

contained an unreasonable, peremptory demand, punitive in substance and intent. The expulsion or exclusion against its will of a peace-loving Member that effectively controlled a territory with a viable system of its own would be contrary to the very spirit of harmony and friendship between nations, they said. It would both contravene the Charter and set a dangerous precedent. Since the word "expel" was clearly written into the 23-power draft resolution, the application of Article 18 of the Charter² listing expulsion as an important question was in order. The 19-power draft resolution, on the other hand, merely accepted, without prejudice to the eventual settlement of the claims, the fact that for the time being there were two Chinese Governments, but refrained from embracing the idea of two Chinas. By adopting it, they argued, the United Nations would open the path to reconciliation and peaceful dialogue, thus promoting peace and stability in Asia.

Members who spoke in opposition to the draft resolution calling for a two-thirds majority and that calling for seating of both the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China included Ceylon, Chile, Cuba, France, Hungary, Mali, Norway, Sierra Leone, Uganda, the USSR and the United Kingdom.

They made the point, among other things, that the precise issue of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations did not imply a question of admission or expulsion. Rather, the issue was one of credentials. The vacating of the seat of China by the Chiang Kai-shek régime was a legal, logical consequence of the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China. Moreover, Taiwan had never been a Member State of the United Nations. There was only one Chinese State that was entitled to a seat at the United Nations. To have an additional seat would require as a prior condition the creation of a second Chinese State which would have to apply for membership under the Charter.

Mali commented that a vote for the two resolutions would create a precedent which far from finding a solution to the problem of divided countries could foster parcellization of the States of the third world, many of which were looking for final boundaries conforming to their national identity. Cuba said that foreign intervention which had sought to segregate a province from the territory of China could never be a valid justification to accord to that territory, separated by force, any national character or any sovereignty.

Supporters of the 23-power draft resolution maintained that this proposal was the only one which took into account the rights and the reality of the People's Republic of China, for the People's Republic of China was clearly the only Chinese

Government empowered to exercise responsibility in the Assembly and the Security Council. The proposal for dual representation was contrary to the Charter, would only create obstacles and delay an event whose inevitability had been made apparent by the diplomatic initiatives under way. To fail to support that draft would be to disavow the vast efforts at rapprochement which had grown since last year and to assail the unity and the rights of China. It would be to refuse to see the world as it was, with China.

Other Members, including Argentina, Laos, Malta and Spain, among others, felt that since both the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China agreed that there was only one China, the question of the retention in or removal from the Organization of the representatives of the Republic of China should be left to the Chinese people themselves. They indicated that the guiding principles in their votes on the various proposals would be the principles of universality and of non-intervention in internal affairs.

On 25 October, the General Assembly proceeded to vote on the proposals before it, after rejecting by 56 votes to 53, with 19 abstentions, a motion by Saudi Arabia for postponement of the voting.

The General Assembly adopted by a roll-call vote of 61 to 53, with 15 abstentions, a motion by the United States that priority be given in the voting to the 22-power draft resolution calling for a two-thirds majority on any proposal depriving the Republic of China of representation in the United Nations.³

The Assembly then rejected the 22-power draft resolution by a roll-call vote of 59 against to 55 in favour, with 15 abstentions.

Following this vote, Tunisia withdrew the three draft resolutions it had submitted, stating it would vote for the 23-power text. The representative of Tunisia said that the texts had been submitted in anticipation of the adoption of a decision affirming

² Ibid.

³ The roll-call vote was as follows:

In favour: Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Portugal, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Thailand, Tunisia, United States, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

Against: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Bhutan, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Republic, Mali, Mauritania, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Abstaining: Austria, Botswana, Cyprus, Ecuador, Iran, Kenya, Laos, Malaysia, Malta, Qatar, Senegal, Singapore, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey.