are considerably less than our share of the world's GNP would warrant. On that basis we should be contributing closer to 40 per cent than to 30 per cent of the regular budget, and more—rather than less, as the administration has itself proposed—to UN development programs.

The overriding fact should be that it is clearly in the United States' national interest to strengthen rather than weaken the United Nations.

Because of Vietnam and our domestic preoccupations, we are properly reducing our unilateral presence and commitments overseas. Yet the world remains as unstable and dangerous a place as ever, nor can it be reliably stabilized by some sort of Washington-Moscow-Peking trilateralism.

A reinforced UN in which big, middle and small states all play a role in multilateral peacekeeping offers the best long-term prospect for world stability.

The author, former chief U.S. ambassador to the UN, is a member of the faculty of Columbia University.

Oct. 29, 1971

today

Following cable received at 9:20 a.m. at UN. Sent 1844 local time to the SYG, signed by Chi Peng-Fei:

Chiao

I have received your telegram of October 26 informing me that at its 26 Session the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted on October 25 a resolution restoring to the People's Republic of China all its rights in the United Nations and expelling forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the place which they unlawfully occupy at the United Nations and in all the organs related to it. I have also noted you have informed all bodies and related agencies of the United Nations of this resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly and believe the above mentioned resolution will be speedily implemented in its entirety. I now inform you that the Government of the People's Republic of China will send a delegation in the near future to attend the 26th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. The name list of the delegation will be sent to you later.

Please accept the assurances of my highest consideration.

* * * * *

Photocopy from George Bush Presidential Library



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



PROVISIONAL

A/PV.1973
21 October 1971

ENGLISH

Twenty-sixth Session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINETEEN HUNDRED AND
SEVENTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 21 October 1971, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. MALIK (Indonesia)

- Statement by the President
- Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations 937 (continued)
 - (a) Draft resolution submitted by Albania, Algeria, Burma, Ceylon, Cuba, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Iraq, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, People's Republic of the Congo, Romania, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia and Zambia;
 - (b) Amendment submitted by Saudi Arabia;
 - (c) Draft resolution submitted by Australia, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gambia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Mauritius, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Philippines, Swaziland, Thailand, United States of America and Uruguay;
 - (d) Draft resolution submitted by Australia, Bolivia, Chad, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Fiji, Gambia, Haiti, Honduras, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Mauritius, New Zealand, Philippines, Swaziland, Thailand, United States of America and Uruguay
- Replies in connexion with statements made at the 1972nd plenary meeting

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be distributed as soon as possible.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent in quadruplicate within three working days, to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, Room LX-2332, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

AS THIS RECORD WAS DISTRIBUTED ON 22 OCTOBER 1971, THE TIME-LIMIT FOR CORRECTIONS WILL BE 27 OCTOBER 1971.

The co-operation of delegations in strictly observing this time-limit would be greatly appreciated.

71-70195/A

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

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.

As I said this morning, I shall call first of all on the speakers whose names are inscribed 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)

- (a) DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY ALBANIA, ALGERIA, BURMA, CEYLON, CUBA, EQUATORIAL GUINEA, GUINEA, IRAQ, MALI, MAURITANIA, NEPAL, PAKISTAN, PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF YEMEN, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO, ROMANIA, SIERRA LEONE, SOMALIA, SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC, SUDAN, UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA, YEMEN, YUGOSLAVIA AND ZAMBIA (A/L.630 and Corr.1 and Add.1-2).
- (b) AMENDMENT SUBMITTED BY SAUDI ARABIA (A/L.637).
- (c) DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY AUSTRALIA, BOLIVIA, COLOMBIA, COSTA RICA, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, EL SALVADOR, FIJI, GAMBIA, GUATEMALA, HAITI, HONDURAS, JAPAN, LESOTHO, LIBERIA, MAURITIUS, NEW ZEALAND, NICARAGUA, PHILIPPINES, SWAZILAND, THAILAND, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND URUGUAY (A/L.632 and Add.1-2).
- (d) DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY AUSTRALIA, BOLIVIA, CHAD, COSTA RICA, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, FIJI, GAMBIA, HAITI, HONDURAS, JAPAN, LESOTHO, LIBERIA, MAURITIUS, NEW ZEALAND, PHILIPPINES, SWAZILAND, THAILAND, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND URUGUAY (A/L.633 and Add.1-2)

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 this morning; I mean the information which we had from Mr. Malik of the Soviet Union that his Mission had been attacked. When we come

(Mr. Ibingira, Uganda)

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, and we hope that although it is said that no one can ever recall a sped arrow, no such incidents will occur in future with regard to any one of us with the purpose of intimidating, coercing or unduly influencing, whatever diverse views may be held by anyone in this august Organization.

I shall now proceed to the issue before the Assembly

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.

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.

I have looked for guidance through the speeches of the representative of the United States and the Foreign Minister of Taiwan, 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 (1967th meeting) makes it abundantly clear that he, like the People's Republic of China, believes that there is only China and only one Government for that China.

(Mr. Ibingira, Uganda)

Nowhere did the Foreign Minister of Taiwan assert the independent existence of that island. Throughout, he maintains that there is only one Government, and there can be only one Government, for the whole of China. In doing this, 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-China policy in the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633. 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.

All of us, including the sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633, 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. Otherwise it would have been necessary for the seating of the People's Republic of China by the General Assembly for it to have received a recommendation of the Security Council in accordance with Article 4, paragraph 2. The absence of a reference to a Security Council recommendation in the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633 plainly means that the People's Republic of China is an old Member of this Organization which does not require admission.

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 the draft resolution contained in document A/L.630 has been introduced; it 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.

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

(Mr. Ibgingira, Uganda)

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.

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 under 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 of this Organization. With the great English poet Shakespeare, we can truly ask: what's in a name?

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.

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.

First of all it is argued by several Members that, Taiwan having been represented for nearly a quarter of a century as a law-abiding Member of this Organization, it would be wrong to deprive it of its seat. This, in our opinion, raises a fundamental issue of whether international law and justice would legitimize a usurper of a seat in this Organization belonging legally to another State simply because such a usurper had enjoyed prolonged presence in the United Nations. I strongly submit it cannot. The law by which membership of this Organization 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 by the law of nations that Taiwan has no locus standi in

(Mr. Ibingira, Uganda)

the Organization. Its presence here, despite the impressive length of that presence, has derived its reality not in international law but in political convenience. Since that political convenience is getting unfashionable and as 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.

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, in any given State a province is exceedingly wealthy does not entitle it to representation here. If it were so, most of the States in the United States of America and some States in Canada, Australia and the Soviet Union should 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.

The third argument has been advanced 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.

(Mr. Ibingira, Uganda)

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.

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 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, of 98.04 per cent of the population, represents the totality of the Chinese State.

The fourth argument is that we must accept Taiwan and the People's Republic of China as two political realities and therefore allow each 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 by any other name, would then have to apply for membership of 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 this General Assembly, together with the Security Council, under certain circumstances 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.

(Mr. Ibingira, Uganda)

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 the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633, 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 the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633 and we shall vote against that draft resolution.

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 "... foments 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, page 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 the masses of subject people their elementary rights to freedom and self-determination; there are States which, because they are powerful, throw their weight about and suppress and grip 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.

(Mr. Ibingira, Uganda)

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 (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.

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

My delegation will vote for the draft resolution contained in document A/L.630. 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.

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, nor any other State for that matter.

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.

(Mr. Ibiringira, Uganda)

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.

(Mr. Ibiringira, Uganda)

That is absolutely critical. When we trace the evolution of man from the cave through the millenia 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.

My delegation will, as I have said, vote against any measure designed to frustrate the passage of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.630. Consequently, we shall vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/L.632 and the amendment proposed by the representative of Saudi Arabia (A/L.637) in so far as it seeks to derogate from the substance of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.630. We shall also vote against any move designed to vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633 before voting on that contained in document A/L.630.

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.

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.

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.

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, allowing the representative of Israel to usurp the right to speak in the name of all Jews living in Russia or Syria or my country and to consider that they are all nationals of Israel even when they are patriots living for their own countries.

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

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.

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

(Mr. El-Zayyat, Egypt)

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.

(Mr. El-Zayyat, Egypt)

Well, this year there are new circumstances. We note that the authors of the draft resolution (A/L.633), 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 their 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 (A/L.633), 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.

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 the draft resolution contained in document A/L.630 -- the position we urge this Assembly to adopt now.

But also, this year the United States delegation invoked the right of self-determination. We 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 use the word "self-determination"? Because only if they did not feel that they have determined their own destiny and they want to determine it apart from those who prevent them from this determination, that there is a case for applying 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 by 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, that there are no two Chinas, not one China and one Taiwan. If there is therefore only -- and according to the declared position of the United States -- one State of China, then this State is surely entitled only to one delegation, and the issue now is really and simply which delegation should represent this one State.

(Mr. El-Zayyat, Egypt)

The issue which you 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 human population. On this, and only on this, we limit our consideration. On this, and only on this, the General Assembly should act now at this session to restore to the People's Republic of China its rightful place among us.

That is why my delegation shall vote for the draft resolution proposed by Albania, Algeria and other delegations (A/L.630); 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.

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. These are inadmissible, reprehensible acts which must be resolutely brought to an end.

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 our Organization, has led to the perpetration of a flagrant anomaly, that of having deprived the people of China from exercising its right to participate in the United Nations, merely because it had chosen a superior form of social organization, for a free and independent development.

(Mr. Ecobescu, Romania)

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 in solving the international problems and to contribute to the strengthening of 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 prestige and effectiveness of this Organization resides precisely in its ability to reflect the mutations which occur in international life, in consistently applying the principles enshrined in the Charter, of ensuring that these principles will at all times govern the conduct of all Member States.

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 being vigorously strengthened in the international arena, it is more necessary than ever that the United Nations be the faithful image of that positive trend, that it act resolutely so that it will continually develop.

The entire experience of the Organization proves that the true value of its decisions consists in their being adopted at the right 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 to increase in the attainment of the objectives of the Charter in a substantial manner, would mark a historic moment, a turning-point in its life.

China, a great socialist State, has obtained success and prestige in the development of its economy, science and culture, in the consolidation and strengthening of its country -- eloquent proof 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 of 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 struggle of peoples for their national and social liberation, for the defence and strengthening of their national independence and sovereignty, against imperialism and colonialism.

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 in which we live.

An undeniable recognition of the role of China in international life is to be found in 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, 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; it will eliminate from international life practices of the policy of force and domination; it will lead to the establishment of relations between States which are based on equality of rights, mutual respect and esteem.

The Socialist Republic of Romania has worked consistently and will continue to work in favour of putting 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 organizations of the United Nations system, and for expelling the emissaries of Chiang Kai-shek.

We believe that the General Assembly has the lofty responsibility immediately to put an end to a situation in which the highest 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 just course is in conformity with the Charter; it consists of restoring all its rights to the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, and confirmation by the General Assembly of the unchallengeable reality that there exists only one China -- Taiwan belongs to the People's Republic of China -- and that the Government of the People's Republic of China is the only legal representative of the Chinese people.

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 the subject. Accordingly, the solution requires a simple majority of the votes. Any other approach to the question not only is contrary to the rules

of the Organization and to the practice constantly observed but also is designed to sabotage the entry of the People's Republic of China into the United Nations. Strict respect for the system of representation as 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.

In this case, too, the application of the fundamental standard regarding representation has two inseparable aspects: that the seat of China be occupied by the lawful representatives of the People's Republic of China and that those who at present usurp the seat be expelled from the Organization. Those two elements, which are indissolubly linked, are provided for in the operative part of the draft resolution (A/L.630 and Corr.1) of which Romania has the honour at this session to be one of the twenty-three co-sponsors. Under the operative part of that draft resolution the General Assembly would decide, without any confusion,

"... 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."

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 theory of the so-called two Chinas or of one China and one Taiwan.

(Mr. Ecobescu, Romania)

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. 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, while maintaining at the same time that those who now unlawfully occupy the seat of China be kept in the Organization. That is what is proposed in the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633.

Furthermore, they affirm that this would be proof of a realistic and constructive attitude. But in fact what is 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 my 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.

The theory of dual representation runs flagrantly counter to the basic principle of the Charter that every State Member of the Organization has only one seat, which is indivisible and which cannot be occupied by anyone other than 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 that would have particularly harmful consequences for the proper functioning of our Organization in the future.

There exists only one China in the world -- the People's Republic of China -- and that reality must be consecrated here, too, in the United Nations.

(Mr. Ecobescu, Romania)

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, usurping by force 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 intervention and military 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.

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 lawfully has as a Member of the United Nations. The United Nations cannot be associated with any such 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.

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.

The two-Chinas theory, whatever the cover under 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.

We also hear, in support of keeping in the Organization the representatives of a régime rejected by the people of China, that we must follow the principle of universality. However paradoxical this may seem, this is advocated precisely by those countries which, acting against the imperatives of universality, have in the past prevented, and now too endeavour to prevent, the participation of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. Attainment of universality means guaranteeing the right which all sovereign States have -- I repeat, sovereign States, not legal fictions -- of being in the United Nations.

The commandment of universality, therefore, also imposes 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.

For all those considerations, the delegation of Romania categorically objects to the draft resolutions in regard to dual representation and the two-thirds majority, respectively, and we shall vote against them. Similarly, we oppose and will vote against any other proposal intended to prevent or postpone the just solution of the question.

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 the draft resolution contained in document A/L.630, because this is the course that will cause legality to reign and will increase the prestige and effectiveness of our Organization.

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.

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. 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 co-sponsor the draft resolutions contained in documents A/L.632 and A/L.633.

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 co-sponsors of both the draft resolutions contained in documents A/L.630 and A/L.633 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.

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.

(Sir Laurence McIntyre, Australia)

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 prospects for peaceful and orderly solutions to many of the problems of the world and particularly of the Asian and Pacific region.

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 co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633. The only question before us is how 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.

By this I mean to say that while the Australian Government has no wish or intention to impede 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 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.

(Sir Laurence McIntyre, Australia)

Equally, we must not deny continuing membership to the Republic of China because it, too, does not control all of that territory.

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 the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633, co-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.

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 with 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.

The draft resolution contained in document A/L.630 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.

(Sir Laurence McIntyre, Australia)

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 14 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.

(Sir Laurence McIntyre, Australia)

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 membership of our Organization.

It has been stated several times in the course of this debate, particularly by co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/L.630, that no question of 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 expulsion of Members as an important question requiring decision by a two-thirds majority of Members present and voting. The representative of Costa Rica has quoted from numerous statements made in the general debate underlining what we must all acknowledge -- that the representation of China is indubitably an important question.

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.

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.

(Sir Laurence McIntyre, Australia)

I submit that neither is reasonable or just. Neither is designed to promote those purposes that we are here to serve and to promote. That is why Australia, as well as co-sponsoring the dual representation draft resolution contained in document A/L.633, has also co-sponsored the non-expulsion draft resolution contained in document A/L.632.

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 of 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.

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:

First, 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.

Second, 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.

Third, 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 on claims, but to take account of the situation that is actually before us.

(Sir Laurence McIntyre, Australia)

Fourth, the ideal of 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.

Finally, I would like to say that we hope that the decisions taken on this issue by this Assembly will mark a turning-point to the path that we all earnestly want to follow -- the path to peace and 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 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. These 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 -- for which we shall seek priority and for which we shall certainly expect to gain priority -- and in document A/L.633 for acceptance by this Assembly.

Mr. ALGARD (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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

The future development 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.

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

(Mr. Algard, Norway)

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.

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 22 countries on the "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations" (A/L.630) 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.

Mr. KLUSAK (Czechoslovakia) (interpretation from Russian): Before turning to the main subject of our meeting I should like to express to the delegation of the USSR and the Permanent Mission of the USSR to the United Nations our comradely sympathy and solidarity in connexion with yesterday's unprecedented attack carried out by criminal elements against that Permanent Mission, an attack which might have involved human injury. We should like to express our indignation at all such events as those that took place this morning, and similar views have been expressed by a number of previous speakers, that effective steps should be taken to prevent the recurrence of such acts. That would be in the interests of all Members of the United Nations.

In less than a month it will be the twenty-second anniversary of the day when the Foreign Minister of the Chinese Central People's Government officially notified the United Nations of the historic changes that had taken place in his country. The Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China had become the sole representative of the Chinese people, while the delegates of the Kuomintang had lost the right to represent China in the United Nations.

Since that time, almost a quarter of a century ago, the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies have had on their agenda the question of the exercise by the People's Republic of China of its lawful rights.

(Mr. Klusak, Czechoslovakia)

For more than two decades the Chinese People's Republic has been denied an opportunity to take the place in the United Nations that belongs to it by right. Contrary to the Charter and contrary also to the true state of affairs, that place has so far been occupied by private persons who represent no one.

Czechoslovakia from the very outset has always uncompromisingly upheld, irrespective of its relations with the People's Republic of China from time to time, the viewpoint 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 view, which we have upheld together with other socialist States. It has also shown that attempts to prevent the People's Republic of China from participating in the activities of the United Nations are to the detriment, in the first instance, of the Organization itself.

The present discussion of the question, at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, has repeatedly borne out better than anything what was already generally known, namely, who it is that is interested now and has been interested in maintaining an anomalous state of affairs and also whose policy it is that actually prevents a solution of the problem of the representation of China in the United Nations.

Year after year variations are played on one and the same artificial theme for the sole purpose of stopping, and now at least of delaying, what is an inevitable development. The latest product of these aspirations is the transparent attempt to block the access of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations by imposing the idea of the so-called simultaneous representation of the People's Republic of China and Taiwan. This approach, expressed primarily in the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633 introduced here by the United States, is presented as realistic despite the fact -- or, indeed, perhaps because of the fact -- that the official viewpoint of the People's Republic of China, as everyone knows and as published in General Assembly document A/8470, dated 15 October 1971, is that it will not take its place in the United Nations until such time as the Chiang Kai-shek régime withdraws from it.

(Mr. Klusak, Czechoslovakia)

Plans to institute so-called simultaneous representation or membership of the People's Republic of China and Taiwan in the United Nations are being pushed by all possible means without the participation in the discussion by the People's Republic of China. Yet in essence these are tantamount to direct interference in the domestic affairs of China. These attempts are justified here by the argument that the United Nations should not prejudge any future settlement between the People's Republic of China and Taiwan. The attempt to carry through the conception of dual representation of China is in essence an attempt to violate the territorial integrity of a State Member of the United Nations and to detach part of the People's Republic's territory. What future settlement are they talking about? Those who advocate this draft resolution have perhaps forgotten about 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 in Potsdam, which quite clearly states that Taiwan belongs to China.

The restoration of the People's Republic of China's lawful rights in the United Nations is not a question either of the admission or expulsion of a State. Taiwan is not a State but a Chinese province which was returned to China after the Second World War. Consequently it can have no lawful right to speak as the representative of a State founder of the United Nations. For the Czechoslovak delegation and at all sessions of the General Assembly which have taken place thus far, the question of the rightful representation of China in the United Nations has always been a question of recognition of the credentials of the representatives of China who, since 1949, have been the representatives of the Government of the Chinese People's Republic. The so-called two-China theory in any of its forms was not devised in order to further the just representation of China in the United Nations but rather in order to prevent it, or at least to postpone it.

The Czechoslovak delegation at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly, just as at all preceding sessions, considers that there is only one acceptable solution to the question of the representation of China -- that on the basis of which the representatives of the Chinese People's Republic will assume their lawful place in the United Nations and that the persons who represent the Chiang Kai-shek régime in the General Assembly should withdraw from the United Nations. We shall accordingly vote for the draft resolution contained in

(Mr. Klusak, Czechoslovakia)

document A/L.630. At the same time, my delegation rejects any manoeuvres aimed at preventing such a decision.

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 convinced that your personal and professional qualifications are sufficient guarantees to ensure that our debates will be guided to a successful conclusion. At the same time I wish to express our admiration for the brilliant work done by your predecessor, Mr. Edvard Hambro, Ambassador of Norway, who with so much skill and wisdom guided the debates in the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly when I had occasion to attend as a member of the delegation from my Government. May I also avail myself of the 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.

The Government of the People's Republic of China was prevented from representing its country as the de facto and de jure Government because of the intense rivalries of the cold war in the decade of the fifties. It is lack of realism that this should continue in the era of peaceful co-existence. The two-China 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 therefore is a grave error for this General Assembly to act as the artifact in the division of the people of China.

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 to the President of the United States of America, who was then Mr. Harry S. Truman, who had ordered United States marines to prevent any attacks being launched against Formosa. The representative of China proved that this was aggression against China since, according to the Cairo Declaration and the Potsdam Declaration of 1945, Formosa is Chinese territory.

In January 1955 the Security Council adopted a resolution 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 it should not participate in deliberations of the Security Council until its representative attended on behalf of China. 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 tried to confuse international opinion while bringing out sophistries such as those proposed in the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633 as well as the application of Article 18 of the Charter as presented in the draft resolution contained in document A/L.632. It is regrettable that they do not realize that they have made a great leap to reach that famous Article 18 without objecting at least to the provisions of Article 27 of the Charter which in our opinion is more appropriate to the case under consideration.

The delegation of Equatorial Guinea has concentrated all its attention on these essential matters and in order not to confuse this problem with procedural or other secondary matters we have, together with 22 other delegations presented a draft resolution which appears in document A/L.630 entitled: "Restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations".

(Mr. Esono Mica,
Equatorial Guinea)

In its final paragraph, that draft resolution calls for us to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek, and without any recourse. It may be difficult for some to do that, when we consider that there does exist a republic having the name of Taiwan or Formosa or whatever one may wish to call it. The draft resolution contained in document A/L.630 does not speak of the expulsion of a nation, nor of a Member of this General Assembly, but of the expulsion of some provincial representatives who, being represented here, lead to a loss of prestige for this Organization and to scorn on the part of accredited nations who have at their side a province that is also accredited.

That would occur were we to take into account the draft resolution submitted by the Washington Government and some of its satellites (A/L.633). 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. The colonial occupation of Taiwan is not and cannot be a force of law. The group of renegades that remain 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 words such as "sovereignty over a State" is an insult to all States, as I said earlier, and a deliberate mockery of the most elementary principles of international law.

I would draw the attention of all independent nations represented here by their legitimate representatives to the words of the representative of the United States 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.

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.

My country cannot lend its support to the idea of keeping outside this noble international Organization a country with about 850 million human beings. Nor can we support the idea that they are represented by a group of exiled

(Mr. Esono Mica,
Equatorial Guinea)

dissidents 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.

The Government of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea, under the wise leadership of its President, Don Francisco Macias 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 clear that that is a weak argument. It is not a matter of expelling a Member but of expelling a spurious representative. A nation cannot be represented by a clique that rebels against its legally recognized Government.

My delegation categorically objects to voting first on the draft resolution contained in document A/L.632, which refers to the application of Article 18 of the Charter, because we consider that that Article is not applicable to the item under consideration. My delegation also rejects the draft resolution presented by the United States and its allies appearing in document A/L.633 because we consider it reflects the idea of dual representation in this Assembly for the people of China. Its second operative paragraph reads as follows:

"Affirms the continued right of representation of the Republic of China". My delegation will also oppose any amendment that may be proposed to the draft resolution contained in document A/L.630.

Were we to review 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 that concept will be applied through 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. My Government believes the time has come for this Organization to break the rigid mould in which it has been enclosed in its thinking in regard to the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. That rigid mould would be broken by the unanimous vote of all delegations in favour of the draft resolution proposed by Albania and other States including my own.

(Mr. Esono Mica,
Equatorial Guinea)

Finally, I would repeat that my delegation opposes the priority requested by the United States representative, Mr. Bush, in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/L.632. My delegation objects not only to priority voting for that draft resolution but also calls for its rejection for the reasons I have stated.

If the Assembly unanimously votes in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.630 it will have abided by the concept of justice so necessary in this international Organization. Were we to do the contrary, we should fulfil the prophecy of the prophet Isaiah, who said "Those who preach truth will shed bitter tears".

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.

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.

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.

(Mr. Thaung Kyi, Burma)

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.

The delegation of Burma consistent with its stand 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 co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/L.630.

As to the other draft resolutions contained in documents A/L.632 and A/L.633, 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 and 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.

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.

(Mr. Geghman, Yemen)

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 America 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.

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, particularly local and limited wars. The policy of confrontation, containment, cordon sanitaire, which was the fashion of the Forties and Fifties bears 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.

The Americans are 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 co-sponsor, 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

YEMEN

(Mr. Geghman, Yemen)

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."

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 (A/L.630) and defeating all other drafts, amendments or any other 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, with a population of nine million, would be as nice, decent, law-abiding though not quite as hospitable and peace-loving -- as past and recent experience has proved -- a Member 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 hard-working, decent, law-abiding, freedom-loving Manhattan people is a hopeless case.

(Mr. Geghman, Yemen)

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, because the United States has thus far withheld its blessing, have been deprived of membership therein? 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 of 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.

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 twenty-two years. We could have dealt with it as a simple procedural matter twenty-two years ago. We cannot now correct that error which the Americans led us to commit by perpetrating another error at the behest of the Americans. Nor can we wait until Washington gives us the green light, after Mr. Nixon's visit to Peking.

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 in 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 the draft resolution contained in document A/L.630. That is the only appropriate course of action, and the time is now. Later it will be too late.

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, but also to the initiative of President Nixon 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.

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) 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.

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, p. 41)

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 statements of many previous speakers. I myself indicated earlier in the General Committee 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.

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 the draft resolution contained in document A/L.633 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.

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 of China in our search for solutions to 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.

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.

Mr. MANDI (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (interpretation from French):

In a statement made during the general debate, 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 bear in mind the realities of our time and of the world in which we live. It is our sincere belief that it would be a failure of 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. We also know -- and this is incontestable -- that the People's Republic of China neither de facto nor de jure exercises its 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.

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.

It will soon be 20 years since 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 of the People's Republic of China in its lawful rights, I would be tempted to pose the question whether, in the case which is now before us, one can speak of the so-called restoration of the rights of 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

(Mr. Mandi, Democratic Republic
of the Congo)

has never formally adhered to the United Nations Charter. 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 the seat for more than 20 years. Is it possible, taking this situation into account, 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.

If the expulsion of a Member of the Organization constitutes a grave violation of the Charter, the same is true concerning the attitude of a State which, for its entry into the Organization, would pose particular preconditions. All Members of the United Nations being signatories to the Charter, there can be no question of any of them having special prerogatives. If mainland China sets condition for 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 the course of 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, p. 67)

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.

(Mr. Mandi, Democratic Republic of
the Congo)

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.

This brings me to explaining my Government's view on the two draft resolutions, one submitted by Albania and the other by the United States. 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. This draft resolution, if it should be adopted by our Assembly, 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.

On the other hand, my delegation emphasizes that the Republic of China, founding Member of the United Nations, that 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.

In regard to the draft resolution submitted by the United States in document A/L.632 and supported by various countries, we understand the motives which impelled that country to submit such a draft resolution and which seems to take account of the realities of the world in which we are now living. We praise the efforts made by the sponsors of that draft resolution which, we believe, represents an acceptable compromise. However, despite this objective appreciation, my Government, for reasons peculiar to itself, is unable to support that draft resolution, because it would bring into our Organization a country which, scornful of the ideals of the Charter, makes domestic subversion

AP/ef

A/PV.1973

74-75

(Mr. Mandi, Democratic Republic
of the Congo)

a rule of its foreign policy and which has openly invited trouble in 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 resolved to change their foreign policy.

Mr. BETANCES (Dominican Republic) (interpretation from Spanish): For two decades, the Dominican Republic has supported the Republic of China, and more than for political reasons: because of our recognition of the principles of the Charter. 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. 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 most regrettable step backwards. We are co-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 Republic of China as a Member of 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 of the United Nations recognizes 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.

REPLIES IN CONNEXION WITH STATEMENTS MADE AT THE 1972ND PLENARY MEETING

The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply.

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 Ambassador Malik saw fit to bring in an entirely different matter. He chose to refer to my Government

(Sir Colin Crowe, United Kingdom)

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 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.

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.

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 Yemen. 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.

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 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.

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.

(Mr. Bush, United States)

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.

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.

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 which Ambassador Tomeh referred to this morning, and to the Mission of Saudi Arabia for the cases to which Ambassador Baroody referred. I also regret that there have been further incidents today involving teenagers who threw paint and tried to break up furniture and property in the lobby, as I understand, of the Soviet Mission and in the offices of another agency here. We regret those shameful incidents as well.

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

(Mr. Bush, United States)

this morning -- 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..

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 Tanenbaum, 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.

(Mr. Bush, United States)

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 attacks, which was the subject we were on this morning. Rabbi Tanenbaum 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."

Surely I can understand if 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.

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 Tanenbaum and see that it is not indeed an editorial.

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..

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

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.

Mr. Malik was followed by Mr. Baroodi 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 oombs 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 and 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 their facilities. We are their guests; they are the hosts. 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.

Mr. Tekoah, the Permanent Israeli Representative, 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

(Mr. Tomeh, Syrian Arab Republic)

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.

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.

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.

(Mr. Tomeh, Syrian Arab Republic)

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 it is 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 representative in the Third Committee this afternoon was doing the same thing, and WINS, Ambassador Bush, was saying the same thing last Sunday.

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 until today 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.

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.

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:

"Young Jewish girls" -- speaking about Damascus -- "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."

(Mr. Tomeh, Syrian Arab Republic)

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 it 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."

Then it concludes with the paragraph which Ambassador Bush read out.

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?

I must say that all the things that have been mentioned therein are dirty lies, and there cannot be other words to describe them. Damascus is an open city 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 street 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.

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".

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 -- Syrians of the Jewish faith -- to hospitals in Beirut in order to have them treated. I can produce the broadcast from Radio Damascus that

(Mr. Tomeh, Syrian Arab Republic)

Jews in Syria are Syrian citizens of the Jewish faith as Christians, like myself, are Syrian citizens of the Christian faith.

Then there is the following:

"Distinctive Jewish identity cards marked with a red stamp: Member of the Mosaic faith."

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 two, 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 identify the 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.

(Mr. Tomeh, Syrian Arab Republic)

It is stated: "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 always 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 -- 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 similar to singling out the identification card and saying that the Jews in Syria are referred to as "of the Mosaic faith."

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

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.

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.

The second report of the Tripartite Committee on Violations of Human Rights by Israel in the Occupied Territories 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 on their own bodies. 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, the World Health Organization, 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.

(Mr. Tomeh, Syrian Arab Republic)

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 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 by Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) reaffirming the previous 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?

Let us not forget that in 1969 in its resolution 2546 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.

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.

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, in Europe, in America and Nazi leaders, foremost among them being Eichmann. In 1953 a Zionist American writer named Ben Hecht, well known to the American public, published a book called: "Perfidy". 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. Rudolph Kastner, spokesman of the Trade and Industry Ministry in Israel as having collaborated with the Nazis in their extermination of Hungarian

(Mr. Tomeh, Syrian Arab Republic)

Jews. The Attorney General, Chaim Cohen, on behalf of the Israeli Government, brought Greenwald to trial on criminal libel. The defence attorney was Shmuel Tamir.

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.

(Mr. Tomeh, Syrian Arab Republic)

"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; Becher is one of the very few SS leaders who had the courage to oppose the programme of annihilation of the Jews and who tried to rescue human life. 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 quote comes from the same book.

"Walter Rapp, evidence counsellor 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.

"Schmuel Tamir pushed for a trial of Kastner. Kastner was assassinated by Zeev Eckstein; a few months before he was a paid under-cover agent of the Israeli intelligence service. Too much has 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 Zionist leaders and the Nazis. There were Lord Moyne; Count Folke Bernadotte, who was later sent to Palestine and assassinated by the Irgun Zvei Leumi -- the Security Council adopted a resolution condemning the gangs in Israel for his assassination; Kastner himself and, last but not least, Eichmann.

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.

(Mr. Tomeh, Syrian Arab Republic)

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.

It is a well known fact that Vorster, who at best is an unrepentent 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 or 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?

And yet the irony is that a man like Tekoah -- Tekoah is a name, but 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.

Listen to this. The Jewish Telegraphic Agency is located here in the city of New York. This is published by 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, twenty-six 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

(Mr. Tomeh, Syrian Arab Republic)

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.

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 of 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 fifteen 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.

(Mr. Tomeh, Syrian Arab Republic)

"Also represented will be the Standard Bank and Barclays Bank International divisions. The mission has been organized by the Israeli-South African Trade Association."

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.

In Mr. Tekoah's new approach to explaining Zionism, he has resorted to a new line. Because I follow his thoughts very carefully. As we heard this morning, Israel, according to the Bible, is the Chosen People of God. But for anybody who knows nazism, they know that according to Hitler the German people was the chosen people of God who should rule the world from end to end. I hope that you will see in the record tomorrow whether Mr. Tekoah has said and affirmed or not that he represents the Chosen People of God. In the twentieth century, after man has gone to the moon, we have to accept this from Mr. Tekoah. We have to give up our territories to him, not only to be satisfied since they 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, because it is a falsification of Judaism because Zionism is nothing but a colonial settler régime movement. And when we tried to prove to Mr. Tekoah that the Zionism movement started with Herzl as The Colonial Jewish Trust Company for the colonization of Palestine, he just tried to forget about this, and he goes back to 2,000 years ago.

(Mr. Tomeh, Syrian Arab Republic)

So, after saying that they are the Chosen People of God, 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 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 human rights against 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."

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 accepted so

(Mr. Tomeh, Syrian Arab Republic)

far any border to Israel. 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 is 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 the Epistles of St. Paul 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.

(Mr. Tomeh, Syrian Arab Republic)

The following are not my words but are contained in the decisions of the Zionist General Council's fifth session after the Twenty-Third 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.

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 Zvei 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.

(Mr. Stavropoulos, Under-Secretary
General for General Assembly Affairs)

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 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 that there will be no repetition of such an irresponsible and criminal act.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.

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

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

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.

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.

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

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.

Republic of China

Barbados

Botswana (NYC)

Congo K (conserv.)

El Salvador (conserv.)

Guatemala (conserv.)

South Africa (FM, NYC)

Spain

Togo

Thailand

Afghanistan

Indonesia

Iran

Laos

Malaysia (NYC)

Netherlands

*Singapore
(demarche, followed
by letter to Lee)

New Zealand

Afghanistan

Denmark

Iceland

Ireland

Malaysia (NYC)

Netherlands

Australia

Afghanistan

Bhutan

Denmark

Iceland

Ireland

Malaysia (NYC)

Netherlands

Norway

Anyone's help

Ecuador

Ghana

Kuwait

Malta - Japan

Morocco - Japan

Panama

Portugal - U.S.

Spain - (ROC)

Togo

Venezuela (NYC)

CH 11/12
CP

IMPORTANT QUESTION RESOLUTION

(US and Japanese Missions 10/11/71)

YES -- 58
NO -- 59 UNKN -- 1
ABS -- 12 Absent- 1

COUNTRY	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	COUNTRY	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Afghanistan		X		Kuwait (JAPAN/ARGENTINA)		X	0
Albania		X		Laos	X		
Algeria		X		Lebanon	X		
Argentina (JAPAN/KUWAIT)	0	0	X	Lesotho	X		
Australia	X			Liberia	X		
Austria PIQ	0		X	Libyan Arab Republic		X	
Bahrain	X			Luxembourg	X		
Barbados	X		0	Madagascar	X		
Belgium	X			Malawi	X		
Bhutan		X		Malaysia PIQ		X	
Bolivia	X			Maldives Is.			
Botswana			X	Mali		X	
Brazil	X			Malta	?X		0 (5)
Bulgaria		X		Mauritania		X	
Burma		X		Mauritius	X		
Burundi		X	0	Mexico	0	0	X
Byelorussian S.S.R.		X		Mongolian P.R.		X	
Cameroon		X		Morocco PIQ	0	X	0
Canada		X		Nepal		X	
Central African Rep.	X	0 (6)		Netherlands PIQ	0		X
Ceylon		X		New Zealand	X		
Chad	X			Nicaragua	X		
Chile		X		Niger	X		
China	X			Nigeria		X	
Colombia	X			Norway		X	
Congo (K)	X			Oman	X		
Costa Rica	X			Pakistan		X	
Cuba		X		Panama	X		0
Cyprus	X			Paraguay	X		
Czechoslovakia		X		Peop Dem Rep of Yemen		X	
Dahomey	X			Peop Rep of the Congo		X	
Denmark		X	0	Peru		X	
Dominican Republic	X			Philippines	X		
Ecuador			X	Poland		X	
Egypt		X		Portugal	0		X
El Salvador	X			Qatar	X		0 (1)
Equatorial Guinea		X		Romania		X	
Ethiopia		X	0	Rwanda	X		
Fiji	X			Saudi Arabia	X		
Finland		X		Senegal	X		
France		X		Sierra Leone		X	
Gabon	X			Singapore PIQ		X	
Zambia	X			Somali Republic		X	
Ghana		0	X	South Africa	X		
Greece	X			Spain	X		
Guatemala	X			Sudan		X	
Guinea		X		Swaziland	X		
Guyana		X		Sweden		X	
Haiti	X			Syrian Arab Republic		X	
Honduras	X			Thailand	X		
Hungary		X		Togo		0	UNKN
Iceland		X	0	Trinidad and Tobago			X
India		X		Tunisia	X		
Indonesia	0	0	X	Turkey	0		X
Iran		0	X	Uganda		X	
Iraq		X		Ukrainian S.S.R.		X	
Ireland (NEW DIFFERS) PIQ		X	0	U.S.S.R.		X	
Israel	X		0	United Kingdom		X	
Italy PIQ		X	0	United Rep of Tanzania		X	
Ivory Coast	X			United States	X		
Jamaica	X			Upper Volta	X		
Japan	X			Uruguay	X		
Jordan	X			Venezuela	X		
Kenya		X	0	Yemen Arab Republic		X	
Khmer Republic	X			Yugoslavia		X	
				Zambia		X	
YES : 29				YES : 29			
NO : 29				NO : 30			
ABS : 7				ABS : 5			

YES -- 61

NO -- 54

ABST - 14

UNKN - 1

Absent -1

(US and Japanese Missions 10/11/71)

COUNTRY	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	COUNTRY	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
Afghanistan		X	O	Kuwait		X	O
Albania		X		Laos	X		
Algeria		X		Lebanon	X		
Argentina			X	Lesotho	X		
Australia	X			Liberia	X		
Austria 19	X			Libyan Arab Republic		X	O
Bahrain	X			Luxembourg	X		
Barbados	X			Madagascar	X		
Belgium	X			Malawi	X		
Bhutan		X		Malaysia 19		O	X
Bolivia	X			Maldives Ts.			
Botswana			X	Mali		X	
Brazil	X			Malta	X		O
Bulgaria		X		Mauritania		X	
Burma		X		Mauritius	X		
Burundi		X	O	Mexico	O		X
Byelorussian S.S.R.		X		Mongolian P.R.		X	
Cameroon		X		Morocco 19	O		X
Canada		X		Nepal		X	O
Central African Rep.	X			Netherlands 19	X		O
Ceylon		X		New Zealand	X		
Chad	X			Nicaragua	X		
Chile		X		Niger	X		
China	X			Nigeria		X	
Colombia	X			Norway		X	
Congo (K)	X			Oman	X		
Costa Rica	X			Pakistan		X	
Cuba		X		Panama	X		O
Cyprus	X			Paraguay	X		
Czechoslovakia		X		Peop Dem Rep of Yemen		X	
Dahomey	X			Peop Rep of the Congo		X	
Denmark		X		Peru		X	O
Dominican Republic	X			Philippines	X		
Ecuador	O		X	Poland		X	
Egypt		X		Portugal	O		X
El Salvador	X			Qatar	X		
Equatorial Guinea		X		Romania		X	
Ethiopia		X		Rwanda	X		
Fiji	X			Saudi Arabia	X		
Finland		X		Senegal	X	O	
France		X	O	Sierra Leone		X	
Gabon	X			Singapore 19			X
Gambia	X			Somali Republic		X	
Ghana	O		X	South Africa	X		
Greece	X			Spain	X		
Guatemala	X			Sudan		X	
Guinea		X		Swaziland	X		
Guyana		X		Sweden		X	
Haiti	X			Syrian Arab Republic		X	
Honduras	X			Thailand	X		
Hungary		X		Togo	O	O	O
Iceland		X	O	Trinidad and Tobago			X
India		X		Tunisia	X		
Indonesia	O		X	Turkey	O		X
Iran	O		X	Uganda		X	O
Iraq		X		Ukrainian S.S.R.		X	
Ireland 19	O		X	U.S.S.R.		X	
Israel	X			United Kingdom		X	O
Italy 19	X		O	United Rep of Tanzania		X	
Ivory Coast	X			United States	X		
Jamaica	X			Upper Volta	X		
Japan	X			Uruguay	X		
Jordan	X			Venezuela	X		
Kenya		X	O	Yemen Arab Republic		X	
Khmer Republic	X			Yugoslavia		X	
				Zambia		X	
YES 31				YES 30			
NO 27				NO 27			
ABST 7				ABST 7			

YES = 61

NO = 54

ABST = 14

UNKN = 1

ABSENT = 1

US/A/123/Rev. 28 (9/71)

251

Moely
Brenner
address
to you

Nov 6 -

Pilot's Deal
to Canada

Kyle Jones
xpm

Voting on the Question of Chinese Representation:
26th General Assembly

The voting on the question of Chinese representation took place on October 25, 1971, and involved three major resolutions.

One resolution stated that "any proposal to change the representation of China is an important question" thus requiring a two-thirds majority vote, and was defeated with 55 for, 59 against, and 15 abstaining. A vote was taken by roll call as follows:

In favor: Central African Republic, Chad, China, Columbia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil.

Against: Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon.

Abstaining: Cyprus, Iran, Italy, Laos, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, Qatar, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Austria, Belgium, Botswana.

Absent: Maldive Islands, Oman.

Another resolution called for the "restoration of 7 all the rights of the People's Republic of China and the recognition of the representatives of its government as the only lawful representatives of China to the United Nations and The expulsion forthwith of 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." It was adopted with 76 for, 35 against, and 17 abstaining. The voting was as follows:

In favor:

Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada.

Against:

Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Democratic Republic of) Costa Rica, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Gabon, Gambia, Guatamala, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Japan, Khmer Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, New Zealand, Nicagagua, Niger, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Swaziland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil.

Abstaining:

Columbia, Cyprus, Fiji, Greece, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Panama, Qatar, Spain, Thailand, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados.

Absent:

.Maldiv Islands, Oman, Republic of China.

A third resolution (sponsored by the United States) which affirmed the "right of representation of the People's Republic of China" and recommended that it be seated in the Security Council, and also affirmed the "continued right of representation of the Republic of China" was not brought to a vote once the second of the two resolutions listed above was adopted.

Public Affairs Office
United States Mission
November 1971

VOTING ON THE QUESTION OF CHINESE
REPRESENTATION SINCE 1950

Following are the votes on questions relating to China's representation since they first came before the United Nations in 1950. For consistency in the tabulation, the "Yes" column indicates the votes in favor of Peking, the "No" indicates the votes against Peking.

(Until 1960, unless otherwise indicated, the vote was in the General Assembly on a motion by the United States to keep the question off the agenda. In recent years, however, the motions have, for the most part involved two resolutions: a United States-sponsored resolution to classify the issue as an "important issue", thus requiring a two-thirds vote for approval; and an Albanian-Cambodian-sponsored resolution to expel the Republic of China and seat the Chinese Communists.)

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>ABSTAIN</u>
*1950	3	6	2
1950	6	33	10
1951	11	37	4
1952	7	42	11
1953	10	44	2
1954	11	43	6
1955	12	42	6
1956	24	47	8
1957	27	48	6
1958	28	44	9
1959	29	44	9
1960	34	42	22
+1961	34	61	7
≠1961	36	48	20
≠1962	42	56	12
** 1963	41	57	12
1964 - No vote taken because of United Nations financial crisis			
+1965	49	56	11
**1965	47	47	20
+1966	48	66	7
**1966	46	57	17
+1967	48	69	4
**1967	45	58	17
**1968	44	58	23
**1969	48	56	21
**1970	51	49	25
**1971	76	35	17

* Security Council vote on a Soviet motion to seat

+ United States-sponsored resolution to classify the issue as an "important issue" requiring a two-thirds vote for approval

≠ Soviet motion to seat

** Albanian-Cambodian proposal to seat

Voting on the Question of Chinese Representation:
26th General Assembly

The voting on the question of Chinese representation took place on October 25, 1971, and involved three major resolutions.

One resolution stated that "any proposal to change the representation of China is an important question" thus requiring a two-thirds majority vote, and was defeated with 55 for, 59 against, and 15 abstaining. A vote was taken by roll call as follows:

In favor: Central African Republic, Chad, China, Columbia, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Costa Rica, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil.

Against: Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon.

Abstaining: Cyprus, Iran, Italy, Laos, Malta, Morocco, Netherlands, Qatar, Senegal, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Austria, Belgium, Botswana.

Absent: Maldives Islands, Oman.

Another resolution called for the "restoration of 7 all the rights of the People's Republic of China and 7 the recognition of 7 the representatives of its government as the only lawful representatives of China to the United Nations and 7 the expulsion forthwith of 7 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." It was adopted with 76 for, 35 against, and 17 abstaining. The voting was as follows:

In favor:

Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Libyan Arab Republic, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, People's Republic of the Congo, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada.

Against:

Central African Republic, Chad, Congo (Democratic Republic of) Costa Rica, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Gabon, Gambia, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Ivory Coast, Japan, Khmer Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Paraguay, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Swaziland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil.

Abstaining:

Columbia, Cyprus, Fiji, Greece, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Panama, Qatar, Spain, Thailand, Argentina, Bahrain, Barbados.

Absent:

Maldives Islands, Oman, Republic of China.

A third resolution (sponsored by the United States) which affirmed the "right of representation of the People's Republic of China" and recommended that it be seated in the Security Council, and also affirmed the "continued right of representation of the Republic of China" was not brought to a vote once the second of the two resolutions listed above was adopted.

Public Affairs Office
United States Mission
November 1971

VOTING ON THE QUESTION OF CHINESE
REPRESENTATION SINCE 1950

Following are the votes on questions relating to China's representation since they first came before the United Nations in 1950. For consistency in the tabulation, the "Yes" column indicates the votes in favor of Peking, the "No" indicates the votes against Peking.

(Until 1960, unless otherwise indicated, the vote was in the General Assembly on a motion by the United States to keep the question off the agenda. In recent years, however, the motions have, for the most part involved two resolutions: a United States-sponsored resolution to classify the issue as an "important issue", thus requiring a two-thirds vote for approval; and an Albanian-Cambodian-sponsored resolution to expel the Republic of China and seat the Chinese Communists.)

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>ABSTAIN</u>
*1950	3	6	2
1950	6	33	10
1951	11	37	4
1952	7	42	11
1953	10	44	2
1954	11	43	6
1955	12	42	6
1956	24	47	8
1957	27	48	6
1958	28	44	9
1959	29	44	9
1960	34	42	22
+1961	34	61	7
≠1961	36	48	20
≠1962	42	56	12
** 1963	41	57	12
1964 - No vote taken because of United Nations financial crisis			
+1965	49	56	11
**1965	47	47	20
+1966	48	66	7
**1966	46	57	17
+1967	48	69	4
**1967	45	58	17
**1968	44	58	23
**1969	48	56	21
**1970	51	49	25
**1971	76	35	17

* Security Council vote on a Soviet motion to seat

+ United States-sponsored resolution to classify the issue as an "important issue" requiring a two-thirds vote for approval

≠ Soviet motion to seat

** Albanian-Cambodian proposal to seat

UPI-86

(JACKSON)

TALLAHASSEE FLA -- SEN. HENRY M. JACKSON (D-WASH) SAID TODAY THAT THE EXPULSION OF TAIWAN FROM THE UNITED NATIONS HAS ERODED U.S. WORLD LEADERSHIP.

JACKSON, AN UNANNOUNCED CANDIDATE FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION, BLAMED PRESIDENT NIXON FOR WHAT HE TERMED "A FIASCO".

THE WASHINGTON DEMOCRAT SAID NIXON HAD PROMISED ON JULY 15 THAT EFFORTS TO IMPROVE RELATIONS BETWEEN PEKING AND WASHINGTON WOULD NOT BE "AT THE EXPENSE OF OUR FRIENDS".

"BUT THE EXPULSION OF TAIWAN IS ELOQUENT EVIDENCE THAT THE ADMINISTRATION DOES NOT DELIVER ON ITS PLEDGES," HE SAID IN A STATEMENT.

JACKSON SAID HE AGREED WITH THOSE WHO TERM THE U.S. DEFEAT IN THE U.N. AS "SYMBOLIC" BUT ADDED THAT HE DID NOT BELIEVE IT WAS "MERELY SYMBOLIC".

"FOR WHAT THE U.N. VOTE SYMBOLIZED, IN FACT, IS THAT AMERICA'S POSITION OF WORLD LEADERSHIP HAS BEEN ERODED," HE SAID.

"THROUGHOUT THIS FIASCO THE ADMINISTRATION FAILED TO CONVEY A CONVINCING IMPRESSION OF WHAT ITS REAL POLICY WAS. CAPITALS AROUND THE WORLD WERE ALIVE WITH SPECULATION THAT THE U.S. COMMITMENT TO THE MAINTENANCE OF TAIWAN REPRESENTATION WAS NOTHING BUT A PRO FORMA EFFORT. ON THE EVE OF THE CRUCIAL VOTE, THE PRESIDENT'S MOST TRUSTED ADVISER WAS DEEP IN CONVERSATION AT PEKING. WHEN THE ADMINISTRATION SOUGHT TO RALLY SUPPORT, THE DAMAGE HAD ALREADY BEEN DONE."

10-28 HPIKASPED

Chavez for