

FILE COVER SHEET

DO NOT REMOVE CONTENTS OF FILE

CENTRAL FILES

CLASSIFICATION

C/China/000 Recognition of Chinese
Communist Regime by U.N.

CONTENTS

CROSS REFERENCES

C/China/760 Representation
Protests

C/China/000 Recognition of Mainland China
Fund Members and Non-Members

SM/73/252

November 9, 1973

To: Members of the Executive Board
From: The Secretary
Subject: Representation of China Within the United Nations System

The attached memorandum prepared by the Fund staff provides background information for Executive Directors on the participation of the People's Republic of China in other international organizations within the United Nations framework.

Att: (1)

Other Distribution:
Department Heads

*copy c/China / 2005 Status of China
in IM.Fund*

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Representation of China within the United Nations System

Prepared by the Legal Department

(In consultation with the Special Representative
to the United Nations)

Approved by Joseph Gold

November 8, 1973

At ERM/73/99 on October 29, 1973, a number of executive directors requested additional information on the status of participation of China in other agencies in the United Nations system, with particular emphasis on the financial aspects of participation.

Attachment I contains a report prepared in 1972 by the United Nations Secretariat on the representation of China within the United Nations system. ^{1/} The present memorandum summarizes developments since that report, with special reference to the decisions that have been taken by various organizations, the responses of the Government of the People's Republic of China to decisions on representation, and the status of contributions by China to those organizations.

1. United Nations (UN) -- Following the General Assembly's decision of October 25, 1971, the Government of the People's Republic appointed a Permanent Representative to the Security Council as well as other delegates to various organs of the United Nations, such as ECAFE and UNCTAD. The Government of the People's Republic has not accepted, however, the invitation to send an observer to the meetings of GATT. The Government of the People's Republic has contributed to the budget of the United Nations for the period beginning October 25, 1971 and to the Working Capital Fund. The Government has refused, however, to make contributions in respect of any previous period and has communicated its refusal to pay assessments attributable to "items which constitute a violation of the purposes and principles of the UN Charter or are hostile to the Chinese people", such as the servicing of peacekeeping bonds, the maintenance of UNEF in the Middle East, or the expenditures on the UN cemetery in Korea.

^{1/} Reproduced with permission from the May 1972 issue of International Legal Materials.

In Resolution No.3049 C(XXVII), the General Assembly decided on December 19, 1972 to "retain as unpaid assessed contributions ... only a pro rata share ... based on the period ..." following its October 25, 1971 resolution. The 1972 resolution also transferred all arrears of China for previous periods to a special account, from which the balance arising from regular budget assessments would be added to the short-term deficit of the UN.

On December 5, 1972, the Secretary-General was notified by the Government of the People's Republic that it "does not recognize the statement made by the defunct Chinese Government on October 26, 1946 ... concerning the acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the [International] Court [of Justice]". The letter reproduced in Attachment X to SM/73/238 (10/15/73) states the policy of the Government of the People's Republic in relation to the multilateral treaties of which the UN is the depository.

2. International Labor Organization (ILO) -- Following the decision of the Governing Body on November 16, 1971, to "recognize the Government of the People's Republic of China as the representative of the Government of China", that Government expressed interest in the organization but indicated that staffing difficulties would prevent any immediate participation. The ILO has not received either contributions or indications of interest in participation from the Government of the People's Republic to date. In June 1973, the ILO Council adopted a decision that created a special account for pre-November 16, 1971 arrears, but no part of the arrears was added to the current deficit.

3. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) -- Following the decision of the Conference on November 25, 1971, to permit the People's Republic of China to resume its place in the organization as a founding member twenty years after the Government on Taiwan withdrew, the Director-General announced in March 1973 that the Government of the People's Republic of China had informed him that it would resume membership as of April 1, 1973. The Director-General agreed to place before the Conference the views of the Government that it "cannot agree to undertake any obligations incurred by the Chiang Kai-Shek regime when it illegally occupied China's seat", such as arrears in contributions. A draft resolution now before the Conference would cancel the arrears attributable to China's membership before 1952 (net of the contribution of the Government of the Republic of China to FAO's Working Capital Fund), and write off the net loss against FAO's Reserve Surplus Account.

4. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) -- Following the Executive Board's decision on October 29, 1971, that "from today onwards, the Government of the People's Republic of China is the only legitimate representative of China in UNESCO ...", that Government sent representatives to the 1972 UNESCO Conference in November 1972, and one of the representatives of that Government was elected to UNESCO's Executive Board, which was enlarged to accommodate that representative among others. At that Conference a decision was taken not to claim from the Government of the People's Republic of China the net budget arrears attributable to periods before October 29, 1971, but the Government has made contributions for subsequent periods. It is believed that the Government has also been credited with China's contribution to the Working Capital Fund.

5. World Health Organization (WHO) -- On May 10, 1972 the World Health Assembly adopted the decision reproduced in Attachment II. Representatives of the People's Republic attended the twenty-sixth World Health Assembly in May 1973 and meetings of the Executive Committee in 1972 and 1973. The 1973 World Health Assembly took a decision similar to that of the UN General Assembly with respect to arrears attributable to 1949-1952.

6. International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) -- Following the decision on November 19, 1971, of the ICAO Council "to recognize the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China", the Government indicated that it would give further consideration to participation in ICAO. China continues to be regarded by ICAO as a contracting party, and arrears in contributions have accumulated for 1972 and 1973. The amount of these contributions was determined in 1970 on the basis of data relating only to the Republic of China.

7. Universal Postal Union (UPU) -- The present constitution of the UPU came into force on April 1, 1959, although the organization had existed with China as a member for many years previously. Following the decision of the Member States of the UPU that took effect on April 12, 1972, that Resolution No. 2758 (XXVI) of the UN General Assembly should apply to the UPU, the Government of the People's Republic acceded to the Universal Postal Convention on February 7, 1973. Delegations appointed by the People's Republic have represented China at technical meetings of the UPU since November 1972. The arrears in contributions for the period January 1 - April 11, 1972 have been placed in a suspense account.

8. International Telecommunication Union (ITU) -- The Administrative Council adopted on May 29, 1972 the decision that appears in Attachment III. On November 16, 1972 the Government of the People's Republic formally acceded to the International Telecommunication Convention of 1965, and became a new member of the ITU. The Government subsequently appointed delegates to the Plenipotentiary Conference. A "small credit" was left with the ITU by the Government of the Republic of China.

9. World Meteorological Organization (WMO) -- China became a member of WMO on April 1, 1951. Following the decision of the Member States of the WMO that took effect on February 25, 1972, that Resolution No. 2758 (XXVI) of the General Assembly should apply within the WMO, an elected representative of the Government of the People's Republic to the Executive Committee took his seat in September 1972. The Government formally acceded to the Convention of the WMO on February 9, 1973. The Executive Committee has cancelled the unpaid arrears of China attributable to the period January 1 - February 24, 1972.

10. Inter-governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) -- The IMCO Convention came into force on March 17, 1958. On May 23, 1972 the IMCO Council adopted the decision that appears in Attachment IV. The Government of the People's Republic accepted the IMCO Convention on March 1, 1973. Subsequently a representative of the Government has attended Council meetings as an observer, and a delegation is participating in the meeting of the Assembly in November 1973. IMCO has cancelled China's arrears for 1972, and has accepted the position of the Government of the People's Republic that China became a member of IMCO on March 1, 1973 for the purposes of IMCO's budget.

11. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) -- China became a founding member of IAEA in 1957. Following the Board of Governors resolution of December 9, 1971 that recognized the right of the Government of the People's Republic to represent China, the reply to invitations to send representatives to IAEA meetings was that no representatives from the Government of the People's Republic of China would be able to attend. Arrears for the 1970-1972 period were carried as accounts receivable until the beginning of 1973, at which time they were placed in a suspense account. China is now listed as a member of IAEA, but its name does not appear on the 1973 contributions list. It is possible that the Government of the People's Republic does not regard China as a member of IAEA.

12. Summary

All organizations in the United Nations system except the Fund and the World Bank Group have terminated their relations with the Government of the Republic of China ^{2/} and have recognized the right of the Government of the People's Republic to represent China in their organizations. In each of the organizations that has made this decision, the chief executive has communicated it to the Government of the People's Republic and has invited it to participate in the activities of the organization. The chief executives of the UN, FAO, UNESCO and WMO have subsequently visited China at the invitation of the Government of the People's Republic in order to establish working relations. Participation has followed shortly thereafter in the UN and in 7 of the 10 Agencies related to the UN under Article 57 of its Charter. The Government has taken no definitive action on the decisions of the ILO, the ICAO, the IAEA, and GATT. ^{3/} Representatives have participated fully in the other organizations. The Government has taken the position in those organizations in which China became a member after October 1, 1949, that China was not a member but would have to accept afresh the obligations of membership if it wished to participate.

The Government has refused, as a matter of principle, to pay any amounts owing to the organizations that invited its participation in respect of any period antedating the invitation. A number of these organizations (e.g., UN and UNESCO) have cancelled these arrears as obligations of China, whereas others (e.g., ILO) have set aside these arrears in special accounts. Some organizations (e.g., FAO, WHO) have not yet determined the disposition of the arrears. In some cases, if the organization owed money to China, the Government of the People's Republic has claimed it as an "asset of the Chinese people." The Government has contributed or expressed a willingness to contribute to the current budgets of the organizations in which it participates, but not to those programs of the UN that the Government has asserted

^{2/} The IAEA continues to maintain a nuclear safeguards agreement for three nuclear power plants on Taiwan. The Delegate of the People's Republic in the UN General Assembly has insisted that the IAEA sever all links with Taiwan.

^{3/} Although, by virtue of Article 92 of the UN Charter, China is a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the Government of the People's Republic has denounced China's acceptance in 1946 of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

are illegal or hostile to the Chinese people. The Government has taken no action regarding contributions to the organizations in which it has not yet decided to participate, even though the organizations treat China as a member and continue to assess contributions against it.

Table 1 shows the dates on which the various organizations took action to terminate relations with the Government of the Republic, as well as the dates, when known, on which the participation of the Government of the People's Republic began. Table 2 summarizes the amounts of contributions and arrears in the various organizations, and the attitudes of the respective organizations to the arrears.

Attachments

TABLE 1

Dates of Recognition of the Government of the People's Republic
and Commencement of Participation

	Dates after 1949 of Acceptance of Present Constitu- tion <u>1/</u>	Dates on which General Assembly Resolution No.2758 (XXVI) was followed	Dates on which Government of the People's Republic began to participate or accepted member- ship
UN		October 25, 1971	1971
ILO		November 16, 1971	Not yet
FAO		November 25, 1971	April 1, 1973
UNESCO		October 29, 1971	1972
IMCO	March 17, 1958	May 23, 1972	March 1, 1973 <u>1/</u>
WHO		May 10, 1972	1972
ICAO		November 19, 1971	Not yet
UFU	April 1, 1959	April 13, 1972	February 7, 1973 <u>1/</u>
ITU	January 1, 1967	May 29, 1972	November 16, 1972 <u>1/</u>
WMO	April 1, 1951	February 25, 1972	February 9, 1973 <u>1/</u>
IAEA	July 29, 1957	December 9, 1971	Not yet

1/ As China had accepted the constitutions of these organizations after 1949, the People's Republic deposited new instruments of acceptance on the dates shown. The organizations, however, appear to have deemed that there was no interruption in China's membership. Representatives from Peking attended meetings of some of these organizations in the period prior to the deposit of instruments of acceptance.

TABLE 2

China: Status of Contributions and Arrears

	Amount of assessed contributions paid in 1972	Amount of arrears up to the time the Government of the Republic ceased to represent China	Disposition of arrears
UN	\$8,166,330	\$30,169,295	Placed in special account; regular budget portion written off
ILO	<u>1/</u>	\$ 1,624,059	Pre-decision arrears transferred to special account
FAO	None payable <u>2/</u>	\$ 1,077,198	Recommendation that they be placed in special account and written off.
UNESCO	\$2,017,919	\$ 2,644,877	Cancelled
IMCO	<u>3/</u>	\$ 12,000	Cancelled
WHO	"Paid in full"	\$26,700,000	Recommendation that they be placed in special account and written off
ICAO	\$ 523 <u>4/</u>	None	--
UPU	\$ 50,632	<u>5/</u>	Placed in Suspense Account
ITU	\$ 270,279	"A small credit"	Carried forward
WMO	"Paid in full"	"Negligible" <u>5/</u>	Cancelled
IAEA	None	\$ 1,365,000 through 1972, or \$ 791,671.23 through 12/9/71 <u>6/</u>	Placed in Suspense Account

1/ Arrears accumulated since November 16, 1971 equal \$2,392,277.

2/ In April 1973 the Council assessed dues of \$1,487,250 for the eight months of 1973 during which China was a member.

3/ A contribution of \$9,000 for the nine months of 1973 during which China was regarded as a member of IMCO has been paid but is subject to adjustment in the light of China's shipping volume.

4/ Crediting of staff assessment. US\$57,140.20 remains outstanding for 1972 and \$67,194.30 is outstanding for 1973. The contribution for all of 1971 was paid before ICAO's decision on November 19, 1971.

5/ Contributions were paid in full through 1971. Contributions for the period of 1972 preceding the decision to recognize the Government of the People's Republic were not paid.

6/ A three-year budget was adopted in 1970.

REPRESENTATION OF CHINA WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM*

■ *Text of Resolution 2758 (XXVI)*

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,

Recalling the principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

Considering that the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China is essential both for the protection of the Charter of the United Nations and for the cause that the United Nations must serve under the Charter,

Recognizing that the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China are the only lawful representatives of China to the United Nations and that the People's Republic of China is one of the five permanent members of the Security Council,

Decides 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.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Austria, Belgium, Bhutan, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian SSR, Cameroon, Canada, 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, Syria, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian SSR, USSR, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against: Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, 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, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela.

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

Developments Within the Organizations of the UN
System Concerning Chinese Representation

International Labor Organization

Under the terms of Article 9, paragraph 3, of the Standing Orders of the Governing Body, the Chairman of the Governing Body, with the consent of the Vice-chairman, added to the agenda of the 184th session, as an additional item, the question of "Representation of China in the International Labour Organization: Communication and Request from the Secretary-General of the United Nations". This decision was taken in accordance with Article IV, paragraph 1, of the Agreement between the United Nations and the ILO, which provides that

*[United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2758 (XXVI) was adopted on October 25, 1971, by a vote of 76 to 35, with 17 abstentions. The text of the resolution and the recorded vote are reproduced from the UN Monthly Chronicle, Vol. VIII, No. 10 (November 1971).

[On October 26, 1971, the Secretary-General transmitted by cable the text of General Assembly Resolution 2758 (XXVI) to the executive heads of all the organizations of the system and requested them to keep him informed of any relevant action taken within their respective organizations. In the same cable, the Secretary-General drew the attention of the organizations of the system to General Assembly Resolution 396 (V) on recognition by the United Nations of the representation of a Member State, in which the Assembly reaffirmed its role in the consideration of issues involving representation and recommended "that the attitude adopted by the General Assembly ... concerning any such question should be taken into account in other organs of the United Nations and in the Specialized Agencies".

[The organizations of the UN system are the specialized agencies (ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, IBRD, IMF, ICAO, UPU, ITU, WMO, IMCO) and the International Atomic Energy Agency. GATT is considered to be part of the system for purposes of internal coordination, as it is the only remnant of the International Trade Organization which was established at Havana but never came into being. The action taken by these organizations, as of April 25, 1971, with regard to the representation of China is summarized at I.L.M. pages 561-570. Other UN bodies - such as UNCTAD, UNICEF, and UNDP - which are integral parts of the Organization, but function as semi-autonomous entities, automatically applied General Assembly Resolution 2758 (XXVI) from the date on which it was adopted.]

the ILO shall "arrange for the submission as soon as possible, to the Governing Body, the Conference or such other organs of the [ILO] as may be appropriate of all formal recommendations which the General Assembly ... may make to it".

The Governing Body had before it a document submitted by the Director-General^{1/} containing the complete text of the communication from the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The document also contained information on the historical background of the question and on a number of constitutional and legal matters. It pointed out that China became an original Member of the League of Nations and of the ILO from the beginning of the work of the Organization in virtue of its signature and subsequent ratification of the Treaty of St. Germain of September 10, 1919. Its membership in the ILO had been uninterrupted since that time, but, on several occasions, questions had arisen concerning the representation of China in the Organization. The ILO had regarded such questions as political matters in respect of which it should be guided by the central political organ of the international community, namely the League of Nations prior to the Second World War and the United Nations since. The document contained a review of all the instances in which the question of representation had been raised.

On November 16, 1971, at the second sitting of the session, the Governing Body, by 35 votes to 10, with 2 abstentions, rejected the operative paragraph of a draft resolution moved by the United States Government requesting the Director-General to refer General Assembly Resolution 2758 (XXVI) to the next session of the General Conference of the ILO.^{2/} By 35 votes to 10 with 3 abstentions, the Governing Body decided, upon a proposal by the Workers Group, to take a decision on the matter before it immediately.^{3/} The Director-General made a statement in reply to questions from the Employers Group.^{4/} The Governing Body then adopted, by 36 votes to 3 with 8 abstentions, a decision as proposed by the Workers Group "to recognize the Government of the People's Republic of China as the representative Government of China".^{5/}

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

At its fifty-seventh session, the Council of FAO was informed of the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning the representation of China.

The relevant extract from the report of the Council is as follows:^{6/}

"1. The Director-General drew the attention of the Council to resolution 2758 (XXVI) of the General Assembly of the United Nations on the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, and informed the Council that in view of the fact that the Government of the Republic of China had withdrawn from the Organization in 1951, the question presented itself in FAO in a different way than in the other Agencies in which China was at present a member. Recalling similar approaches to other Governments recommended by the Council in the past [See Report of the Forty-ninth Session of the Council (1967), paragraph 163], the Director-General sought the Council's guidance as to the question whether an approach should be made to ascertain whether the Government of the People's Republic of China would wish to seek membership in FAO. At the same time, he informed the Council of the measures that had been taken in the light of the above-mentioned General Assembly resolution, pending receipt of an application by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

^{1/} ILO Document GB.184/A/11.

^{2/} ILO Document GB.184/A/11/D.2.

^{3/} ILO Document GB.184/A/11/D.1, paragraph 1.

^{4/} ILO Document GB.184/A/11/D.4.

^{5/} ILO Document GB.184/A/11/D.1, paragraph 2. See also ILO Record of Decisions: GB.184/205.

^{6/} FAO Document C 71/PV-19; for the relevant records of proceedings, see CL 57/PV-2 and CL 57/PV-7.

[The full text of the Director-General's statement was distributed as document CL 57/LIM/4.]

"2. The Council authorized the Director-General to invite the People's Republic of China to seek formal membership in the Organization and, if it so requests, to attend the Sixteenth Session of the Conference. The Council noted the Director-General's statement that precedents existed for a suspension of the provision of Rule XIX.2 of the General Rules of the Organization (GRO) which requires that an application for admission to membership should be received by the Director-General thirty days before the opening of the session at which the Conference is called upon to decide on such application.

"3. The Council approved the measures taken by the Director-General with regard to communications, distribution of publications, invitations to meetings and eligibility for adherence to Conventions as far as China is concerned."

The Council adopted this decision unanimously on November 2, 1971. On the same date, the Director-General sent a cable to the Prime Minister of the Government of the People's Republic of China conveying an invitation for the People's Republic of China to seek formal membership in the Organization, and also, if it so requested, to attend the Sixteenth Session of the Conference. At the same time, the Director-General expressed his readiness to supply any further information that might be desired by the Government of the People's Republic of China, and to consult, through any channel that might be designated by the Government, on the procedures and implications connected with membership of the Organization.

At the Sixteenth Session of the Conference, the Director-General informed the Conference that he had received a reply from the Acting Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of China. He noted that while "no reference was made in this cable to formal membership in FAO, there is reason to believe that China will be interested in resuming its place in the Organization and it may well be that a positive move will be made after the close of the Conference session". The Director-General added that he had been advised that it would be legally possible for the People's Republic of China to resume, without being formally readmitted, the seat of China if it wished, since the notice of withdrawal given in 1951 by the Government of the Republic of China emanated from a government whose right to represent the State of China had already at that time been formally contested. This notice of withdrawal would not be held against the Government of the People's Republic of China which had no part in it and which had now been recognized as being the legitimate representative of China. This Government had indeed not been in a position to exercise, since the time of its establishment in 1949, its membership rights in FAO and had been prevented from making its contribution to the achievement of the aims of the Organization. Even if the People's Republic had wished in the past to take its place in FAO, it may be assumed that it would not have been recognized as the legitimate representative of China in view of the position taken by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Director-General added that under the present circumstances the Government of the People's Republic of China should not, in his personal view, be deprived of the possibility of availing itself of the rights deriving from the original membership in the Organization. As a consequence, it would be permissible for the People's Republic to resume its place in FAO without any special formality.^{7/} The General Committee of the Conference then submitted a report^{8/} containing a draft resolution for action by the Conference which had been "formulated after discussion within the General Committee and [represented] the consensus of views of the members of the General Committee". The report of

^{7/} The statement of the Director-General is reproduced in FAO Document C 71/LIM/62, dated November 23, 1971.

^{8/} FAO Document C 71/LIM/65.

the General Committee and the draft resolution contained therein were discussed by the Conference and a number of amendments to the draft resolution were moved and voted upon.^{9/} The Conference then adopted on November 25, 1971, and by 68 votes in favor, none against, and 3 abstentions, Resolution 33/71 entitled "People's Republic of China", which reads as follows:

"THE CONFERENCE

"Recalling that China, after having participated in the Hot Springs Conference in 1943, became a founding Member of FAO in 1945 by accepting the Constitution of the Organization,

"Recalling further that, after its establishment in 1949, the Government of the People's Republic of China in a telegram to the Director-General of FAO dated 12 May 1950 affirmed that it was the only legal Government representing the Chinese people,

"Considering Resolution 2758 (XXVI) of 25 October 1971, by which the General Assembly of the United Nations decided 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 in the United Nations and 'in all the Organizations related to it'.

"Considering further that the General Assembly of the United Nations, in its Resolution 396 (V) of 15 December 1950, recommended that the attitude adopted by the General Assembly concerning the representation of a Member State should be taken into account by the Specialized Agencies,

"Noting the exchange of telegrams between the Director-General of FAO and the Government of the People's Republic of China dated respectively 2 November and 23 November 1971,

"Pursuant to Resolution 2758 (XXVI) of the General Assembly of the United Nations,

- "1. Authorizes the Director-General, when the People's Republic of China manifests the wish to resume its place in the Organization, to take all appropriate measures to bring into effect the resumption by China of its place in the Organization;
- "2. Authorizes further the Director-General to take all necessary measures concerning financial questions, taking into account any action that may be taken by the United Nations in this respect and after consultation with the competent organs of FAO;
- "3. Requests the Director-General to transmit the text of this Resolution to the Government of the People's Republic of China."

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

The Director-General drew the attention of the Executive Board to General Assembly resolutions 2758 (XXVI) and 396 (V).^{10/} The Executive Board decided, at the request of the Director-General, and by 30 votes to none and one abstention, to add a new point to its agenda: "Participation of China in the Execution of the Programme". The Permanent Delegate of the Republic of China requested the Director-General to transmit to the Executive Board a statement in which he pointed out that in 1970 "the question of representation was

^{9/} FAO Document C 71/PV.22 and PV.23.
^{10/} UNESCO Document 88 EX/48 and Add.1.

already resolved by a vote of 59 to 39 in favour of my country".^{11/} The member of the Executive Board from Algeria submitted a draft resolution which, in its operative part, would authorize the Director-General to address to the Government of the People's Republic of China all documents relating to the execution of the Programme.^{12/} The members from Mexico, Spain and Peru submitted a draft resolution according to which, in its operative part, the Executive Board would decide, on the basis of Article IV D.9 of UNESCO's Constitution, to convene an extraordinary session of the General Conference to consider exclusively the question of "The representation of China in UNESCO".^{13/} A combined draft resolution--providing for an extraordinary session of the General Conference and authorizing the Director-General, in the meantime, to address documents to the Government of the People's Republic of China--was subsequently circulated to the Executive Board.^{14/} The member from Mexico then moved an amendment to the combined draft resolution according to which the operative part would authorize the Director-General to consider the Government of the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate representative of China in UNESCO.^{15/} The member from the United Kingdom proposed oral modifications to the amendment submitted by the member from Mexico, which was approved, as modified, by 21 votes in favor, 3 against and 7 abstentions. The draft resolution as a whole was then adopted on October 29, 1971 by 25 votes in favor, 2 against and 5 abstentions.^{16/} The text of the resolution is as follows:

"The Executive Board

"1. Taking into account the resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 25 October 1971, whereby the representatives of the People's Republic of China were recognized as the only lawful representatives of China to the United Nations,

"2. Recalling resolution 396 adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its fifth regular session on 14 December 1950 recommending that 'the attitude adopted by the General Assembly' on the question of the representation of a Member State 'should be taken into account in other organs of the United Nations and in the Specialized Agencies',

"3. Decides that from today onwards, the Government of the People's Republic of China is the only legitimate representative of China in UNESCO and invites the Director-General to act accordingly."

World Health Organization

In a letter dated November 11, 1971, the Director-General transmitted to all the members of WHO the communication from the Secretary-General of the United Nations. He also stated in that letter that "as a consequence of the decision taken by the General Assembly at its twenty-sixth session, the question of the representation of China in the [WHO] will be proposed for inclusion in the provisional agenda of the twenty-fifth World Health Assembly, as well as included in the agenda of the forty-ninth session of the Executive Board".

The Director-General then placed before the Executive Board, at its forty-ninth session, a document containing background information on the membership

^{11/} UNESCO Document 88 EX/48/Add.2.

^{12/} UNESCO Document 88 EX/DR.8.

^{13/} UNESCO Document 88 EX/DR.9.

^{14/} UNESCO Document 88 EX/DR.12.

^{15/} UNESCO Document 88 EX/DR.13.

^{16/} UNESCO Document 88 EX/Decision 9. For the records of the relevant proceedings see 88 EX/SR.16, 17 and 18.

of China in WHO and indicating the issues requiring consideration by the Executive Board.^{17/} In that document, the Director-General noted that China became a member of WHO under Article 4 of the Constitution by the signature of the Constitution on July 22, 1946, and reviewed the discussions held within the Organization on the question of representation.

The Executive Board, at its fifteenth meeting, on January 26, 1972, adopted, by 13 votes in favor, 4 against and 4 abstentions, the following resolution:

"The Executive Board,

"Considering Resolution 2758 (XXVI) adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its twenty-sixth session on 25 October 1971 and in which the General Assembly recognized the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations;

"Recalling Resolution 396 (V) adopted by the General Assembly at its fifth session on 14 December 1950 in which the General Assembly recommended that the attitude adopted by the General Assembly on the question of the representation of a Member State should be taken into account in other organs of the United Nations and in the Specialized Agencies;

"Recalling the provisions of Article IV of the Agreement between the United Nations and the World Health Organization under which all formal recommendations made to the World Health Organization by the United Nations shall be submitted as soon as possible to the World Health Assembly, the Executive Board or such other organ of the World Health Organization as may be appropriate;

"Considering that under the provisions of Article 28 (e) of the Constitution, it is a function of the Executive Board to submit advice or proposals to the World Health Assembly on its own initiative:

"1. DECIDES to include in the provisional agenda of the Twenty-fifth World Health Assembly the question of the representation of China in the World Health Organization;

"2. AUTHORIZES the Director-General to address to the Government of the People's Republic of China the notice of convocation, the provisional agenda and the documents for the Twenty-fifth World Health Assembly in accordance with Rule 3 of the Rules of Procedure of the World Health Assembly;

"3. RECOMMENDS to the World Health Assembly that it recognize the Government of the People's Republic of China as the only Government having the right to represent China in the World Health Organization."

World Bank Group

On October 26, 1971, the President of the Bank acknowledged receipt of the Secretary-General's cable and informed him that the cable had been brought to the attention of the Executive Directors of the Bank.

International Monetary Fund

On October 26, 1971, the Managing Director of the Fund acknowledged receipt of the Secretary-General's cable and informed him that the cable had

been brought to the attention of the Executive Directors of the Fund.

International Civil Aviation Organization

The President of the Council and the Secretary-General of ICAO brought to the attention of the Council the texts of General Assembly resolutions 2758 (XXVI) and 396 (V) together with relevant constitutional and historical background information.^{18/} It was noted that China participated in the International Civil Aviation Conference at Chicago, from November 1 to December 7, 1944, at which the Convention on International Civil Aviation was drawn up. The Conference also adopted an Interim Agreement on International Civil Aviation Organization by which PICAQ was established. This Interim Agreement was signed by China which became a member of PICAQ. China was a member of the Interim Council of PICAQ from 1944 to 1947. China signed the Convention on International Civil Aviation, and ratified it on February 20, 1946. ICAO having been established by that Convention, China became a member of ICAO when the Convention entered into force on April 4, 1947. China was a member of the Council of ICAO from 1947 to 1950. On May 31, 1950, the Government of the Republic of China gave notice of denunciation of the Convention on International Civil Aviation, the denunciation to take effect one year from that date. On December 2, 1953, a second instrument of ratification by China of the Convention on International Civil Aviation was deposited by the Government of China, to be effective on January 1, 1954. Objections were made in the Assembly to the acceptance as valid of the notification of denunciation, and some States notified the depository Government that they did not regard as valid either the instrument of denunciation or the second instrument of ratification.

The Council of ICAO, at its seventy-fourth session, on November 19, 1971, adopted the following decision:

"The Council

"Taking into account Resolution 2758 (XXVI) adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 25 October 1971, 'Restoration of the lawful right of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations', whereby the representatives of the People's Republic of China were recognized as the only legitimate representatives of China in the United Nations;

"Recalling Resolution 396 (V) adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 14 December 1950 recommending that 'the attitude adopted by the General Assembly' on the question of the representation of a Member State, 'should be taken into account in other organs of the United Nations and in the Specialized Agencies',

"1. Decides, for the matters within its competence, to recognize the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China to the International Civil Aviation Organization; and

"2. Requests the Secretary-General to immediately communicate these decisions to all contracting States".

Universal Postal Union

China has been a member of the UPU since March 1, 1914. After the establishment of the People's Republic of China, China was represented by the Government of the Republic of China in all organs of the Union, except at the session of the Executive and Liaison Commission held at Montreux in 1950 and at the Joint Conference IATA/UPU held in Cairo in 1951. Consequently, the Government of the Republic of China signed the Acts of the Union which were subsequently revised in Brussels 1952, Ottawa 1957, Vienna 1964 and Tokyo 1969.

^{18/} ICAO Document C-PW/5469.

During the session of the Executive and Liaison Commission in 1950, the Governments of the Republic of China and of the People's Republic of China sent delegations to represent China, which was then a member of the Executive Commission. By a secret vote, the Commission decided to accept the delegation of the People's Republic of China and agreed to request all the Member States of the Union to decide (by way of referendum) on which of the two governments should represent China at the Union. In the meantime, the People's Republic of China attended the meeting of a subsidiary organ of the Executive Commission held in January 1951. The result of the referendum was in favor of the Republic of China and the Executive Commission, at its meeting in May 1951, accepted its delegation.

In as much as the Constitution of the Union (Article 17) provides that when the Congress is not in session the Executive Council ensures continuity of work, the President of the Council consulted the members of the Council regarding the procedure that should be followed to settle the question of the representation of China in UPU. Members were requested to indicate whether the matter should be referred to all the States Members of the Union or whether it should be decided upon by the Executive Council. The result of the consultation was as follows: In favor of referring the matter to all the Members of the Union, 16 votes; in favor of considering the matter within the Executive Council, 11 votes. Two countries did not send a reply and there were two invalid ballots.

In accordance with this decision, the Director-General of the Union, on February 28, 1972, sent a communication to all Member States of the UPU requesting them to express their views as to whether General Assembly Resolution 2758 (XXVI) should apply to UPU. A majority of Member States voting for or against was required for the adoption of a decision. In case of an equal division, the proposal would be considered as rejected. The deadline for the receipt of ballot slips was April 12, 1972.

The result of the vote was as follows: 66 members answered "yes"; 11 members answered "no"; 5 members stated that they wished to abstain. Sixty-four members were considered as abstaining, as they had not replied by April 12, 1972. Accordingly, the proposal was considered as accepted and the decision took effect immediately.

International Telecommunication Union

China is an original member of the Union by virtue of its accession, on September 1, 1920, to the Radio Telegraph Convention, London 1912.

On October 29, 1971, the Secretary-General of the ITU formally transmitted the communication from the Secretary-General of the United Nations to the Chairman of the Administrative Council. Copies of that communication were sent to all the other members of the Council.

World Meteorological Organization

China was represented at the Conference of Directors of the International Meteorological Organization convened at Washington, D.C., on September 22, 1947, at which the Convention of the World Meteorological Organization was drawn up. China signed the text of the Convention at the conclusion of the Conference and the Government of China signified its ratification on March 2, 1951.

On November 26, 1971, the Secretary-General of WMO addressed a letter to all Member States drawing their attention to General Assembly Resolutions 2758 (XXVI) and 396 (V). The Secretary-General also stated that he had consulted the President and the members of the Executive Committee of WMO and that, as a result of such consultations "it has been decided that the matter shall be referred to the Members of the Organization which are states and that a vote by correspondence shall be conducted in order to decide upon the application of

the United Nations' decision within [WMO]."

The vote by correspondence having terminated on February 24, 1972, the WMO formally decided that the decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations as contained in Resolution 2758 (XXVI) shall apply within the Organization. Therefore, from February 25, 1972, WMO has recognized the representatives of the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate representatives of China.

Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization

The Government of the Republic of China accepted the IMCO Convention on July 1, 1958.

The question of representation is likely to be raised at the next regular session of the Council, to be held in the latter part of May 1972.

International Atomic Energy Agency

The Board of Governors, at its 444th meeting, on December 9, 1971, considered a draft resolution entitled "Representation of China in the Agency" which was introduced by the Governor from Romania and supported by several delegations. The Governor from the Republic of China made a statement opposing the adoption of the draft resolution. The draft resolution was then adopted by 13 votes in favor and 6 against, with 5 abstentions. The text of the resolution is as follows:

"The Board of Governors

"(a) Taking into consideration the provisions of resolution 2758 (XXVI) adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 25 October 1971, entitled 'Restoration of the Lawful Rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations',

"(b) Bearing in mind the provisions of Article III.B.1 of the Statute, pursuant to which the Agency shall 'conduct its activities in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations to promote peace and international co-operation',

"(c) Having in mind Article V of the Agreement Governing the Relationship Between the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency, and Article XVI.B.2 of the Statute providing that the Agency shall consider any resolution relating to it adopted by the General Assembly or any of the Councils of the United Nations,

"1. Recognizes that the Government of the People's Republic of China is the only Government which has the right to represent China in the International Atomic Energy Agency;

"2. Decides that Chiang Kai-shek's representatives be expelled immediately from the place they unlawfully occupy in the International Atomic Energy Agency; and

"3. Requests the Chairman and the Director General to take all the actions resulting from this resolution."

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

At the opening of the twenty-seventh session of the Contracting Parties, on November 16, 1971, the Chairman drew attention to General Assembly Resolution 2758 (XXVI) and recalled that in 1965, in reaching their decision to accede to the request from the Republic of China that it be represented by observers at sessions of the Contracting Parties, the Contracting Parties had

agreed to follow decisions of the United Nations on essentially political matters. The Chairman added that it would be logical for the Contracting Parties "to rely in this case likewise on the decision taken by the United Nations" and decide accordingly "that the Republic of China should no longer have observer status at sessions of the Contracting Parties". After a short debate, the Chairman noted that no request for a vote had been made and declared that there was a consensus for the adoption of the views expressed by him.^{19/}

^{19/} GATT Document SR.27/1, dated November 19, 1971.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE REPORT ON DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS OF THE REPUBLIC
OF CHINA AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA*

ABSTRACT

As of May 23, 1972, fifty countries have diplomatic relations with the Republic of China and seventy-one have established or have announced establishment of diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China. A list of the countries which recognize and/or have diplomatic or consular ties with the two governments is appended.

1. REPUBLIC OF CHINA

A. Countries Having Diplomatic Relations with the Republic of China
(ROC) (50)

Argentina*	Honduras	Philippines
Australia	Ivory Coast	Portugal
Barbados	Jamaica	Saudi Arabia
Bolivia	Japan	Spain
Botswana	Jordan	Swaziland
Brazil	Republic of Korea	Thailand
Central African Republic	Lesotho	Togo**
Chad	Liberia	Tonga
Colombia	Libya**	United States
Costa Rica	Luxembourg**	Upper Volta
Dahomey	Malawi	Uruguay
Dominican Republic	Malagasy Republic	Venezuela
El Salvador	New Zealand	Republic of Vietnam
Gabon	Nicaragua	Zaire
Gambia	Niger	
Greece	Panama	
Guatemala	Paraguay	
Haiti		
Holy See		

*Argentina has announced establishment of diplomatic relations with the PRC, but has not broken relations with the ROC.

**Libya, Luxembourg, and Togo have unilaterally announced recognition of the PRC but retain relations with the ROC.

B. Countries Having Consular Relations Only With the Republic of China
(2)

Malaysia
South Africa

2. PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

A. Countries Having Diplomatic Relations with the People's Republic of
China (PRC) (71), with date of the establishment of relations

*[Reprinted from the list prepared by the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the U.S. Department of State.]

[A report on the representation of China within the organizations of the United Nations system appears at I.L.M. page 561.]

Afghanistan (Jan. 1955)	Mali (Oct. 1960)
Albania (Nov. 1949)	Malta (Jan. 1972)
Algeria (Sept. 1958, with Provisional Gov't.)	Mauritania (July 1965)
Argentina (Feb. 1972)*	Mauritius (April 1972)
Austria (May 1971)	Mexico (Feb. 1972)
Belgium (Oct. 1971)	Mongolia (Oct. 1949)
Bulgaria (Oct. 1949)	Morocco (Nov. 1958)
Burma (June 1950)	Nepal (Aug. 1955)
Burundi (resumed Oct. 1971)	Netherlands (Nov. 1954)
Cameroon (March 1971)	Nigeria (Feb. 1971)
Canada (Oct. 1970)	North Korea (Oct. 1949)
Chile (Dec. 1970)	North Vietnam (Jan. 1950)
Congo (Brazzaville) (Feb. 1964)	Norway (Oct. 1954)
Cuba (Sept. 1960)	Pakistan (May 1951)
Cyprus (Jan. 1972)	Peru (Nov. 1971)
Czechoslovakia (Oct. 1949)	Poland (Oct. 1949)
Denmark (May 1950)	Romania (Oct. 1949)
East Germany (Oct. 1949)	Rwanda (Nov. 1971)
Egypt (May 1956)	Senegal (Dec. 1971)
Equatorial Guinea (Oct. 1970)	Sierra Leone (July 1971)
Ethiopia (Dec. 1970)	Somalia (Dec. 1960)
France (Jan. 1964)	Southern Yemen (Feb. 1968)
Finland (Oct. 1950)	Sri Lanka (Ceylon) (Feb. 1957)
Ghana (resumed Feb. 1972)	Sudan (Dec. 1958)
Guinea (Oct. 1959)	Sweden (May 1950)
Hungary (Oct. 1949)	Switzerland (Sept. 1950)
Iceland (Dec. 1971)	Syria (Aug. 1956)
India (April 1950)	Tanzania (Oct. 1964)
Iran (Aug. 1971)	Tunisia (resumed Oct. 1971)
Iraq (Aug. 1958)	Turkey (Aug. 1971)
Italy (Nov. 1970)	Uganda (Oct. 1962)
Kenya (Dec. 1963)	United Kingdom (June 1954)
Kuwait (March 1971)	U.S.S.R. (Oct. 1949)
Laos (Sept. 1962)	Yemen (Aug. 1956)
Lebanon (Nov. 1971)	Yugoslavia (Jan. 1955)
Mali (Oct. 1960)	Zambia (Oct. 1964)
Malta (Jan. 1972)	

B. Countries Having Consular Relations Only with the People's Republic of China (1), with date of establishment of relations

San Marino (May 1971)

C. Countries Which Recognize, But Have No Relations with, the People's Republic of China (7), with date of recognition

Bhutan (Oct. 1971)*	Libya (June 1971)****
Cambodia (July 1958)**	Luxembourg (Oct. 1971)****
Indonesia (April 1950)**	Togo (Sept. 1971)****
Israel (Jan. 1950)***	

*Recognition based on vote in UN to admit PRC and expel ROC.

**PRC missions were expelled or withdrawn.

***Israel has not been recognized by the PRC.

****See Note 1A.

3. Countries Which Neither Recognize Nor Have Relations with the Republic of China or the People's Republic of China (15)

Bahrein
Bangla Desh
Ecuador*
Federal Republic of Germany
Fiji**
Guyana***
Ireland
Maldiv Islands
Nauru

Oman
Qatar
Singapore****
Trinidad and Tobago
United Arab Emirates*****
Western Samoa

*Ecuador has broken relations with the ROC but has not formally recognized the PRC.

**ROC has established a trade mission in Fiji.

***Guyana and PRC have announced establishment of trade missions.

****Singapore has permitted the ROC to establish a trade mission which also handles consular matters. Singapore does not consider this as recognition and has no mission on Taiwan.

*****Carried in this report for the first time.

Decision adopted by WEO

"The Twenty-fifth World Health Assembly,

"Recalling the United Nations General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI) of 25 October 1971 by which it decided 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 occupied at the United Nations and in all organizations related to it:

"Noting that the Executive Board, in its resolution EB49.R37 has recommended to the World Health Assembly that it recognize the Government of the People's Republic of China as the only Government having the right to represent China in the World Health Organization,

"DECIDES 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 World Health Organization, and to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-Shek from the place which they unlawfully occupy at the World Health Organization."

Decision adopted by ITU

"The 27th session of the Administrative Council of the I.T.U.

"Taking into account the United Nations General Assembly resolution 2758 (XXVI) of 25 October 1971,

"Decides to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China in the I.T.U., and recognizes the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representatives of China at the I.T.U."

Decision adopted by IMCO

"The Council,

"Considering resolution 2758 (XXVI) adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its twenty-sixth session on 25 October 1971 and in which the General Assembly recognized the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations;

"Recalling resolution 396(V) adopted by the General Assembly at its fifth session on 14 December 1950 in which the General Assembly recommended that the attitude adopted by the General Assembly on the question of the representation of a member state should be taken into account in other organs of the United Nations and in the specialized agencies;

"Decides that it recognizes the Government of the People's Republic of China as the only Government having the right to represent China in IMCO;

"Records its belief that participation of the Government of the People's Republic of China is essential for the future successful conduct of the Organization's affairs;

"Expresses its hope that the People's Republic of China will be able to accept the convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization and thus to begin its participation in the work of the Organization at the earliest possible date;

"Requests the Secretary-General to bring the foregoing decisions to the attention of the People's Republic of China and to enter into appropriate consultations with its authorities."

M. Lusk

Mr. Schweitzer
Mr. Southard ✓
Gordon Williams

November 20, 1970

UN Vote on China

There has now been a clarification on the ticker of the voting this morning at the General Assembly.

On the proposition that membership is "an important question" and therefore one to be decided only on the basis of a two-thirds majority, the vote was 65 for, 52 against and 7 abstentions.

On the membership question itself, the vote was 51 for Peking, 49 against, and 25 abstentions. Thus, while Peking received a majority of the votes (for the first time, according to Reuters), it did not receive the two-thirds majority needed.



Mr. Hebbard

Mr. Gold
Mr. Hebbard ✓

November 1, 1967

Gordon Williams

Chinese Representation in UN

Attached are two draft resolutions currently circulating at the General Assembly on this subject.

The last clause of A/L.531 cannot, of course, apply to the Fund even if this draft should be accepted, which seems unlikely. Do you think, though, that we should point this out to any of the co-sponsors? My own inclination is to let this sleeping dog lie.

Attachments: A/L.531; A/L.532

to G.W.
I replied that
we should let
it alone.
JWH
11/2/67

copy 2110 GA. - 22nd Session
of China/000 Status of China in Fund

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
LIMITED

A/L.531
27 October 1967
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

Twenty-second session
Agenda item 93

RESTORATION OF THE LAWFUL RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC
OF CHINA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Albania, Algeria, Cambodia, Congo (Brazzaville), Cuba, Guinea, Mali,
Mauritania, Pakistan, Romania and Syria: draft resolution

The General Assembly,

Recalling the principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

Considering that the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China is essential both for the protection of the Charter of the United Nations and for the cause that the United Nations must serve under the Charter,

Recognizing that the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China are the only lawful representatives of China to the United Nations,

Decides to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only lawful 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.

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
LIMITED

A/L.532
27 October 1967

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Twenty-second session,
Agenda item 93

RESTORATION OF THE LAWFUL RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE'S
REPUBLIC OF CHINA IN THE UNITED NATIONS.

Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Gabon, Japan,
Madagascar, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Philippines, Thailand,
Togo and United States of America: draft resolution

Representation of China in the United Nations

The General Assembly,

Recalling the recommendation contained in its resolution 396 (V) of 14 December 1950 that, whenever more than one authority claims to be the Government entitled to represent a Member State in the United Nations and this question becomes the subject of controversy in the United Nations, the question should be considered in the light of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the circumstances of each case,

Recalling further its decision in resolution 1668 (XVI) of 15 December 1961, in accordance with Article 18 of the Charter, that any proposal to change the representation of China is an important question, which, in General Assembly resolutions 2025 (XX) of 17 November 1965 and 2159 (XXI) of 29 November 1966, was affirmed as remaining valid,

Affirms again that this decision remains valid.

China



Office Memorandum

TO : Mr. Coe - 801

FROM : Gordon Williams

SUBJECT : Representation of China

DATE: October 19, 1951

You asked for the documentation on the Special Committee of UN which has been studying the problem. It consists of

- 1) General Assembly Resolution 490(V), dated 19 September 1950, which set up the Committee.
- 2) General Assembly 396(V) which urged uniformity in treatment of this subject among UN and related agencies.
- 3) The Report of the Committee itself.

I have asked Records Division to obtain and forward these to you. Legal Department has been studying the matter as well, based on my series of memos.

Home: I think you should follow here at least to point of staying over. Please F-C

*Marie will supply these to this office -
or Dorothy will transmit. 10/23*



Office Memorandum

TO : Mr. Coe - 801

FROM : Gordon Williams

SUBJECT : Chinese Representation at UN

DATE: October 8, 1951

Further to my recent memo to you on General Assembly consideration of this subject, I have learned that, in the General Assembly Committee now studying the matter, a majority is in favour of making a report to this session of the Assembly. A minority, apparently including the US, is in favour of keeping the Committee studying the matter perhaps into and through the forthcoming session of the Assembly.

However, since the Committee apparently will make a report, the US is now attempting to have it report merely that it met, deliberated, and reached no conclusion. Rao, the Chairman from India, is apparently not yet convinced.



Office Memorandum

TO : Mr. Coe - 801
FROM : Gordon Williams
SUBJECT :

DATE: October 5, 1951

It is possible that the question of the Nationalist vs. the Communist governments right to represent China at the UN may be settled at the forthcoming General Assembly. The Item is on the agenda, and a special committee is currently very actively trying to work out a solution to the problem in New York.

As I learn of any developments I will let you know since obviously the conclusions will have direct implications for us.

Mr. Ervin Hestner

May 14, 1951

Hans Aufrecht

Editorial "China and the U.N.," New York Times, May 12, 1951.

This note discusses briefly two questions involved in the editorial "China and the U.N."

- (1) What is the significance of the attempted distinction between "countries" and "states"?
- (2) Is the U.S. bound by the State Department declaration that the issue of which regime should represent China is only a procedural question and thus not "vetoable"?

Question 1.

At close examination the editorial does not consistently elaborate the distinction between "country" and "state"*. Actually, it assumes that China has been "dismembered" or split into two Chinas, i.e., the "Republic of China" and the "People's Republic of China." The editorial seems to follow the line that the "People's Republic of China" is a new state which therefore would have to apply for membership in the U.N. Such a situation is not unprecedented in U.N. practice, e.g., the division of India and Pakistan and the separation of Indonesia from the Netherlands.

Assuming that there are two "states", i.e., the old state and the new state and that the new state has to apply for membership in the U.N. (and presumably also in the specialized agencies), the U.N. would still face such questions as: (1) who is entitled to the permanent seat of "China" in the Security Council; (2) what should be the respective contribution to the U.N. budget by the two states? It should furthermore be recalled that the U.S. has repeatedly stated that admission to membership is not a matter which should be considered as subject to the veto.

Question 2.

If the distinction between the "new" and "old" state is introduced in the editorial for the purpose of asserting the right of the U.S. to veto the admission of the "People's Republic of China" to the U.N. or its representation in the Security Council, this distinction is unnecessary and presumably not pertinent.

* Reference is made to the sentence in the editorial; "It is worth noting, we believe, that the Charter provides for the admission, not of countries, but of states,..."

5/Re China
Extra Copy

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

June 13, 1950

To: Central Files

For information.

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe



Mr. Frost

It is correct that the State Department has repeatedly stated that it considers the issue of which regime should be represented in the U.N. as a procedural question which is not subject to the "veto." In doing so the State Department has exercised the discretion conferred on the United Nations by the so-called Four Power Agreement (June 7, 1945) to determine whether or not a certain question is a "procedural matter" in the sense of Article 27, par. 2 of the U.N. Charter. It is submitted that the U.S. representative in the Security Council is still free in a formal vote to veto the seating of the Chinese Communist representative.

For political reasons, however, such a reversal of policy would have to be explained, e.g., by stating that previous State Department statements assumed that the Chinese Communist regime is "peace-loving", but that so long as this regime does not discontinue its armed opposition ("aggression") to U.N. enforcement action this regime has no right to be represented or that the right to representation in the U.N. is "suspended".** (This latter view could be defended vis-a-vis those powers which maintain that Communist China rather than the Republic of China is the China which is a U.N. member).

** The question whether the new state, i.e., "The People's Republic of China" is eligible for membership in the U.N., in particular, the question whether it is to be considered "peace-loving" is an issue which should be discussed in connection with Question 1 above.

R.S.

Mr. Joseph Gold

October 26, 1950

Hans Aufricht

Use of "double veto" by Chinese Representative to Security Council.

The following excerpt from the Department of State Bulletin (October 9, 1950) summarizes Security Council Proceedings of September 29, 1950. It is noteworthy in that it reports an attempt on the part of the Chinese representative to block the invitation of the Peiping regime to attend Council meetings on the question of Formosa.

On September 29, by a vote of 7-3-1, the Security Council adopted the reintroduced Ecuadoran resolution to defer consideration of the complaint of armed invasion of Formosa until the first meeting after November 15 and, at that time, to invite a representative of the Peiping regime to attend Council meetings on this subject. The United States, China, and Cuba cast the 3 negative votes, while Egypt abstained. Following a paragraph-by-paragraph vote and approval of the resolution as a whole with one deletion, Council President Sir Gladwyn Jebb (U.K.) commented that in his opinion the resolution was carried.

This action precipitated an involved discussion, which continued into the afternoon, on the applicability of the veto - whether the Ecuadoran resolution involved a procedural or a substantive decision by the Council. Over China's protest, the Security Council voted 9-1 (China), with Cuba abstaining, that the vote to invite a representative of the Peiping regime to attend Council meetings was procedural. Maintaining his right to veto, Dr. Tsiang (China) then declared that the proposition had not carried since he had opposed it. Dr. Tsiang contended that his negative vote constituted a "double veto" and cited the statement by the sponsoring powers at San Francisco in June 1945 that a decision on the preliminary question of whether an issue was procedural or substantive required a majority of seven, including the concurring votes of the five permanent members.

Pointing out that nine Council members had indicated by vote that they considered the action to have been procedural, President Jebb held a grave precedent, not in the general interest of the Security Council, would be created by accepting the substantive interpretation held by only one permanent member. Accordingly, he ruled that, notwithstanding China's objection, the vote taken on the Ecuadoran resolution was procedural. Declaring the President's ruling ultra vires and arbitrary, Dr. Tsiang proposed informally that the question be sent to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion, which his delegation would agree in advance to accept. President Jebb, interpreting Dr. Tsiang's remarks as a challenge to his ruling, submitted it to a vote of the Council.

5/Re China - Extra Copy

No one voted, however, and Sir Gladwyn, therefore, declared that the ruling stood. For the record, Mr. Tsiang commented he did not take part in a vote that was in itself "illegal."

Earlier, Sir Bengal H. Han (India) had stated that it was "quite clear" from the preamble of the Ecuadoran resolution that the invitation to representatives of the Peiping regime would be given under Rule 39 of the Council's Rules of Procedure. The Yugoslav representative, Mr. Ales Hebler, pointed out that the question of inviting parties to a dispute to be heard was one of those specifically enumerated in the San Francisco statement as procedural.

In commenting on Ghini's interpretation that the Ecuadoran proposal involved a matter of substance, Ambassador Ernest A. Gross stated that, although the United States was strongly opposed to the resolution in question, his delegation believed it would be a most undesirable precedent for the Security Council to accept the proposition that an invitation to an outside party to be heard was subject to the veto. The United Nations Charter, the San Francisco declaration, and Council precedents solidly supported that thesis, Ambassador Gross held. Pointing out that the proposed action was being taken under Rule 39, he recalled other cases where the Council had invited and heard representatives over the negative votes of permanent members - the former Czechoslovak representative Papanek and the Chilean representative had been heard during discussion of the Czechoslovak case despite negative votes by the U.S.S.R., and the Indonesian Republic had been invited to Council meetings despite negative votes by the United Kingdom and France. Ambassador Gross also mentioned China's co-sponsorship of the General Assembly resolution which recommended, inter alia, that the Security Council regard decisions on rules as well as decisions under Rule 39 as procedural.

In order to explain further the United States position, Ambassador Gross discussed specific provisions of the General Assembly's resolution, the San Francisco statement, and the United States policy in general toward use of the veto. He first, however, reemphasized that his delegation considered the action of the Security Council in deciding to invite Chinese Communist representatives "at this time" neither appropriate nor desirable. In spite of this conviction on the part of the United States delegation, Mr. Gross observed, the position in supporting the procedural interpretation was in accord with the Assembly's recommendation, based on a study by its Interim Committee, that certain decisions, including decisions under Rule 39, be considered procedural by the Security Council. It was United States policy, Ambassador Gross continued, to restrict the use of the veto by extending wherever possible the area of Security Council action to which the veto did not apply. This policy had been determined with the full knowledge that the United States was working to restrict its own veto right, but the opinion of the American delegation was that "in the long run" proper functioning of the United Nations was more important for the permanent members than their power to obstruct action. In this case, the result of applying "the law of the Charter which has developed" was "against our own interest" and was "not pleasant"; however, unless the law were applied in

these circumstances, the United States could not expect others to apply it when it was not in their interest. These were the considerations, Ambassador Cross concluded, that had led the United States to take its stand.

Associating himself fully with the United States' position, Sir Gladwyn declared that the expressed willingness of a great power to accept a ruling of the President on a matter concerning the veto was an "augury" of better times.

R.S.

Mr. Andre Tunc

September 12, 1950

Hans Aufricht

Chinese representative on the Security Council intimates that he considers the question of representation on the Council as vetoable.

1. At the 199th meeting of the Security Council on September 11, 1950 Mr. Tsiang (China) intimated for the first time that he considered the question of Chinese representation as "vetoable". Commenting on a proposal submitted by the U.S.S.R. to invite the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to participate in the Council's discussion of the "Complaint of Bombing by Air Forces of the Territory of China" he stated:

This invitation has no legal foundation whatever. Its intention is to deny the validity of my representation in the Security Council; it is calculated to destroy and to remove my right of representation in the Council. That is the legal foundation and legal consequence of such an invitation.

This is not a question of mere procedure; it is a question of substance, and it is a question of the highest political importance.

Under the Four Power Agreement of June 7, 1945 China is authorized to decide the preliminary question whether or not a matter is procedural. The foregoing statement by Mr. Tsiang amounts to a clarification of this preliminary question. The legal consequence of this statement is that under Article 27, Section 3 of the U.N. Charter Mr. Tsiang may "veto" the seating of a representative of the People's Republic by withholding his "concurrent vote."

2. The New York Times of September 12, 1950 contains the following comments on the incident:

A new element in the long battle over Chinese representation was introduced today by Mr. T. F. Tsiang, Nationalist China's delegate. Mr. Tsiang, who has held that he has the right to veto admission of Communist China to the United Nations, announced that he considered he had the right to veto even an invitation to Peking to appear before the Council.

Most of the other delegates appeared to believe that the issue was not vetoable but subject to majority rule.

It is submitted that his comment may be slightly misleading:

1. It appears that Mr. Tsiang declared for the first time that he deemed the question of representation as such as vetoable, not only the question of participation in the discussion of a specific complaint.

s/Re China - Extra Copy

2. As far as can be gathered from the excerpts in the New York Times of September 12, 1950 Mr. Tolson made a general statement on representation without expressly adding the "new element" which the reporter (Mr. Rosenthal) reads into this statement.
3. The vote on the question "Does the Security Council approve the draft resolution entitled 'Complaint of Bombing by Air Forces of the Territory of China,' document S/1759, submitted by the Soviet Union delegation on 5 September 1950?" was as follows:

In favor: France, India, Norway, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Yugoslavia. Against: China, Cuba, United States of America. Abstaining: Ecuador, Egypt.

K. S.

Mr. Andre Tunc

September 11, 1950

Elias Rodriguez

List of countries which have recognized the Government of the People's Republic of China as of September 5, 1950.

Countries

Bulgaria
U.S.S.R.
Czechoslovakia
Poland
Hungary
Yugoslavia
Romania
Burma
Israel
Afghanistan
Finland
Ceylon
Norway
U.K.
Pakistan
Sweden
India
Denmark
Netherlands
Indonesia
Switzerland

Regimes

North Korea
People's Republic of
Outer Mongolia
Government of Eastern
Camerun
Democratic Republic of
Viet Nam
Albania

HA/ed

s/Re China Extra Copy

HA:ed/7/12/1950

The question of the representation of China at the
Second Session of the International Law Commission

Excerpt from United Nations
document: A/CN.4/SR.39,
5 June 1950, p. 2-5.

PROPOSAL BY MR. KORETSKY CONCERNING THE PRESENCE OF MR. HSU

Mr. KORETSKY said that the protest made by the Government of the Chinese People's Republic to the Secretary-General of the United Nations against participation in the work of United Nations organs by representatives of the vestiges of the Kuomintang reactionary clique, applied equally to the International Law Commission. He read out Articles 3 and 8 of the Commission's Statutes. All the members of the Commission had been nominated by their Governments and should represent a particular legal system, so that all the main legal systems in the world would be represented in the Commission. Mr. Shuhsi Hsu had been elected following nomination by the former Kuomintang Government which he thus represented, and hence he had clearly ceased to represent the Chinese legal system.

He (Mr. Koretsky) supported the demand of the Government of the Chinese People's Republic and called on the Commission to stop Mr. Shuhsi Hsu from taking part in its work, and, in accordance with Article 11 of its Statute, to elect a representative of the legal system of the Chinese People's Republic.

If his proposal were not accepted, he (Mr. Koretsky) would take no further part in the work of the International Law Commission, moreover, any decisions taken by the Commission with the participation of the Kuomintang representative could not be regarded as valid.

The CHAIRMAN took note of Mr. Koretsky's remarks. He had carefully studied the question and the precedents, and was ready to give his decision on the point of order. Afterwards, all the members of the Commission would be free to appeal to the Commission against his decision.

Mr. HSU argued that the question should not have been raised, since he was not sitting in the capacity of representative of his Government, but as a member elected by the General Assembly. He mentioned incidentally that he had been nominated by the Government of India also.

The CHAIRMAN /Mr. Hudson?/ read out his decision as follows: "The members of the Commission were elected in 1948 to serve for three years. They do not represent States or Governments; instead, they serve in a personal capacity as persons of "recognised competence in International Law" (Article 2 of the Statute). Being a creation of the General Assembly, the Commission is not competent to challenge the latter's application of Article 8 of the Statute. Nor can it declare a "casual vacancy" under Article 11 in these circumstances. Mr. Koretsky's proposal is therefore out of order. This decision follows a

precedent established by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions". /Underlining added/.

Mr. KORETSKY maintained that the Chairman had not given a direct reply to his proposal concerning Mr. Hsu.

The CHAIRMAN said he had stated that Mr. Koretsky's proposal was out of order.

Mr. KORETSKY replied that he had quoted an article of the Commission's Statute proving that his proposal was in order. He requested the Chairman to submit his proposal in the form in which he himself had submitted it.

The CHAIRMAN said that Mr. Koretsky's proposal would not be submitted to the Commission unless one of its members appealed against his decision, in which case that decision would be put to the vote.

Mr. KORETSKY thought that the members should answer the question he had raised, and that the Commission should not adopt a roundabout procedure. He protested against this procedure, and appealed to the Commission against the Chairman's decision.

Mr. SPIROPOULOS was surprised that the question had been raised in a Commission which was not a political body and where members had been elected on a personal basis. Reference had been made to Article 8, but neither that Article nor any other text called for representation in the Commission of all the legal systems of the world. As laid down in Article 8, the principle legal systems "as a whole" were represented. Hence there was no reason why Mr. Hsu, who had been elected as an international law expert, should not sit on the Commission.

Mr. el-KHOURY was astonished that Mr. Koretsky should have raised such an objection, and recalled the method adopted by the General Assembly for the nomination of members of the Commission.

Mr. Hsu had been backed not only by China but also by India, and did not represent any Government. He hoped that Mr. Koretsky would not persist in his objection.

Mr. SCHELLE recalled that during the first session Mr. Koretsky had often emphasized that the International Law Commission was a General Assembly Commission. It had in fact been set up by the General Assembly, and only the Assembly could lay down the conditions for the election of members to the Commission. The Commission itself had no competence to do so. He supported the view of Mr. el-Khoury, and hoped that Mr. Koretsky would withdraw his proposal.

Mr. ALFARO agreed with Mr. Spiropoulos, Mr. el-Khoury and Mr. Scelle. The terms of Article 8 of the Statute had been complied with when the members of the Commission were elected, and the Commission was not at liberty to modify the results of that election. He supported the Chairman's decision.

Mr. CORDOVA thought there was some analogy between the election of members of the Commission and the election of members of the International Court at The Hague. The aim was to avoid any influence exerted by political events which might occur after members had been elected. He too supported the Chairman's decision.

Mr. KORETSKY said that, since the Commission's task was to lay down rules of conduct for States, its members should represent actual Governments; otherwise the rules they adopted would be illusory.

He was quite familiar with the wording of Article 8 of the Statute. He had never suggested that the appointment should be annulled, but that Mr. Hsu be suspended from the meetings, and the Chairman be instructed to report on the matter to the General Assembly.

The Commission approved the President's decision by 10 votes to 1.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 1950

FRENCH DENY SHIFT IN U.N. CHINA STAND

Delegate Returns From Paris, Sees Position Unchanged, but Again Urges Speed

Special to The New York Times.

Lake Success, June 12--Jean Chauvel, French representative on the United Nations Security Council, said on his return from Paris today that the French position on the China question remained unchanged. He added that the question had not been considered by the French Cabinet for several months, but that he would not "pre-judge" the possibility of a change.

Statements by M. Chauvel in a radio interview Saturday had led some sources to believe that France might intend to shift her position and vote for admission of the Chinese Communists. When questioned by correspondents on his arrival, M. Chauvel said he had merely made an "objective analysis" that did not presage any such change.

However, M. Chauvel again insisted on the necessity for speed in reaching a decision on the Chinese question, and said the United Nations would suffer severely if the Soviet Union refused to participate in the autumn session of the General Assembly.

The Assembly will convene at Flushing Meadow on Sept. 19, and M. Chauvel said that failure to take a decision before then would result in a Soviet boycott of the session.

M. Chauvel said he was not sure that the Soviet Union, despite its walkouts, really wanted Communist China to be admitted. He added that the recognition of the Communist regime in French Indo-China by the Soviet Union and Communist China had made it difficult for France to vote in favor of admission of the Peiping regime.

France voted against expulsion of the Nationalist representative last January, but abstained in the Economic and Social Council. M. Chauvel said his instructions called for him to abstain when the question came up again in the Security Council.

Owing to the fact that the Charter requires a vote of seven of the eleven members for any decision, an abstention has the same effect as a vote against.

In this connection, M. Chauvel challenged the right of Dr. T. T. Tsiang, the Nationalist representative, to veto his own expulsion. Dr. Tsiang recently threatened to use the veto, but M. Chauvel said that Dr. Tsiang would not have the right to vote. France, the United States and Britain hold that the decision is a procedural one that is not subject to the veto.

The impression left by M. Chauvel's statements was that the French Government was now considering whether to make the shift but might not reach a decision for several weeks or longer. If Paris decided to shift, this would provide six votes in favor of admission of the Communist regime, and it is generally supposed that Egypt would then supply the seventh.

Miss Hodel

E

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/CONF.10/8
12 June 1950

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CONFERENCE

Yugoslavia: Draft resolution

The Government of the Peoples Republic of China is invited to attend the Technical Assistance Conference.

UNITED NATIONS SURVIVAL (Continued)

There is, moreover, no reason to believe that surrender to Soviet coercion at this point would be the last surrender. On the contrary, it is logical to assume that the Kremlin, having abundant assurance that its obduracy will pay dividends, would make its next demands even steeper. If the issue, therefore, is United Nations survival, it is also the issue of whether the United Nations is to survive under the whims of Soviet dictation.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

June 5, 1950

To: Central Files

For information.

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

THE NEW YORK TIMES, MONDAY, JUNE 5, 1950

MAJORITY AT U.N. HELD TO BACK THE EFFORTS OF LIE TO MEDIATE

Even Delegations of Countries Standing By
Nationalists Support Move to End StrifeBy Thomas J. Hamilton
Special to The New York Times.

LAKE SUCCESS, June 4--If the views expressed by the permanent delegations to the United Nations are an accurate reflection of those held by their foreign ministers, Secretary General Trygve Lie's efforts to mediate between East and West appear to be supported by the majority of the member nations.

Since Mr. Lie's efforts have been concentrated on obtaining the admission of Communist China to the United Nations, it goes without saying that the Soviet bloc approves. The Daily Worker, published in New York, has overlooked no opportunity to pay tribute to his efforts.

Nations that, though non-Communist, have recognized the Peiping regime and want it admitted to the United Nations, also approve. That applies to such countries as India, Pakistan, Sweden and Israel.

Surprisingly enough, however, in view of the passions that the China question has aroused in the United States, most countries that are standing by the Nationalist regime also are standing by Mr. Lie, for the present at least.

Rankin Attacks Lie

Representative John E. Rankin, Democrat of Mississippi, to be sure, attacked him the other day as a Communist, while Dr. T. F. Tsiang, Nationalist representative at the United Nations, called him another Neville Chamberlain. However, as far as the Communist label is concerned, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican of Wisconsin, is now calling Secretary of State Dean Acheson the "Red Dean," and Dr. Tsiang could hardly qualify as an unbiased witness.

One well-known delegate who is generally known for his unwavering support of United States proposals feels that Mr. Lie was entirely correct in making his tour of the Big Four capitals. Although he does not know what Soviet offers, if any, Mr. Lie brought back, he thinks he deserved points for trying.

On the other hand, another delegate, also from a country that habitually sides with the United States, is bitter in his criticisms of Mr. Lie. He holds that it would have been far better to have concentrated on the resumption of great power negotiations, outside the United Nations, rather than to make the revival of all forms of negotiation conditional upon the admission of the Chinese Communists.

This emphasis, he feels, gives the impression that the United States and the other countries opposing the admission of the Chinese Communists are responsible for the present highly unsatisfactory condition of the United Nations. He says it was the Soviet Union, after all, that walked out.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

June 12, 1950

To: Central Files

For information.

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

UNITED NATIONS SURVIVAL

The statement of the chief of the French mission to the United Nations, Jean Chauvel, on the deadlock over the admission of representatives of Communist China was so carefully guarded that it did not indicate any definite change in the French position. M. Chauvel merely declared that the China issue would have to be settled shortly if the United Nations were to survive. A favorable vote by France and by either Ecuador or Egypt would presumably provide the necessary seven ballots to admit the Chinese Communists to a place on the Security Council.

This, obviously, is a matter that France has to decide for herself. The United States has declared repeatedly that this country will abide by majority rule, and that if the seven votes are forthcoming there will be no American veto. We have made it plain that we do not intend, at this time, to recognize the Peiping regime, but we will not make our non-recognition the basis for impeding any majority decision in the United Nations.

If France is prepared to make any sort of shift at Lake Success, a corresponding attempt at a divorce between the issues of recognition and United Nations representation will probably be necessary. It is unlikely that France will recognize the Peiping regime after the Chinese Communists have extended their sympathetic recognition to the Communist-directed Vietnam revolt in Indo-China. France may therefore be placed in the position of supporting the admission to the United Nations of a regime that France does not recognize. The United States will not support such a move, but will accede to it if the majority so decides.

While it is highly desirable to get the United Nations back on the rails, it is questionable if M. Chauvel has posed a true alternative. The implication of his statement is that the world must either yield to Soviet dictation in this case or see the international organization go on the rocks. Something of the same purport has been conveyed by statements of the Secretary General, Mr. Lie. There is, unhappily, no assurance that surrender to Soviet blackmail and boycott at this point will make the United Nations any sounder or stronger or will enable it to get on with its essential tasks.

It is hard to see how the mere presence of another Soviet satellite in a limited number of United Nations agencies will further the cause of making and keeping peace and of rebuilding a better world. The United Nations has functioned thus far, not because of Soviet participation, but in spite of it. The organization has been used as a sounding board for Communist propaganda, but there has been little constructive work done by the Russians or their agents. The walkouts on the Chinese question have been spectacular, but they have been no more significant in the long run than the persistent Soviet stay-out as far as all the constructive activities of the United Nations are concerned.

The admission of the Chinese Communists to the Security Council will certainly not change the Russian position on the international control of atomic weapons. It will not modify Russian obstruction to setting up an international police force under the United Nations. It will certainly not ease the deadlock on the peace treaties, nor will it contribute to a settlement of the useful case of partitioned Korea.

Perhaps the technical survival of the United Nations in its present form might be at issue in the Chinese case. The real living growth of the organization will not be affected one way or the other. No one can be so bemused as to believe that genuine progress toward better world understanding will have been achieved when the present Chinese representatives are replaced by faithful Soviet stooges.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

June 2, 1950

To: Central Files

For information.

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

3

Mr. Frost

THE NEW YORK TIMES, FRIDAY, JUNE 2, 1950

RUSSIAN WALKS OUT OF TRUSTEE GROUP

**Quits Third Basic U.N. Body Over Red China Issue--
France Adds Her "No" to Soviet**

By A. M. Rosenthal
Special to The New York Times.

LARGE SUCCESS, June 1--The Soviet Union, which boycotted the last two-month meeting of the United Nations Trusteeship Council, showed up for the spring session today--and walked out nineteen minutes later.

Representation of China once again was the issue that led to the march to the delegates' exit. Once again, the Soviet Union demanded the expulsion of the delegate of Nationalist China and once again was defeated. This time the vote was heavily lopsided--nine "no's" against the lone Soviet affirmative, with Britain and Argentina abstaining.

The Trusteeship Council is one of the four basic organs of the United Nations and it is the third to be struck by the Russian boycott policy. Only the General Assembly of the United Nations is left.....

The usual procedure has been for the chairman to rule the Soviet custer motion out of order, but M. Garreau decided to put it to a vote at once. On the show of hands, these nine countries voted against the Russian resolution: France, Australia, Belgium, New Zealand, the United States, the Dominican Republic, Iraq, the Philippines and China.

The only major change in the line-up was that France, which abstained in the Economic and Social Council's fight on Chinese representation, voted "no." Francois Lecoete, speaking for France, said his country believed the question met one that should be decided in the trusteeship body.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

May 31, 1950

To: Central Files

For information.

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

THE NEW YORK TIMES, WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 1950

EDITORIAL

CHINA AND THE U. N.

Secretary Acheson has again assured Secretary General Trygve Lie that the United States will not use its veto power to keep Communist China out of the United Nations. This has been our Government's position from the start of the present controversy. We have not been ready to extend our own diplomatic recognition to the Communist regime. But we have at all times been willing to abide by a majority decision of the Security Council as to who shall represent China in the U.N.

The reasons why we have not been ready to extend our own diplomatic recognition are spread plainly on the record. In its dealings with our Government the Communist regime has--in the words of our State Department--followed the practice of "tribal law" rather than of normal diplomatic conduct. It has seized and imprisoned American diplomatic representatives on the basis of patently false and trumped-up charges. It has taken over American consular property in what the State Department describes as "a flagrant violation of our treaty rights." It has sold out, to Soviet Russia, vast properties and rights of the Chinese people themselves, and, again in the words of the State Department, "placed the richest industrial area of China firmly behind the Far Eastern segment of the Iron Curtain." In these circumstances it is both our right and our duty to wait for further evidence before we recognize the Communist regime as a genuinely sovereign government desirous of maintaining normal international relations.

In taking this attitude, and at the same time affirming our willingness to abide at any time by the result of a majority vote in the Security Council, it is not we who block the work of the United Nations. It is not the United States but Soviet Russia that has walked out of the U.N., in a deliberate and dramatically staged effort to demonstrate that the will of a minority can prevail over the votes of a majority. What will the United Nations gain, if it bows to this procedure? Russia will "return to the U.N." But Russia will not return to any of the U.N.'s important and ambitious collateral agencies--such as the World Trade Organization, the World Health Organization, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund--for Russia is not even represented in those agencies. As for the rest: long, very long, before the question of Communist China even became an issue, Soviet Russia's unilateral opposition had blocked every effort in the Security Council to agree upon such matters as control of atomic energy, regulation of conventional armaments and establishment of a U.N. police force.

We can well understand the desire of U.N. spokesmen to dispose of the question of Chinese representation. But on the basis of evidence now available, there is no good reason to believe that Russia's "return to the United Nations" would make more easy of solution any of the many problems which Soviet Russia's consistent intransigence has thus far made impossible of solution.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

May 26, 1950

To: Central Files

For information.

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

THE NEW YORK TIMES, FRIDAY, MAY 26, 1950

UNESCO PARLEY PUTS OFF CHINESE DECISION;
FORMOSA DELEGATE PILLORIES SOVIET GROUPBy Kathleen Teltch
Special to The New York Times.

FLORENCE, Italy, May 25—The whole explosive issue of China's representation in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization was delayed today until Tuesday.

Meanwhile, Unesco officials and many delegations to this fifth annual conference were still seeking some magic formula that would keep the only Soviet bloc states in Unesco from turning their temporary withdrawal over the presence of Nationalist China into a permanent walk-out from the session. Director General Dr. Jaime Torres Bodet called a special plenary session for tomorrow to communicate his views as to what effect the absence of Eastern Europe would have on the international agency, and three delegations—the Czechoslovak, Hungarian and Polish—were scheduled to hold press conferences to explain their positions.

Adolf Hoffmeister, Czechoslovak delegate, held his conference tonight to say flatly that his Government would not accept any "compromise," and it is obvious that this view would be supported by Hungary, which joined Czechoslovakia in a double walkout on the conference's opening day.

Czech Hits at "Kuomintang"

The Czechoslovak delegate said he could not accept the proposal of some members of the Unesco credentials committee that the Chinese Nationalists be seated provisionally but with voting power, and he said emphatically that his Government would not join meetings attended by representatives of the "Kuomintang group". He is waiting, he added, for instructions from Prague as to whether he should remain until the China issue is voted on Tuesday.

The Nationalist Chinese representatives also had their say today. In a bitterly anti-Soviet speech, Wen Yuan-ning condemned Hungary and Czechoslovakia to a burning "inferno reserved for the soulless." The Chinese acting chief delegate referred also to India as another state that should be consigned to the flames of Dante's inferno for the "sins of faithlessness and ingratitude."

As for the governments that have given recognition to the Communist Government of Mao Tse-tung he termed them too bad for purgatory and not full-blooded enough for inferno and so dismissed them "to settle their account with their conscience if they have any."

The decision to postpone the Chinese issue grew out of a meeting of Unesco's credentials committee, at which it was apparent that six of the nine members favored seating of the Nationalists. The delegates from the United States, Canada and Lebanon lined up in support of a three-point Brazilian proposal that would find the Nationalists' valid, seat them at this session and then solicit an opinion from the Security Council and General Assembly as to what action to take when confronted by similar situations.

Jordan and Korea Added

Only India and Yugoslavia vigorously opposed the seating of the Nationalists, while Britain decided to abstain. No final vote will be taken on the Brazilian motion by the committee until Monday. It will be acted on by the full conference on Tuesday. Indonesia, Jordan and Korea were admitted to membership, bringing the total of member states to fifty-nine.

UNESCO PARLEY PUTS OFF CHINESE DECISION; FORNOSA DELEGATE PILLORIES SOVIET GROUP (Cont'd.)

The conference heard Britain, France and New Zealand express opinions favoring a long-term Unesco program dedicated to the promotion of international cooperation. Yesterday's United States proposal to concentrate on immediate aid to Germany plus a limited activities program won support from China and France.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

May 25, 1950

To: Central Files

For information.

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

BEVIN WARNS WEST AGAINST CIVIL WARS INSPIRED BY RUSSIA

He Brackets Arming of Police in East Germany With Revolt in Indo-China as Examples

Backs Peiping U. N. Role

Lake Success Ponders Effect of Speech on Shifting Votes in the Security Council

By Benjamin Welles
Special to The New York Times.

LONDON, May 24—In a comprehensive debate in the House of Commons on British Far Eastern policy today Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin.....stood firmly by the advice he had given to the Cabinet to recognize the Peiping regime. He said it had been a "difficult" decision to make as it had been apparent that the United States could not follow suit. Nevertheless, he believed that the "years to come" would vindicate his policy.

He said that while there had been American criticism of his action, at the same time the British Government was being asked daily to assume more of United States responsibilities in China.

Possibly, on the advice of Moscow, Mao Tse-tung, head of the Peiping regime, was seeking "little things which could be annoying and irritating," to Britain, Mr. Bevin said.

The Peiping Government was making certain conditions prerequisite to the establishment of full diplomatic relations, but to this, Mr. Bevin declared, the British Government would not submit.

Although Britain thought it "better for the new China to be inside the United Nations," the Foreign Secretary added, the onus of keeping China out lay with Russia, which was now virtually "on strike" against the United Nations.

Britain had no desire to "ostracize" any nation on political grounds, Mr. Bevin added. He asserted that but for the Nationalist blockade of China from Formosa, British relations with the Chinese Communists might have been far better.....

Lake Success Weighs Talk
Special to The New York Times.

LAKE SUCCESS, May 24—There was general agreement here that the importance of British Foreign Secretary Bevin's statement today on China was limited to its possible psychological effect on two other members of the United Nations Security Council, France and Egypt.

Since Britain is one of the five members of the Security Council that has recognized Communist China, it has been taken for granted that Britain would vote in favor of admitting the Communist regime to the United Nations.

Actually, Britain abstained last January on a Soviet resolution to expel the nationalists, holding that the decision was premature. Since then, British circles had said that when the matter came up again Britain would vote for the admission of Communist China if this would produce the required majority of seven—in other words, if there were already six votes in favor.

BEVIN WARNS WEST AGAINST CIVIL WARS INSPIRED BY RUSSIA (Continued)

It is supposed that Norway, which also had recognized the Communist regime, but also abstained on the vote last January, would follow the same course.

However, even if Britain and Norway are now willing to vote without conditions for the admission of Communist China, there are still two votes lacking. Since it is generally agreed that the United States and the two Latin American members of the Council, Cuba and Ecuador, will continue to abstain or vote against—the effect is the same, under the Council's peculiar voting procedure—the two extra votes can be obtained only from France and Egypt.

For months Egypt has been reported to be on the point of deciding to vote in favor of the admission of the Communists, and some delegates saw a possibility that Mr. Bevin's statement might bring this about. However, this would still produce only six weeks, and would mean nothing unless France also changed.

Delegates here are under the impression that France believes it would be better to admit the Communist regime, despite the fact that the latter has recognized the Communist regime in Indo-China. However, French circles have emphasized that such a step should be taken only if the United States, Britain and France agreed on a common policy regarding China, Indo-China, and in fact the entire Far East.

According to information here, the Western Big Three foreign ministers decided at their recent meeting in London not to take any action regarding the admission of Communist China to the United Nations, at least for the time being. However, some delegates believe the question is still being discussed by the three Governments and see a possibility that the United States, although unwilling to vote in favor of the Communists, may agree to France's doing so.

Were France and Egypt to change their votes the way would be clear for the Soviet Union to return to the Security Council and its dependent bodies, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Commission on Conventional Armaments, and the Military Staff Committee. The Russians in other United Nations agencies probably would follow suit, and in any case there would no longer be any impediment to holding either a regular session of the Security Council or the special session proposed by Trygve Lie, the Secretary General.

However, the prevailing opinion continues to be that the Security Council will not take action, and that the matter will go over until the September session of the General Assembly.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

May 22, 1950

To: Central Files

For information.

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

WEST ALLIES PUT OFF ACTION ON CHINESE ISSUE IN U. N.

By A. M. Rosenthal
Special to The New York Times.

Lake Success, May 21—The Foreign Ministers of the Big Three Western powers took up the problem of China's representation in the United Nations at their recent London meeting, and decided to take no steps for the time being to ease the way for admission of the Communist regime.

Reliable diplomatic circles here said that the foreign ministers of the United States, Britain and France had discussed United Nations affairs several times during their session, with the accent on China's seat in the world organization.

The foreign ministers were said to have agreed that they would let the situation stand as it was, with each country maintaining its present position toward recognizing Peiping.

The line-up in the Security Council now shows that only one of the three Western powers recognizes Communist China—Britain. United States spokesmen have made it plain that this country will not vote for admission of the Communists, and speculation had centered on whether France would switch her vote in favor of Peiping.

No Changes Held in Sight

But United Nations sources said today that the foreign ministers' meeting had strengthened the belief that there was no change in sight. Even if rumors that Egypt will recognize the Communists become a reality, Peiping would thus still be one vote shy of the necessary majority of seven of eleven.

The problem of China was also reported to have come in for discussion at the deliberations of the twelve foreign ministers of the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty. The questions of Chinese representation and the string of Soviet boycotts that grew from it were raised by several of the smaller treaty members, including some Scandinavian states.

Talk at Lake Success has been that the Scandinavians, represented on the Security Council by Norway, pointed to the danger to the United States of allowing the issue of Chinese representation to drag on into the September session of the General Assembly.

The discussions of the three Western powers on China took place after Secretary General Trygve Lie had seen the foreign ministers in Washington, London and Paris but before he had made his journey to Moscow to see Premier Stalin.

Second Round of Talks

Mr. Lie is now on his second round of talks. He has conferred again with French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman but there has been no hint so far that he was able to change the decision made in London and switch the pivotal vote of France.

From Paris, Mr. Lie will go to London tomorrow for more talks with British leaders. The Secretary General will fly back to the United States on Wednesday, and is due to arrive in New York the next day.

Original plans had called for Mr. Lie to sail home on the Queen Elizabeth, leaving Southampton on Thursday. The chief executive of the United Nations staff is expected to hold a press conference here on that day.

WEST ALLIES PUT OFF ACTION ON CHINESE ISSUE IN U. N. (Continued)

After attending to a back-log of work, Mr. Lie is scheduled to go to Washington to see President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson. Mr. Lie had a twenty-minute talk with the President before he left on his swing of European capitals.

Miss Hodel

United Nations
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

Miss Hodel

Nations Unies
CONSEIL
ECONOMIQUE
ET SOCIAL

UNRESTRICTED

E/CN.11/247 *
17 May 1950

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST

Sixth Session

REPRESENTATION OF CHINA

Resolution adopted 16 May 1950

THE ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST

HAVING CONSIDERED the resolution of the U.S.S.R. delegation that "the sixth session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East resolves to exclude the Kuomintang representative from its midst and to recognize as legal representative of China the representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China",

RESOLVES that, without raising the question of the competence of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East to decide upon the matters set forth in the motion proposed by the delegate of the U.S.S.R. calling for expulsion of the representative of the Nationalist Government of China and seating in his place the representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, it is, nevertheless, the wish and desire of this Commission that the matters set forth in the motion of the U.S.S.R. should be decided by a higher body of the United Nations.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

May 10, 1950

To: Central Files

For information.

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

COPY

THE NEW YORK TIMES, WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1950

RUSSIANS WALK OUT ON U.N. ASIAN PARLEY

Bangkok, Thailand, May 9 (AP)—The Russians today extended to the Orient their walkouts from United Nations bodies. The Soviet Delegation stalked from the Industry and Trade Committee of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

The issue was the same as that which prompted previous Soviet walkouts from various United Nations sessions—a Russian demand for the seating of a delegate from Red China. Russia was voted down.

A showdown is expected May 16, when the full commission meets. The vote in the thirteen-nation body may be close.

S. S. Nemtchina, head of the Russian delegation, who is minister to Thailand, offered a resolution to unseat the Chinese Nationalist delegate to the committee. Patrick Pichi Sun, the Nationalist delegate, challenged the Russian resolution. In the voting he was supported by Australia, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Thailand, Britain and the United States.

The Soviet position was backed only by Burma and India. Pakistan and the Philippines abstained.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1950

RUSSIANS WALK OUT ON U.N. ASIAN PANEL

Bangkok, Thailand, May 9 (AP)—The Russians today extended to the Orient their walkouts from United Nations bodies. The Soviet delegation stalked from the Industry and Trade Committee of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

The issue was the same as that which prompted previous Soviet walkouts from various United Nations sessions—a Russian demand for the seating of a delegate from Red China. Russia was voted down.

A showdown is expected May 16, when the full commission meets. The vote in the thirteen-nation body may be close.

S. S. Kestchin, head of the Russian delegation, who is minister to Thailand, offered a resolution to unseat the Chinese Nationalist delegate to the committee. Patrick Pichi Sun, the Nationalist delegate, challenged the Russian resolution. In the voting he was supported by Australia, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Thailand, Britain and the United States.

The Soviet position was backed only by Burma and India. Pakistan and the Philippines abstained.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

May 2, 1950

To: Files

For information.

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

THE NEW YORK TIMES, TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1950

PEIPING REPEATS BID FOR U.N. SEAT

BANGKOK PARLEY WILL DECIDE ON FAR EAST BODY ADMISSION
—CLOSE VOTE PREDICTED

Special to The New York Times.

Lake Success, May 1—Communist China's application for membership in the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East was referred today to the commission, which will meet at Bangkok on May 16, for a decision. A cable, signed by Chou En-lai, Foreign Minister of the "People's Republic of China," said that Chi Chao-ting had been appointed Communist representative, and asked Secretary General Trygve Lie to request a visa from the Thailand Government.

Byron Price, Acting Secretary General in the absence of Mr. Lie, referred both requests to the commission, whose decision on whether to seat the Communist representative presumably will determine whether it asks for the visa. Chi Chao-ting previously had been named as the Communist representative on the Economic and Social Council, which refused to expel the Nationalist representative.

The commission is only a minor United Nations organ, but there is considerable interest in its decision because its membership includes all the neighbors of China that are in the United Nations. Not counting China, it is divided, 6 to 6 between countries that have recognized the Communist regime and those that have not.

Of its membership, Britain, Burma, India, the Netherlands, Pakistan and the Soviet Union have recognized the Communist regime, and Australia, France, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand and the United States have not. It is supposed that, in accordance with recent practice, the commission will rule out of order the expected Soviet motion for the expulsion of the Nationalist representative, and then another Soviet walkout will follow.

However, some countries, such as France, that still recognize the Nationalist regime, may abstain. In that case the admission of the Communist representative is at least possible, since the commission, unlike the Security Council, does not recognize the great power veto.

—
Stanton to Represent U. S.

Washington, May 1 (AP)—President Truman today nominated Edwin F. Stanton, Ambassador to Thailand, as the United States representative on the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

—
Norway to Back Peiping

Oslo, Norway, May 1 (Reuters)—Foreign Minister Halvard Lange declared in a May Day speech here today said Norway was prepared to back Communist China in her campaign for representation in the United Nations and other international organizations. Mr. Lange said that the Peiping Government undoubtedly held the real authority in China now.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

April 28, 1950

To: Files

For information.

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

THE NEW YORK TIMES, WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1950

RUSSIANS WALK OUT OF U.N. ASIAN PARLEY
—

Bangkok, Thailand, May 9 (AP)—The Russians today extended to the Orient their walkouts from United Nations bodies. The Soviet delegation stalked from the Industry and Trade Committee of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

The issue was the same as that which prompted previous Soviet walkouts from various United Nations sessions—a Russian demand for the seating of a delegate from Red China. Russia was voted down.

A showdown is expected May 16, when the full commission meets. The vote in the thirteen-nation body may be close.

S. S. Nemtchin, head of the Russian delegation, who is minister to Thailand, offered a resolution to unseat the Chinese Nationalist delegate to the committee. Patrick Pichi Sun, the Nationalist delegate, challenged the Russian resolution. In the voting he was supported by Australia, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Thailand, Britain and the United States.

The Soviet position was backed only by Burma and India. Pakistan and the Philippines abstained.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1950

RUSSIANS WALK OUT ON U.N. ASIAN PARLEY

Bangkok, Thailand, May 9 (AP)—The Russians today extended to the Orient their walkouts from United Nations bodies. The Soviet delegation stalked from the Industry and Trade Committee of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

The issue was the same as that which prompted previous Soviet walkouts from various United Nations sessions—a Russian demand for the seating of a delegate from Red China. Russia was voted down.

A showdown is expected May 16, when the full commission meets. The vote in the thirteen-nation body may be close.

S. S. Nentchin, head of the Russian delegation, who is minister to Thailand, offered a resolution to unseat the Chinese Nationalist delegate to the committee. Patrick Pichi Sun, the Nationalist delegate, challenged the Russian resolution. In the voting he was supported by Australia, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Thailand, Britain and the United States.

The Soviet position was backed only by Burma and India. Pakistan and the Philippines abstained.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1950

PEIPING REPEATS BID FOR U.N. SEAT

BANGKOK PARLEY WILL DECIDE ON FAR EAST BODY ADMISSION
 —CLOSE VOTE PREDICTED

Special to The New York Times.

Lake Success, May 1—Communist China's application for membership in the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East was referred today to the commission, which will meet at Bangkok on May 16, for a decision. A cable, signed by Chou En-lai, Foreign Minister of the "People's Republic of China," said that Chi Chao-ting had been appointed Communist representative, and asked Secretary General Trygve Lie to request a visa from the Thailand Government.

Byron Price, Acting Secretary General in the absence of Mr. Lie, referred both requests to the commission, whose decision on whether to seat the Communist representative presumably will determine whether it asks for the visa. Chi Chao-ting previously had been named as the Communist representative on the Economic and Social Council, which refused to expel the Nationalist representative.

The commission is only a minor United Nations organ, but there is considerable interest in its decision because its membership includes all the neighbors of China that are in the United Nations. Not counting China, it is divided, 6 to 6 between countries that have recognized the Communist regime and those that have not.

Of its membership, Britain, Burma, India, the Netherlands, Pakistan and the Soviet Union have recognized the Communist regime, and Australia, France, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand and the United States have not. It is supposed that, in accordance with recent practice, the commission will rule out of order the expected Soviet motion for the expulsion of the Nationalist representative, and then another Soviet walkout will follow.

However, some countries, such as France, that still recognize the Nationalist regime, may abstain. In that case the admission of the Communist representative is at least possible, since the commission, unlike the Security Council, does not recognize the great power veto.

—
 Stanton to Represent U. S.

Washington, May 1 (AP)—President Truman today nominated Edwin F. Stanton, Ambassador to Thailand, as the United States representative on the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

—
 Norway to Back Peiping

Oslo, Norway, May 1 (Reuters)—Foreign Minister Halvard Lange declared in a May Day speech here today said Norway was prepared to back Communist China in her campaign for representation in the United Nations and other international organizations. Mr. Lange said that the Peiping Government undoubtedly held the real authority in China now.

THE NEW YORK TIMES, TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1950

PEIPING REPEATS BID FOR U.N. SEAT

BANGKOK PARLEY WILL DECIDE ON FAR EAST BODY ADMISSION
—CLOSE VOTE PREDICTED

Special to The New York Times.

Lake Success, May 1—Communist China's application for membership in the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East was referred today to the commission, which will meet at Bangkok on May 16, for a decision. A cable, signed by Chou En-lai, Foreign Minister of the "People's Republic of China," said that Chi Chao-ting had been appointed Communist representative, and asked Secretary General Trygve Lie to request a visa from the Thailand Government.

Byron Price, Acting Secretary General in the absence of Mr. Lie, referred both requests to the commission, whose decision on whether to seat the Communist representative presumably will determine whether it asks for the visa. Chi Chao-ting previously had been named as the Communist representative on the Economic and Social Council, which refused to expel the Nationalist representative.

The commission is only a minor United Nations organ, but there is considerable interest in its decision because its membership includes all the neighbors of China that are in the United Nations. Not counting China, it is divided, 6 to 6 between countries that have recognized the Communist regime and those that have not.

Of its membership, Britain, Burma, India, the Netherlands, Pakistan and the Soviet Union have recognized the Communist regime, and Australia, France, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand and the United States have not. It is supposed that, in accordance with recent practice, the commission will rule out of order the expected Soviet motion for the expulsion of the Nationalist representative, and then another Soviet walkout will follow.

However, some countries, such as France, that still recognize the Nationalist regime, may abstain. In that case the admission of the Communist representative is at least possible, since the commission, unlike the Security Council, does not recognize the great power veto.

Stanton to Represent U. S.

Washington, May 1 (AP)—President Truman today nominated Edwin F. Stanton, Ambassador to Thailand, as the United States representative on the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East.

Norway to Back Peiping

Oslo, Norway, May 1 (Reuters)—Foreign Minister Halvard Lange declared in a May Day speech here today said Norway was prepared to back Communist China in her campaign for representation in the United Nations and other international organizations. Mr. Lange said that the Peiping Government undoubtedly held the real authority in China now.

RUSSIA WALKS OUT OF 19TH U.N. GROUP

Quits Conventional Arms Unit After Delegates Reject Move to Oust Nationalist China

Special to The New York Times.

Lake Success. April 27 - The Soviet Union marched out of the long-stalled United Nations disarmament talks today after failing again by a close vote to oust the delegation of Nationalist China.

Walkout 19 came early in a meeting of the Commission on Conventional Armaments. It was one of the higher level marches to the delegates' exit, performed by Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Jacob A. Malik, who was in a jovial sort of mood as he came and left within the space of a half hour.

Mr. Malik opened the session of the commission - its first in nine months - by making his now familiar demand for the unseating of the delegation of the "Kuomintang." He warned that the Soviet Government would not stay in the commission if the Nationalists were allowed to remain and would recognize none of its decisions.

The Vote Is 3 to 4

Three countries voted India. There were four neg The other countries represe abstained.

It was noted that the issue since earlier votes. an ouster move instead of in the Economic and Social

Britain and Norway, based their abstentions to China should be settled on a procedural move in one

Although there were seating the Nationalists, unchanged. They said it two delegations to change membership as the commis

After Mr. Malik led walkout as "Gallous ind commission had a duty to

The commission had plan - safeguards needs for a world-wide arms Union on the grounds th

Mr. Nash warned thinking that commissi only thing that could policies of the Soviet Union.

The commission decided to have its working committee meet on May 18.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND
April 28, 1950
To: Files
For information.
cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe
Mr. Frost

THE NEW YORK TIMES, FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1950

RUSSIA WALKS OUT OF 19TH U. N. GROUP

Quits Conventional Arms Unit After Delegates Reject Move to Oust Nationalist China

Special to The New York Times.

Like Success. April 27 - The Soviet Union marched out of the long-stalled United Nations disarmament talks today after failing again by a close vote to oust the delegation of Nationalist China.

Walkout 19 came early in a meeting of the Commission on Conventional Armaments. It was one of the higher level marches to the delegates' exit, performed by Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Jacob A. Malik, who was in a jovial sort of mood as he came and left within the space of a half hour.

Mr. Malik opened the session of the commission - its first in nine months - by making his now familiar demand for the unseating of the delegation of the "Kuomintang." He warned that the Soviet Government would not stay in the commission if the Nationalists were allowed to remain and would recognize none of its decisions.

The Vote Is 3 to 4

Three countries voted for the ouster motion - the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and India. There were four negatives, from the United States, China, Cuba and France. The other countries represented on the commission - Ecuador, Egypt, Norway and Britain - abstained.

It was noted that there had been a switch in voting on the Chinese representation issue since earlier votes. In the Security Council Egypt and Ecuador had voted against an ouster move instead of abstaining, and France, which voted "no" today, had abstained in the Economic and Social Council.

Britain and Norway, two countries that recognize the Chinese Communists, apparently based their abstentions today on the belief that the issue of the representation of China should be settled on a political level in the Security Council rather than through a procedural move in one of its commissions.

Although there were only four negatives in the commission to three votes for unseating the Nationalists, observers commented that the political situation remained unchanged. They said it would still take a change of opinion on the part of at least two delegations to change the picture in the Security Council, which has the same membership as the commission.

'Gallous Indifference' Seen

After Mr. Malik left the room, Frank C. Nash, United States representative, hit the walkout as "gallous indifference" to the obligations of the Charter. ~~Mr. Nash said the commission has a duty to consider~~

The commission had been called to consider the next item on its long-dormant work plan - safeguards needed for disarmament. In an earlier stage, the commission had voted for a world-wide arms census but had seen it vetoed in the Security Council by the Soviet Union on the grounds that it did not include atomic weapons.

Mr. Nash warned that the peace-loving people of the world must not be deluded into thinking that commission discussion of arms reduction was a break in the clouds. The only thing that could bring about that break, he declared, was a major change in the policies of the Soviet Union.

The commission decided to have its working committee meet on May 15.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

April 28, 1950

To: Files

For information.

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

THE NEW YORK TIMES, FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1950

RUSSIA WALKS OUT OF 19TH U.N. GROUP

Quits Conventional Arms Unit After Delegates Reject Move to Oust Nationalist China

Special to The New York Times.

Like Success. April 27 - The Soviet Union marched out of the long-stalled United Nations disarmament talks today after failing again by a close vote to oust the delegation of Nationalist China.

Walkout 19 came early in a meeting of the Commission on Conventional Armaments. It was one of the higher level marches to the delegates' exit, performed by Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Jacob A. Malik, who was in a jovial sort of mood as he came and left within the space of a half hour.

Mr. Malik opened the session of the commission - its first in nine months - by making his now familiar demand for the unseating of the delegation of the "Kuomintang." He warned that the Soviet Government would not stay in the commission if the Nationalists were allowed to remain and would recognize none of its decisions.

The Vote Is 3 to 4

Three countries voted for the ouster motion - the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and India. There were four negatives, from the United States, China, Cuba and France. The other countries represented on the commission - Ecuador, Egypt, Norway and Britain - abstained.

It was noted that there had been a switch in voting on the Chinese representation issue since earlier votes. In the Security Council Egypt and Ecuador had voted against an ouster move instead of abstaining, and France, which voted "no" today, had abstained in the Economic and Social Council.

Britain and Norway, two countries that recognize the Chinese Communists, apparently based their abstentions today on the belief that the issue of the representation of China should be settled on a political level in the Security Council rather than through a procedural move in one of its commissions.

Although there were only four negatives in the commission to three votes for unseating the Nationalists, observers commented that the political situation remained unchanged. They said it would still take a change of opinion on the part of at least two delegations to change the picture in the Security Council, which has the same membership as the commission.

'Callous Indifference' Seen

After Mr. Malik left the room, Frank C. Nash, United States representative, hit the walkout as "callous indifference" to the obligations of the Charter. ~~Mr. Malik said the commission had a duty to discuss~~

The commission had been called to consider the next item on its long-dormant work plan - safeguards needed for disarmament. In an earlier stage, the commission had voted for a world-wide arms census but had seen it vetoed in the Security Council by the Soviet Union on the grounds that it did not include atomic weapons.

Mr. Nash warned that the peace-loving people of the world must not be deluded into thinking that commission discussion of arms reduction was a break in the clouds. The only thing that could bring about that break, he declared, was a major change in the policies of the Soviet Union.

The commission decided to have its working committee meet on May 13.

PEIPING SETS TERMS FOR TIE TO BRITISH (Continued)

Request for Clarification

John C. Hutchison, British charge d'affaires in Peiping, called at the Communist Foreign Ministry on Feb. 14 to discuss the establishment of relations. After the Chinese New Year holiday on March 3 he received from the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs a request for clarification of the British attitude on the three points.

The British Government's reply, given on March 17, made the following points:

While Britain abstained from voting on the first proposal to seat the Communist Government on the Security Council she would be prepared to vote for the Communists if and when there were enough other favorable votes to give the required majority of seven.

In the meantime Britain has been encouraging other governments, including those of the British Commonwealth countries to recognize the Communist regime.

As Britain had recognized the Communist Government, the assets of the Nationalist Government in British territory would pass automatically to the Communists except where there was a conflicting claim. In the latter case the courts would decide the ownership.

Such a case has arisen with the Hong Kong aircraft. The courts ruled on Feb. 23 that it would be a violation of the immunity of a foreign sovereign power (that is the Peiping regime) if the aircraft should be delivered to a receiver as requested by United States interests.

General Chennault and his associates appealed from that ruling, and the case is to be heard on April 28.

In the meantime John Dugdale, Minister of State for Colonial Affairs, told the House of Commons last Friday that "it would be highly improper for the Government to make any attempt to influence the Hong Kong courts in regard to a matter under consideration by them or to take any executive action which could be justifiably interpreted by either side as partial."

The third point in Britain's reply to the Communist Government was that Britain traditionally had extended the right of asylum to political refugees and would continue to extend it to Chinese Nationalists as individuals.

The New York Times, Wednesday, April 5, 1950

RUSSIANS WALK OUT AGAIN

—
Leave Florence Radio Parley on China Representation Issue

—
Special to The New York Times
—

Rome, April 4—The International High Frequency Radio Conference in Florence was almost disrupted today when the Soviet delegation walked out. The Polish, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Czechoslovak and Albanian delegation followed the Russian lead.

The conference, which has the purpose of fixing new wave lengths for the world's shortwave radio stations, has been meeting in Florence since April 1. Today the chief Russian delegate, Sergei Mikhailov, introduced a motion to exclude the delegation from Nationalist China and to invite the delegation from the Chinese Communist Government. When the Soviet motion was defeated by a secret vote the Russians and their satellites left the hall.

The walkout caused the conference of forty-nine nations to be suspended, but it was hoped that it would resume tomorrow.

The New York Times, Wednesday, April 5, 1950

U. N. ATOMIC TALKS MINUS CHINA ASFOOD

Some Nations for Resumption Through Committee of Six—Question Held Basic

By Thomas J. Hamilton
Special to The New York Times

Lake Success, April 4—Several influential United Nations delegates have proposed the resumption here of atomic discussions by the other great powers in the absence of Nationalist China.

Discussions in the Atomic Energy Commission's committee of six—the five great powers and Canada, who are permanent members of the commission—were suspended on Jan. 19, when the Soviet Union walked out in protest against the committee's refusal to expel Nationalist China. Since the commission itself suspended work last year there is no United Nations organ now available for atomic discussions.

It is the unanimous belief of delegates here that the question of international atomic control is the most important single issue dividing the Soviet Union and the West, and the new proposal reflects the belief that the atomic discussions must be resumed without further delay.

No End of Deadlock Seen

It is now agreed that there is little or no prospect that the Nationalist delegation will be expelled from the Security Council before the meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the North Atlantic countries next month, if then. This would depend on the formulation of a common policy by the United States, Britain and France, and many delegates expect a continuance of the present deadlock on China until the General Assembly convenes in September.

Other United Nations organs are continuing to function without the Russians, but it is generally felt that the end of the United States monopoly on atomic energy creates an urgent situation. Moreover, supporters of the proposal point out, Dr. T. F. Tsiang, representative of Nationalist China, already has given what they interpret as his approval of the new procedure.

On March 14, in a letter to Secretary General Trygve Lie protesting against a memorandum by Mr. Lie that favored the admission of Communist China to the United Nations, Dr. Tsiang denied that the Chinese question had deadlocked atomic discussions.

"The two problems have no relation to each other," Dr. Tsiang wrote. "If you believe that the problem of Chinese representation is the obstacle toward a solution of the atomic energy problem, the precedent set by the Dumbarton Oaks talks, where the foundations of the United Nations were laid, might be followed by the six sponsoring powers in their consultation on atomic energy."

Competent sources said that Dr. Tsiang was referring to the fact that for a considerable part of the Dumbarton Oaks discussions the Soviet Union refused to sit at the same table with representatives of Nationalist China. The late Edward R. Stettiniv Jr., who was then Under-Secretary of State, met the difficulty by holding separate conferences with the Soviet and Chinese representatives.

Chinese National circles refused to comment, but supporters of the proposal say that they saw no reason to believe the United States or other participants in the atomic discussions could meet Dr. Tsiang's conditions by subsequently informing the Nationalist delegation of what took place.

U.N. ATOMIC TALKS MINUS CHINA ASKED (Continued)

Although it is known that the proposal for a meeting of the committee of six nations is receiving favorable consideration by several delegations, United States circles gave it a cool reception. The suggestion is under study, it was said, along with proposals by Mr. Lie for a high-level meeting of the Security Council or a special session of the General Assembly, and Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo's proposal that the United Nations request a world congress of scientists to draw up an atomic control plan.

United States circles expressed fear that the Soviet Union would reject the proposal, or would accept it only to have an opportunity to make a propaganda attack on the Western powers. However, supporters of the proposal believe that at worst, if the Soviet Union rejected it, this would show the world that the Kremlin, despite its protestations, does not favor either the resumption of atomic discussions or the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

PRAVDA SCORES U.S. IN U.N.

Moscow Paper Backs Lie's Move to Get Red China Into Group

Special to The New York Times

Moscow, April 4—Pravda today declared the Soviet Union firmly and strongly supports the United Nations as an "instrument of peace and security of the peoples" and charged the United States with deliberate efforts to delay and sabotage the question of China's United Nations representation in order to transform the United Nations into a "weapon of their aggressive policy."

Pravda expressed approval of the "timid effort" of Trygve Lie, Secretary General, to solve the Chinese question through his memorandum, which, it declared, "established beyond dispute" the right of the Mao Tse-tung Government to sit in the United Nations. It said Mr. Lie had made an effort to clarify the Chinese question but that "even these timid attempts provoked vicious comment of the American monopolistic press, and the State Department has simply ignored the memorandum of Secretary General."

"This proves once more that the United States Government does not strive toward removing the absurd situation that has developed in the United Nations and fears of collaboration with peace-loving and democratic states in the United Nations," Pravda said in a dispatch written by two of its correspondents in New York, G. Rassadin and I. Filippov.

Pravda charged that the United States had exerted diplomatic pressure on Ecuador and Egypt to prevent them from recognizing the Mao regime.

Pravda declared that, despite American plans to obstruct the United Nations and destroy it as an "instrument of peace," these efforts "are doomed to unavoidable failure."

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

March 29, 1950

To: Files

For information.

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

The New York Times, Tuesday, April 4, 1950

SOVIET WALKS OUT OF U.N. A 17TH TIME

Poles Join in Quitting Social Commission Meeting Over Issue of China's Seat

Special to The New York Times

Like Success, April 3—The delegates of the Soviet Union and Poland walked out of the Social Commission today, raising the list of United Nations bodies boycotted by the Soviet bloc countries to seventeen since the current series began three months ago.

Turning their backs on the eighteen-member commission in protest against the majority's refusal to vote on the Soviet demand to oust the representative of Nationalist China, V. I. Forashev of the Soviet and Dr. Juliusz Katz-Suchy of Poland carried out for their countries the familiar walkaway pattern.

The Russians proposed the removal of Dr. Hsiu Gm from China's chair. The vote was on the chairman's ruling that the Soviet move was out of order. With twelve countries supporting the chairman, three against (including Yugoslavia), and the United States, New Zealand and Iraq not voting. The two Eastern European delegates then served the standard notice that they would not return while Nationalist China was represented and that in their view any decisions taken in the meantime would be illegal.

The vote was on a purely procedural matter, with those supporting the chairman contending that the Commission was not competent to decide the question of representation but must leave the matter to the parent body, the Economic and Social Council.

Louis K. Hyde, Jr., representing the United States, was among the non-voting delegates because he was sitting in on the debate only as an alternate.

The latest failure of the Soviet bloc to pave the way for the seating of Chinese Communists at the United Nations brought from Dr. Katz-Suchy a bitter attack. He described the Chinese Nationalist regime as "only sad remnants" of a clique that for the past twenty years had been betraying the interests of China and "selling its people lock, stock and barrel to all types of foreign interventionists."

The Polish representative said that the United States was finding itself in a position of "helpless rage and fury at the complete destruction of the dream of an American century of world domination" and was still pouring into China hundreds of millions of dollars and arms and ammunition to bolster the Nationalists in a doomed struggle.

Dr. Katz-Suchy charged that terrorism and mass executions were being carried out now in Formosa, and he specifically cited the alleged execution of 370 persons on the night of March 22, including thirteen generals and fifteen journalists.

He said that foreign correspondents of The Associated Press and The United Press had been arrested. According to the records of the two agencies here, a Chinese correspondent of The United Press has been arrested and one or two Chinese translators working for The Associated Press have been arrested.

After the walkouts Mr. Hyde noted for the United States that if everyone took a walk every time he was defeated there would soon be no one left to work in the United

SOVIET WALKS OUT OF U.N. A 17TH TIME (Continued)

Nations. Yugoslavia, he observed, also had protested but had nevertheless elected in the spirit of give-and-take to stay with the Commission.

At the meeting, the first of the sixth session, the Commission elected Dr. Jose A. Correa of Ecuador as chairman, Bharatan Kumarappa of India, first vice chairman, Gustav Vlahov of Yugoslavia, second vice chairman, and R. B. Gury of Canada, rapporteur.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

March 30, 1950

To: Files

For information.

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

The New York Times, Thursday, March 30, 1950

ARANHA FOR ENTRY OF RED CHINA IN U.N.

Brazilian, Former Assembly Head, Backs Lie Plan—Mrs. Roosevelt
Scolds Nationalists

Special to The New York Times.

Lake Success, March 29—Dr. Oswaldo Aranha of Brazil came out strongly today for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

The one-time President of the General Assembly sent a cablegram to the United Nations giving his full support to Secretary General Trygve Lie's proposal for a top-level meeting of the Security Council—a meeting that would take place only after the settlement of the issue of China's representation.

Dr. Aranha, who served as President of the special Assembly session on Palestine and the second regular session in 1947, was the third chief Assembly executive to go on record in favor of the Lie recommendation. On Saturday Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, present President of the General Assembly, gave his blessing to Mr. Lie's suggestion that the Council hold a special or "periodic" meeting to give the statesmen of the world a chance to thresh out "cold-war" issues.

Backs Lie's "Initiative"

Dr. Herbert V. Evatt, former Australian External Affairs Minister and General Romulo's predecessor as Assembly President, came through with his support for Mr. Lie yesterday. Dr. Evatt added a word of praise for Mr. Lie's "initiative and perseverance."

The statements of the former Assembly Presidents came in response to queries sent out by the United Nations Department of Information, asking for opinions on Mr. Lie's suggestion. All former Presidents were questioned. The two still to be heard from are Paul-Henri Spaak of Belgium and Dr. Jose Arce of Argentina. Other leading United Nations personalities were also queried.

Speaking of military preparations, Dr. Aranha in his message said that it was "difficult to admit" that even the great powers could face the "cost, destruction or cataclysm of a new, purposeless conflict."

Dr. Aranha said that the road to peace was easier and simpler than the road to war, and added:

"I therefore applaud without reservation Trygve Lie's warning about the perils which threaten the world community and I launch an appeal for his suggestion that new efforts be made and new understandings be sought in United Nations councils for free examination, free debate, free adjustment of problems which in this crucial hour jeopardize the objectives of the organization and the peaceful future of civilization and human culture."

Dr. Aranha then moved on to the question of China's representation in the United Nations. He said he saw no reason for objection to the admission of the "China of today" to the United Nations.

ARANHA FOR ENTRY OF RED CHINA IN U.N. (Cont'd.)

"Any policy which seeks to deny or to escape reality is wrong," he commented. "It is in the world of facts that we should seek a field of understanding for the aims and aspirations of peoples."

Dr. Aranha said he did not approve Russian "intransigence" in boycotting the United Nations a government which was unable to maintain itself in its own country," he said. . . .

U. N. AS A MORGUE

Two more Soviet walkouts at Lake Success have been added to the others in turning the United Nations into a morgue. The issue in the U. N. is intimately related to China, for the Russian walkouts are concerned with Chinese representation. The Russians won't come back to the Security Council till the Communist takes the Nationalist place in the Security Council. Secretary General Lie thinks that in this respect the credentials of the new regime in China have a sound title warranting acceptance of the new regime as the controller of Chinese territory. We agree with him. The Peking government has as much authority as any government in Chinese Republican history, and that authority has never been 100 percent. If the issue could be settled in Peking's favor in a kind of Jessup-Malik talk, then the Security Council could resume business, preferably with the first meeting composed of Foreign Ministers as authorized under Article 29.

This would serve to bring the United States and the Soviet together again around the conference table. And nothing is more important as showing the world that America's fundamental aim is to pursue peace. Nothing in particular might come of it, but the first task of our foreign policy is to keep the door open to the Soviet Union, and the best door is the one in the Security Council. Mr. Byrnes had a guiding rule as Secretary of State: never stop talking. It is a sound rule, as was illustrated in the case of the struggle over Berlin. This brought the United States close to war, yet the diplomats never threw up their hands, but kept on talking with the Russians.

It would be folly to compound the diplomatic defeat we have sustained in China by refusing to deal with realities. A lesson here is provided in the Von Bulow memoirs. When Bethman-Hollweg took over the Chancellorship of Germany before the last war, he said he found the situation "irremediably compromised," meaning that his predecessor had made the 1914 war inevitable. Von Bulow was his predecessor, and he retorted that, if he had been in power, he would never have allowed the Balkan war to blow up in general catastrophe. Nothing was worse, he said, than the "fatalistic doctrine" of diplomacy; on occasion it must accept a "diplomatic defeat" and start again. There are many illustrations in our times. Moscow, for instance, has recognized Hatta in Indonesia, though it strained every nerve to keep him out of office.

Acceptance of a representation policy in the United Nations would not necessarily mean recognition of Communist China by the United States. But it would serve a realistic purpose in addition to that of reassembling the conference table at Lake Success. It would pave the way for the return of American influence in China. It would put the Chinese Communists along with all other U. N. members always before the bar of world opinion. We don't say this would ipso facto induce a sense of responsibility in Peking. By no means. But to make a government a pariah—especially when the U. N. embraces all kinds and conditions of governments—is to put a premium on nuisance, and the place where the Chinese can be and threaten to be a nuisance is on the northern border of Indo-China. If anything happens there, the challenge, as Secretary Acheson has reaffirmed, will be and should be met, and not half-heartedly either. The deadly seriousness of the American intent needs to be put before the Chinese face to face, not across a space to a capital which looks at America and the world, as Peking does, with an astigmatic as well as a jaundiced vision.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

March 28, 1950

To: Files

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

SOVIET QUITS TWO U.N. BODIES AFTER ATTACK ON U.S. POLICY

By Thomas J. Hamilton
Special to The New York Times

Lake Success, March 27—Soviet representatives walked out of the Commission on Human Rights and the Transport and Communications Commission today after attacking the United States and "United States satellites" for the continued refusal of United Nations bodies to expel representatives of Nationalist China.

.....

Following their now standard procedure, the Soviet representatives introduced resolutions calling for expulsion of the "Kuomintang group," and afterward walked out with the announcement that the Soviet Union would not be bound by any decisions taken while Nationalist China was still represented.

Today, however, the Soviet resolutions did not reach a vote. Mrs. Roosevelt in the Commission of Human Rights, ruled that the motion for the expulsion of Nationalist China was out of order when it was introduced by Mr. Tsarapkin at the start of the meeting this morning. The commission upheld her by a vote of 12 to 2, with the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia in the minority.

The same ruling was made by J. J. Oyevar of the Netherlands, chairman of the Transportation and Communication Commission, when Mr. Klimov introduced an identical resolution at its opening session this afternoon. The vote was 11 to 4, with the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Yugoslavia in the minority.

The Ukraine is also a member of the Commission on Human Rights, but did not have a representative at the meeting, and Mr. Tsarapkin walked out alone. However, Mr. Klimov was accompanied by the representatives of Czechoslovakia and Poland.

.....

These rulings made it unnecessary for countries that have recognized the Communist regime to vote on whether they should be admitted to these United Nations bodies. This was not a matter of practical importance on the Human Rights Commission, since only four of its eighteen members have recognized the Communist regime, but it has been recognized by nine of the fifteen members of the Transport and Communications Commission. Therefore, a close vote had been expected on the Soviet resolution.

However, it was obvious from the start that there was little chance that this would result in the admission of the Chinese Communists, since some countries, such as Britain, that have recognized the regime are willing to vote for their admission, but not for the expulsion of the Nationalists. Others, such as India, while eager to have the Communists admitted, believe that the decision should not be made by such an obscure organ, and would prefer that the General Assembly lay down a uniform rule for the United Nations.

The Soviet walkout, incidentally, paved the way for the subsequent re-election of Dr. P. C. Chang, the Nationalist representative, as first vice chairman. The Commission, by unanimous vote, re-elected its other officers—Mrs. Roosevelt as chairman, Prof. Rene Cassin of France, second vice chairman, and Dr. Charles Malik of Lebanon, rapporteur. A separate and secret ballot on Dr. Chang, taken at the request of Branko Jevremovic of Yugoslavia, resulted in his election by a vote of 12 to 0, with two abstentions.

SOVIET QUITS TWO U.N. UNITS AFTER ATTACK ON U.S. POLICY (Cont'd.)

The Commission on Human Rights, which is starting a three-week session, adjourned after electing its officers, and will start work tomorrow. The Transport and Communications Commission, in addition to electing officers, took up several items on its agenda, including a report from the Secretariat on progress in simplifying passport and frontier formalities.

Boycott Twelve Agencies

Since January, when the Soviet Union walked out of the Security Council, its representatives have staged similar scenes in a dozen United Nations agencies. In addition, they did not show up for meetings of the Little Assembly (which the Soviet Union has boycotted from the outset) or the Trusteeship Council session in Geneva. The only United Nations body in which they are now participating is the European Economic Commission, of which Nationalist China is not a member.

On their way out of the building, the Soviet representatives made the usual statement that they would return as soon as Nationalist China was expelled. Britain and several other countries, while unwilling to vote for the expulsion of Nationalist China, would vote for a resolution to seat Communist China, it is thought, since they have extended recognition.

Until the Soviet delegation introduces its resolution in a form that will win maximum support, therefore, it is considered obvious that Moscow still actually opposes the admission of Communist China and the consequent return of its delegates to the United Nations organs.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

March 27, 1950

To: Files

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

C O P Y

The New York Times, Monday, March 27, 1950

2 SOVIET WALKOUTS AT U.N. TODAY SEEN

Defeat of Demand for Ouster of Chinese Nationalists Is Expected in 2 Bodies

Special to The New York Times.

LAKE SUCCESS, March 26--The Soviet bloc is set to walk out of two more United Nations meetings tomorrow if it is defeated again in its ten-week-old attempt to oust the representatives of Nationalist China from the world organization.

The Commission on Human Rights, at its opening session, is virtually certain to turn down the routine Russian demand for expulsion of the Chinese delegate on the eighteen-member body. The situation will be slightly different in the case of the Transport and Communications Commission, which opens its fourth session tomorrow afternoon. A majority of eight of its fifteen members have recognized the Chinese Communist regime.

United Nations officials believe, however, that several of these eight governments will vote against the Soviet ouster demand on the ground that the comparatively minor body should not attempt such precedent-making actions.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

March 21, 1950

To: Files

For information.

Also distributed to:

Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

The New York Times, Tuesday, March 21, 1950

BRITISH MOVE FAILS IN U.N. CHINA ROW

London's Delegate Tries to Get Cuba, Ecuador and Egypt to Back Communists

By Thomas J. Hamilton
Special to The New York Times

Lake Success, March 20—A recent attempt by Britain to break the deadlock over the admission of Communist China to the United Nations Security Council has failed to produce any result, it was disclosed today.

British circles said that Sir Terrence Shone, British deputy representative, acting on instructions from Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, had called on the representatives of Cuba, Ecuador and Egypt to express the British Government's concern over the deadlock, which was followed by a Soviet walkout.

These three countries were chosen because they appeared to present the best possibilities of changing their position and voting for the admission of Communist China. However, Sir Terrence also presented Mr. Bevin's views to Ernest A. Cross, deputy United States representative.

Admission Seen Inevitable

Mr. Bevin's message, it was stated, emphasized that the admission of Communist China to the Security Council was inevitable sooner or later, and that it would be better for the Council to settle the issue rather than leave it to be decided by some minor United Nations organ. The message stated also that there was a possibility that the existence of the United Nations might be endangered if the deadlock, together with the Soviet walkout, continued.

The conversations with the four representatives were said to have taken place ten days ago, and Ecuador's subsequent announcement that she would abstain in the Security Council destroyed any possibility, for the time being at least, that the talks would alter the situation. The United States and Cuba are standing by their decision to oppose the expulsion of Nationalist China or the admission of Communist China, and Egypt is now expected to abstain.

However, under Security Council rules an abstention on this question is equivalent to a vote against, and British circles conceded today that it would be impossible for the present to get the seven necessary votes in favor of seating the Communists. Although the British Government had just recognized the Communist regime, Britain abstained last January on a Soviet resolution to expel the Nationalists from the Security Council, holding that it was premature.

Britain Plans No Motion

British circles reiterated today that Britain would vote for a resolution to seat the Communists, if this would produce a majority, but said that Britain would not introduce such a resolution now because it would be "useless." They denied that Mr. Bevin's move was made to improve relations with the Communist regime, which, presumably in retaliation for Britain's abstention, has refused thus far to agree on arrangements for the exchange of Ambassadors.

Britain's abstention last January was actuated by desire to prevent the Soviet Union from using the China question as a means of creating a split between Britain and the United States on the China issue. On the other hand, Britain recognized the

BRITISH MOVE FAILS IN U.N. CHINA NOW (Continued)

Communist regime to protect British trade and investments in China, and British policy thus has tried to take the two contradictory factors--the United States position and British economic interests--into account.

The prevailing belief among other delegates is that the United States, Britain and France, as the three Western powers with the largest stake in the Far East, should now develop a common policy toward China. Failing agreement by the three Western powers it is now expected that the deadlock may continue until the General Assembly convenes in September.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

March 16, 1950

To: Files

Also distributed for information
to:

Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

U.N. CHINA IMPASSE WAITS ON POWERS

No Break Seen Until Britain, France and U.S. Give Lead to Smaller Nations

By Thomas J. Hamilton

Special to The New York Times.

Like Success, March 15 - The deadlock in the United Nations over the China question, and the accompanying Soviet walkout, will continue until the United States, Britain and France give smaller countries a definite indication of the policy they intend to follow, a leading delegate predicted today.

A number of delegates agreed that a memorandum circulated last week by Secretary General Trygve Lie, which was generally interpreted as suggesting the admission of Communist China to United Nations organs, made an effective statement of the legal position. The question, however, is political, and since then Ecuador has announced her decision to abstain in the Security Council, destroying any possibility that the Council will expel D. T. F. Tsiang, Nationalist Chinese representative, in the near future.

Delegates are still studying the possibility of placing the China question before a special session of the Security Council in Europe, to be attended by Foreign Ministers rather than by the permanent delegates here, or of calling a special session of the General Assembly. If either meeting were held under existing circumstances, however, it would merely ratify the refusal of the Security Council and other United Nations organs to expel the Nationalist representatives.

No Special Session Seen

Since the General Assembly will open its regular session on September 19, the general feeling appears to be that a special session would not be worth while unless a majority of the membership had decided in favor of the admission of the Chinese Communists.

Revised figures made available today showed that fifteen of the fifty-nine members of the United Nations had now recognized the Communist regime. Mr. Lie's memorandum argued that the question of its admission to the United Nations should be decided on a different basis from recognition by individual governments, but most delegates appear to feel that it is impossible to separate them.

In compliance with a request by Dr. Tsiang, copies of his attack on Mr. Lie yesterday are being distributed to all members of the United Nations. This action was taken by Dr. Homero Viteri-Lafrente, of Ecuador, President of the Security Council for March.

Nationalist Charges Rest

Meanwhile, despite the rejection of the Soviet proposal for the expulsion of the Nationalists, members of the United Nations continued their reluctance to discuss Nationalist charges that the Soviet Union had intervened in the Chinese civil war. These charges were referred by the General Assembly to its Interim Committee, the Little Assembly, which heard a statement by Dr. Tsiang on Feb. 7 and immediately adjourned.

None of the representatives on the Little Assembly, including Dr. Tsiang, has asked for another meeting, and it is understood that Dr. Jose Carlos Muniz of Brazil, the president, now plans to ask members whether they would like to take up the question

U.S. CHINA IMPASSE WAITS ON POWER (Continued)

of delimiting the boundaries of the former Italian colonies. Ethiopia, however, has refused to be bound by such action pending a decision at the next session of the General Assembly on the administration of Eritrea.

March 10, 1950

MEMORANDUM:

TO: FILES

FROM: A. C. Frost *mx.*

SUBJECT: Recognition of Chinese Communist Regime

Attached is an extract from the New York Times of March 10, 1950, reporting (a) a feeling among delegates at the UN that the US Secretary of State inclines to favor recognition, (b) comments of the Chinese Ambassador on Mr. Lie's proposal and (c) the withdrawal of the Nationalist Government of China from GATT.

cc: Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

LIE PISA ON CHINA STIRS HOPES IN U. N.

Most Delegates Feel Acheson Favors Admission of Reds
—Rival Soviet Body Feared

By Thomas J. Hamilton

Lake Success, March 9.—Hope that the deadlock over China's representation in the United Nations could be solved in the next few weeks was expressed by a number of United Nations sources today. It was generally agreed that a memorandum circulated by Secretary General Trygve Lie presented an effective argument for the admission of the Chinese Communist regime, but that the problem was essentially political. Also, it was agreed that if no solution were reached soon, the deadlock would continue for months.

Since the Western world, under the leadership of the United States, is now striking back at communism, it is acknowledged that the admission of a Communist regime to the United Nations would appear inconsistent. Furthermore, it is agreed that many nations that have voted against the expulsion of the Nationalists are hardly likely to shift their position unless they are convinced that the United States would acquiesce in such a change.

Hold U.S. Favors Admission

Most delegates here are convinced that Secretary of State Dean Acheson, in view of the fact that the authority of the Nationalist Government no longer exists on the mainland of China, believes it would be better for the United States to admit the Communist regime, and that eventually, at least, the United States should recognize it.

However, Ernest A. Gross, deputy United States representative, announced yesterday that since the United States continued to recognize the Nationalist regime, it would continue to vote against the expulsion of the Nationalists and the admission of the Communists.

Mr. Lie's memorandum suggested that the question of United Nations membership and recognition be separated, and that United Nations membership should belong to the Government that exercised effective control over its territory. Republican Senators, however, continue to demand that the United States support the Nationalist regime.

Delegates now are convinced they were correct in their supposition that the Soviet Union did not want the Communist regime admitted to the United Nations while the two countries were negotiating in Moscow. The Soviet objective, they hold, was clearly to convince Mao Tze-tung that the Soviet Union was the only true friend of his Government.

However, the Soviet Union has continued to walk out of United Nations agencies, and this has given rise to speculation on the possibility that the Kremlin may now use the refusal to expel the Nationalist regime as a pretext for a permanent withdrawal of the Soviet Union and Communist-controlled countries from the United Nations.

LIE PLEA ON CHINA STIRS HOPES IN U.N. (Continued)

Provocations Held Encouraged

Delegates who believe in this theory say that this would be logical in view of the consternation produced in the Soviet Union by the defection of Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia. Since then, the Soviet Union has started a new drive to tighten its grip on the satellite countries, and at the same time has apparently encouraged their Governments—as witness the provocative actions of Hungary and Bulgaria toward the United States—to break the remaining ties with the West.

Obviously, these delegates hold, firm control over China is even more important to the Kremlin than over these relatively small European countries. Therefore, they see a possibility that the Soviet Union in the end may decide to set up what would correspond to a Soviet United Nations.

The experience of the past few weeks, with no member of the Soviet bloc taking part in the work of any United Nations organ, has inspired misgivings in a number of delegates about the value of the work the organization could do in that event.

United States spokesmen continued to express the hope that the Soviet Union would come back soon, but other delegates said they had a feeling that some officials in the State Department would not be too unhappy if the Soviet delegates never came back.

In any event, it is generally held that the longer the Soviet walkout lasts, the more probable a permanent departure will become.

Koo Assails Lie Proposal

Washington, March 9 (AP)—Dr. V. K. Wellington Koo, Chinese Nationalist Ambassador, said tonight that the proposal by Mr. Lie on the Chinese Communists' claim to representation in the United Nations was "questionable course of action."

Dr. Koo said in a statement:

"If such a suggestion should be approved by the bulk of the member states, it would have the effect of putting a premium on force and violence in national politics and upon international aggression for imperialistic expansion."

CHINA QUITS TRADE GROUP

Action Spares the West, as Well as Nationalists, Embarrassment

Geneva, March 9—The Nationalist Government of China has announced its withdrawal from the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The announcement was in form of a telegram to Secretary General Lie of the United Nations from the Chinese delegation to the United Nations. The withdrawal will be effective May 5, 1950.

By this action the Nationalist Government has saved the Western countries a great deal of embarrassment. It has also saved itself embarrassment. In the present state of its control over Chinese territory the Nationalist Government could not effectively carry out the terms of the General Agreement. The status of a contracting party to the General Agreement carries specific practical obligations with respect to trade and tariff policy and administration.

LIE PLEA ON CHINA STIRS HOPES IN U.N. (Continued)

Sooner or later, Governments such as Britain, which no longer recognize the Nationalist Government would have had to challenge its capacity to remain a contracting party.

By the simple withdrawal without any explanation the Nationalist Government loses no face. The contracting parties as an organization are not a specialized agency of the United Nations nor have they any formal connection organizationally with the United Nations. The Chinese position in the United Nations itself, therefore, is not formally prejudiced by the action.

Records

to file

Mr.

Mr. Frost

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Date 3/9/50

TO:

(1) Mr. Gutt's Office Room.....

(2) Room.....

(3) Room.....

For information.

In principle, Lie is right. But
this would have meant accepting
in the thirties, Hitler's Germany
as the real Germany. - In fact,
I think the League would have done
so, had Germany remained in it.

FROM Mr. Frost

Room.....

THE NEW YORK TIMES, MARCH 9, 1950

U.S. WON'T DROP AIM ON RED CHINA IN U.N.

Gross Says We Will Continue to Oppose Admitting It to World Body's Units

Tsiang Attacks Lie View

Nationalist Calls It "Bad Law, Bad Politics"

--Acheson Scores Russia on New Walkout

By Thomas J. Hamilton

LAKE SUCCESS, March 8--Ernest A. Gross, deputy United States representative, said this afternoon that the United States would continue to oppose the admission of the Chinese Communist regime to United Nations organs. His statement was interpreted as meaning that there would be no change in the vote of the United States on the China question despite a memorandum by Secretary General Trygve Lie for the acceptance of whatever Government "exercises effective control" over Chinese territory.

Restating the United States position in much the same language that he used last January when the Security Council was debating a Soviet proposal for the expulsion of the Chinese Nationalists, Mr. Gross said:

"Because of the fact that we do not recognize the Chinese Communist Government, we, therefore, will vote against unseating the Nationalist representative and will, by the same token, vote against seating the Communist representative."

Would Bar Nationalist Veto

Guy de la Tournelle of the French delegation, said in a radio speech that the Council must decide the question without recognizing the claim of Dr. T. F. Tsiang, the representative of Nationalist China, that he would have the right to veto. He added that use of the veto would create "an intolerable situation" whereby a great power delegate "could remain for ever in a seat where he would represent no one but himself."

Mr. Gross stated that the United States would abide by the "constitutional majority" in each United Nations organ, and that the negative vote of the United States in the Security Council should not be considered a veto.

Dr. Tsiang later criticized Mr. Lie's memorandum as "both bad law and bad politics," and charged that it was "a deliberate attempt to prejudice China's case before the United Nations."

"It oversteps the duties of the Secretary General and undermines public confidence in his impartiality," Dr. Tsiang said. "The present deadlock in the United Nations is caused by the Soviet walkout, which is illegal. If the Secretary General wishes to exercise his influence, it should be in the direction of the Soviet delegation."

Gross Avoids Position on Lie

Mr. Gross, however, while declining directly to comment on Mr. Lie's right to intervene, said that "I would not want to leave the implication that I have doubts that it is within his responsibilities."

U.S. WON'T DROP AIM ON RED CHINA IN U.N. (Continued)

"I think the Secretary General, in a matter which is obviously of so much concern to him, would feel that it is part of his responsibilities to make whatever suggestions he considered were constructive," he added.

Mr. Gross explained that it would be improper for him to discuss either the question of recognition of the Communist regime by the United States, or its representation in the United Nations. Mr. Lie's memorandum emphasized that the recognition of the Communist regime by an individual country and its admission to the United Nations should be treated separately, and Mr. Gross said that as a matter of law "I don't see how anybody possibly could quarrel with that."

"But for its political implications and for its implications with respect to our recognition policy, I am the wrong source," he added.

Mr. Lie's memorandum, entitled, "Legal aspects of problems of representation in the United States," was distributed to members of the Security Council ten days ago, and he discussed it yesterday with Mr. Gross and John C. Ross, deputy United States representative in the Council.

Mr. Lie's memorandum held that the "linkage" of the questions of United Nations representation and recognition by individual countries was "unfortunate from the practical standpoint and wrong from the standpoint of legal theory."

It said that, in addition to similar examples in the League of Nations, Yemen and Burma were admitted to the United Nations by unanimous vote of the General Assembly at a time when they had been recognized by only a minority of the members.

The memorandum laid particular emphasis on the fact that the International Court of Justice had held that the sole factors to be taken into consideration in electing members of the United Nations were those laid down by the Charter--that they should be peace-loving states, able and willing, in the judgment of the organization, to carry out their obligations under the Charter.

This ruling, the memorandum said, thus rejected the Soviet Union's claim that it was justified in vetoing the applications of Ireland, Portugal and Trans-Jordan because it did not have diplomatic relations with them. Furthermore, it pointed out, although the governments of a number of members of the United Nations have been changed in the past four years, this is the first time that such a conflict has arisen.

After declaring that it was legally incorrect to make a decision depend on the number of governments that had recognized rival regimes, the memorandum declared:

"It is submitted that the proper principle can be derived by analogy from Article 4 of the Charter. This article requires that an applicant for membership must be able and willing to carry out the obligations of membership. The obligations of membership can be carried out by governments which in fact possess the power to do so.

"Where a revolutionary government presents itself as representing a state, in rivalry to an existing government, the question at issue should be which of these two governments, in fact, is in a position to employ the resources and direct the people of the state in fulfillment of the obligations of membership. In essence, this means an inquiry as to whether the new government exercises effective authority within the territory of the state and is habitually obeyed by the bulk of the population.

U.S. WON'T DROP AIM ON RED CHINA IN U.N. (Continued)

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

Comment among other delegates disclosed a general belief that Mr. Lie's memorandum, which was drafted by A. H. Feller, United Nations general counsel, was an effective job but that it did not affect what they considered the basic factor in the case--the unwillingness of Secretary of State Acheson, in the face of sharp Republican criticism for existing policy, to modify the United States position. They said that it might have been better if Mr. Lie had addressed it directly to the Republican Senators in Washington.

Of the ten members of the Security Council, excluding China, five have recognized Communist China--the Soviet Union, Britain, Yugoslavia, India and Norway--and five have not--the United States, France, Cuba, Ecuador and Egypt. However, Britain and Norway abstained on Jan. 13 when the Security Council rejected a Soviet proposal for the expulsion of Nationalist China, which thus got only three votes, four less than the needed majority.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

3/9/50

To: Files

The attached also distributed to:

Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

THE NEW YORK TIMES, MARCH 9, 1950

U.S. WON'T DROP AIM ON RED CHINA IN U.N.

Gross Says We Will Continue to Oppose Admitting It to World Body's Units

Tsiang Attacks Lie View

Nationalist Calls It "Bad Law, Bad Politics"

--Acheson Scores Russia on New Walkout

By Thomas J. Hamilton

Like Success, March 8.—Ernest A. Gross, deputy United States representative, said this afternoon that the United States would continue to oppose the admission of the Chinese Communist regime to United Nations organs. His statement was interpreted as meaning that there would be no change in the vote of the United States on the China question despite a memorandum by Secretary General Trygve Lie for the acceptance of whatever Government "exercises effective control" over Chinese territory.

Restating the United States position in much the same language that he used last January when the Security Council was debating a Soviet proposal for the expulsion of the Chinese Nationalists, Mr. Gross said:

"Because of the fact that we do not recognize the Chinese Communist Government, we, therefore, will vote against unseating the Nationalist representative and will, by the same token, vote against seating the Communist representative."

Would Bar Nationalist Veto

Guy de la Tournelle of the French delegation, said in a radio speech that the Council must decide the question without recognizing the claim of Dr. T. T. Tsiang, the representative of Nationalist China, that he would have the right to veto. He added that use of the veto would create "an intolerable situation" whereby a great power delegate "could remain for ever in a seat where he would represent no one but himself."

Mr. Gross stated that the United States would abide by the "constitutional majority" in each United Nations organ, and that the negative vote of the United States in the Security Council should not be considered a veto.

Dr. Tsiang later criticized Mr. Lie's memorandum as "both bad law and bad politics," and charged that it was "a deliberate attempt to prejudice China's case before the United Nations."

"It oversteps the duties of the Secretary General and undermines public confidence in his impartiality," Dr. Tsiang said. "The present deadlock in the United Nations is caused by the Soviet walkout, which is illegal. If the Secretary General wishes to exercise his influence, it should be in the direction of the Soviet delegation."

Gross Avoids Position on Lie

Mr. Gross, however, while declining directly to comment on Mr. Lie's right to intervene, said that "I would not want to leave the implication that I have doubts that it is within his responsibilities."

U.S. WON'T DROP AID ON RED CHINA IN U.N. (Continued)

"I think the Secretary General, in a matter which is obviously of so much concern to him, would feel that it is part of his responsibilities to make whatever suggestions he considered were constructive," he added.

Mr. Gross explained that it would be improper for him to discuss either the question of recognition of the Communist regime by the United States, or its representation in the United Nations. Mr. Lie's memorandum emphasized that the recognition of the Communist regime by an individual country and its admission to the United Nations should be treated separately, and Mr. Gross said that as a matter of law "I don't see how anybody possibly could quarrel with that."

"But for its political implications and for its implications with respect to our recognition policy, I am the wrong source," he added.

Mr. Lie's memorandum, entitled, "Legal aspects of problems of representation in the United States," was distributed to members of the Security Council ten days ago, and he discussed it yesterday with Mr. Gross and John C. Ross, deputy United States representative in the Council.

Mr. Lie's memorandum held that the "linkage" of the questions of United Nations representation and recognition by individual countries was "unfortunate from the practical standpoint and wrong from the standpoint of legal theory."

It said that, in addition to similar examples in the League of Nations, Yenan and Burma were admitted to the United Nations by unanimous vote of the General Assembly at a time when they had been recognized by only a minority of the members.

The memorandum laid particular emphasis on the fact that the International Court of Justice had held that the sole factors to be taken into consideration in electing members of the United Nations were those laid down by the Charter--that they should be peace-loving states, able and willing, in the judgment of the organization, to carry out their obligations under the Charter.

This ruling, the memorandum said, thus rejected the Soviet Union's claim that it was justified in vetoing the applications of Ireland, Portugal and Trans-Jordan because it did not have diplomatic relations with them. Furthermore, it pointed out, although the governments of a number of members of the United Nations have been changed in the past four years, this is the first time that such a conflict has arisen.

After declaring that it was legally incorrect to make a decision depend on the number of governments that had recognized rival regimes, the memorandum declared:

"It is submitted that the proper principle can be derived by analogy from Article 4 of the Charter. This article requires that an applicant for membership must be able and willing to carry out the obligations of membership. The obligations of membership can be carried out by governments which in fact possess the power to do so.

"Where a revolutionary government presents itself as representing a state, in rivalry to an existing government, the question at issue should be which of these two governments, in fact, is in a position to employ the resources and direct the people of the state in fulfillment of the obligations of membership. In essence, this means an inquiry as to whether the new government exercises effective authority within the territory of the state and is habitually obeyed by the bulk of the population.

U.S. WON'T DROP AIM ON RED CHINA IN U.N. (Continued)

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

Consent among other delegates disclosed a general belief that Mr. Lio's memorandum, which was drafted by A. H. Feller, United Nations general counsel, was an effective job but that it did not affect what they considered the basic factor in the case--the unwillingness of Secretary of State Acheson, in the face of sharp Republican criticism for existing policy, to modify the United States position. They said that it might have been better if Mr. Lio had addressed it directly to the Republican Senators in Washington.

Of the ten members of the Security Council, excluding China, five have recognized Communist China--the Soviet Union, Britain, Yugoslavia, India and Norway--and five have not--the United States, France, Cuba, Ecuador and Egypt. However, Britain and Norway abstained on Jan. 13 when the Security Council rejected a Soviet proposal for the expulsion of Nationalist China, which thus got only three votes, four less than the needed majority.

COPY

UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL

GENERAL

S/1466
9 March 1950

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 8 MARCH 1950 FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TO THE
PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL TRANSMITTING A
MEMORANDUM ON THE LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM
OF REPRESENTATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

8 March 1950

During the month of February 1950 I had a number of informal conversations with members of the Security Council in connexion with the question of representation of States in the United Nations. In view of the proposal made by the representative of India for certain changes in the rules of procedure of the Security Council on this subject, I requested the preparation of a confidential memorandum on the legal aspects of the problem for my information. Some of the representatives on the Security Council to whom I mentioned this memorandum asked to see it, and I therefore gave copies to those representatives who were at that time present in New York.

References to this memorandum have now appeared in the Press and I feel it appropriate that the full text now be made available to all members of the Council. I am therefore circulating copies of this letter and of the memorandum unofficially to all members and am also releasing the text of the memorandum to the Press.

(Signed)

Trygve Lie
Secretary General

/LEGAL ASPECTS

February 1950

LEGAL ASPECTS OF PROBLEMS OF REPRESENTATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

The primary difficulty in the current question of the representation of Member States in the United Nations is that this question of representation has been linked up with the question of recognition by Member Governments.

It will be shown here that this linkage is unfortunate from the practical standpoint, and wrong from the standpoint of legal theory.

From a practical standpoint, the present position is that representation depends entirely on a numerical count of the number of Members in a particular organ which recognize one government or the other. It is quite possible for the majority of the Members in one organ to recognize one government, and for the majority of Members in another organ to recognize the rival government. If the principle of individual recognition is adhered to, then the representatives of different governments could sit in different organs. Moreover in organs like the Security Council, of limited membership, the question of representation may be determined by the purely arbitrary fact of the particular governments which happen to have been elected to serve at a given time.

From the standpoint of legal theory, the linkage of representation in an international organization and recognition of a government is a confusion of two institutions which have superficial similarities but are essentially different.

The recognition of a new State, or of a new government of an existing State, is a unilateral act which the recognizing government can grant or withhold. It is true that some legal writers have argued forcibly that when a new government, which comes into power through revolutionary means, enjoys, with a reasonable prospect of permanency, the habitual obedience of the bulk of the population,

other States are under a legal duty to recognize it. However, while States may regard it as desirable to follow certain legal principles in according or withholding recognition, the practise of States shows that the act of recognition is still regarded as essentially a political decision, which each State decides in accordance with its own free appreciation of the situation.

A recent expression of this doctrine occurred during the consideration of the Palestine question in the Security Council, when the representative of Syria questioned the United States recognition of the Provisional Government of Israel. The representative of the United States (Mr. Austin) replied:

"I should regard it as highly improper for me to admit that any country on earth can question the sovereignty of the United States of America in the exercise of that high political act of recognition of the de facto status of a State.

"Moreover, I would not admit here, by implication or by direct answer, that there exists a tribunal of justice or of any other kind, anywhere, that can pass judgment upon the legality or the validity of that act of my country.

"There were certain powers and certain rights of a sovereign State which were not yielded by any of the Members who signed the United Nations Charter and in particular this power to recognize the de facto authority of a provisional Government was not yielded. When it was exercised by my Government, it was done as a practical step, in recognition of realities: the existence of things, and the recognition of a change that had actually taken place. I am certain that no nation on earth has any right to question that, or to lay down a proposition that a certain length of time of the exercise of de facto authority must elapse before that authority can be recognized." 1/

Various legal scholars have argued that this rule of individual recognition through the free choice of States should be replaced by collective recognition through an international organization such as the United Nations (e.g. Lauterpacht, Recognition in International Law). If this were now the rule then the present impasse would not exist, since there would be no individual recognition of the new Chinese Government, but only action by the

1/ See Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, No. 68, page 16.

appropriate United Nations organ. The fact remains, however, that the States have refused to accept any such rule and the United Nations does not possess any authority to recognize either a new State or a new government of an existing State. To establish the rule of collective recognition by the United Nations would require either an amendment of the Charter or a treaty to which all Members would adhere.

On the other hand membership of a State in the United Nations and representation of a State in the organs is clearly determined by a collective act of the appropriate organs; in the case of membership, by vote of the General Assembly on recommendation of the Security Council, in the case of representation, by vote of each competent organ on the credentials of the purported representatives. Since, therefore, recognition of either State or government is an individual act, and either admission to membership or acceptance of representation in the Organization are collective acts, it would appear to be legally inadmissible to condition the latter acts by a requirement that they be preceded by individual recognition.

This conclusion is clearly born out by the practise in the case of admission to membership in both the League of Nations and in the United Nations.

In the practise of the League of Nations, there were a number of cases in which Members of the League stated expressly that the admission of another State to membership did not mean that they recognized such new Member as a State (e.g. Great Britain in the case of Lithuania; Belgium and Switzerland in the case of the Soviet Union; Colombia in the case of Panama). 2/

2/ A number of writers such as Scalle, Fauchille, Anzilotti, Malbone Graham, contended that admission to the League constituted an implied recognition by all Members. In the words of Lauterpacht (Recognition in International Law, page 401): "Actual practise did not substantiate these postulated implications of admission."

In the practise of the United Nations there are, of course, several instances of admission to membership of States which had not been recognized by all other Members, and other instances of States for whose admission votes were cast by Members which had not recognized the candidates as States. For example, Yemen and Burma were admitted by a unanimous vote of the General Assembly at a time when they had been recognized by only a minority of Members. A number of the Members who, in the Security Council, voted for the admission of Transjordan [Jordan] and Nepal, had not recognized these candidates as States. Indeed, the declarations made by the delegation of the Soviet Union and its neighbours that they would not vote for the admission of certain States (e.g. Ireland, Portugal and Transjordan [Jordan], because they were not in diplomatic relations with these applicants, were vigorously disputed by most other Members, and led to the request for an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice by the General Assembly.

The Court was requested to answer the question whether a Member, in its vote on the admission to membership of another State, was "juridically entitled to make its consent to the admission dependent on conditions not expressly provided" by paragraph 1 of Article 4 of the Charter. One of the conditions which had been stated by Members had been the lack of diplomatic relations with the applicant State. The Court answered the question in the negative. At its fourth session the General Assembly recommended that each Member act in accordance with the opinion of the Court.

The practise as regards representation of Member States in the United Nations organs has, until the Chinese question arose, been uniformly to the effect that representation is distinctly separate from the issue of recognition of a government. It is a remarkable fact that, despite the fairly large number of revolutionary changes of government and the larger number of instances of breach of diplomatic

relations among Members, there was not one single instance of a challenge of credentials of a representative in the many thousands of meetings which were held during four years. On the contrary, whenever the reports of credentials committees were voted on (as in the sessions of the General Assembly), they were always adopted unanimously and without reservation by any Members.

The Members have therefore made clear by an unbroken practise that

- (1) a Member could properly vote to accept a representative of a government which it did not recognize, or with which it had no diplomatic relations, and
- (2) that such a vote did not imply recognition or a readiness to assume diplomatic relations.

In two instances involving non-members, the question was explicitly raised - the cases of granting the Republic of Indonesia and Israel the right to participate in the deliberations of the Security Council. In both cases, objections were raised on the grounds that these entities were not States; in both cases the Security Council voted to permit representation after explicit statements were made by members of the Council that the vote did not imply recognition of the State or government concerned. 3/

The practise which has been thus followed in the United Nations is not only legally correct but conforms to the basic character of the Organization. The United Nations is not an association limited to like-minded States and governments of similar ideological persuasion (as in the case in certain regional associations). As an Organization which aspires to Universality, it must of necessity include States of varying and even conflicting ideologies.

The Chinese case is unique in the history of the United Nations, not because it involves a revolutionary change of government, but because it is the first in

3/ See statements by Mr. Faris el-Khouri and Mr. T. F. Tsiang on Indonesia at the 181st meeting (Official Records of the Security Council, Second Year, No. 74); and by Sir Alexander Cadogan, Mr. Manuilsky, and Mr. Jessup on Israel at the 330th meeting (Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, No. 93).

which two rival governments exist. It is quite possible that such a situation will occur again in the future and it is highly desirable to see what principle can be followed in choosing between the rivals. It has been demonstrated that the principle of numerical preponderance of recognition is inappropriate and legally incorrect. Is any other principle possible?

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

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

- - - -

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

March 8, 1950

TO: Files

For information.

Also distributed to:

Mr. Gutt's Office
Mr. Crick
Mr. Sucharda
Mr. Coe

Mr. Frost

THE NEW YORK TIMES, MARCH 8, 1950

LIE OFFERS A PLAN TO BREAK DEADLOCK IN U.S. OVER CHINA

Reported Urging Big Powers to Divorce Recognition Policy From That in World Body

Memorandum Circulated

All Work Seen Held Up Pending Settlement of Pending Dispute
—Washington Favors Move

By James Neaton

Washington, March 7.—Secretary General Trygve Lie of the United Nations has intervened with the United States, Soviet Russia, Britain, France and several other nations in an effort to break the United Nations deadlock over China.

Confronted by a prolonged Soviet boycott of all U.N. agencies attended by representatives of Nationalist China, and faced with the United States refusal to recognize Communist China, Mr. Lie was reported tonight to have circulated to various governments a private memorandum urging a compromise approach to the question of representation in the United Nations.

The Lie memorandum, prepared by the legal staff of the U.N. secretariat and now being studied here and in other capitals, is understood to make the following points:

1. A nation's policy of diplomatic recognition need not determine its attitude toward the representation of a government in the United Nations.
2. The national policy of a member of the United Nations on exchanging diplomatic relations with another nation or withholding such an exchange should not be allowed to hamper the proper functioning of the United Nations.
3. Members of the United Nations have on various occasions cooperated with one another within the United Nations, despite the fact that they did not have diplomatic relations with one another outside the United Nations.
4. A distinction should, therefore, be made between "diplomatic recognition" policy and United Nations representation policy, so that the orderly business of the security organization can proceed.

Mr. Lie is understood to have explained the reason for circulating this memorandum by stating that until the China representation problem was solved, the United Nations was put in an intolerable position.

Holds Atom Talks Blocked

The Soviet Union has indicated that it was willing to have conversations with the Western powers on atomic energy, Mr. Lie noted. The United States had agreed that such conversations could take place through the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. But it was not possible for such conversations to take place so long as the fight between the United States and the U.S.S.R. over the recognition of China blocked the normal functioning of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Secretary General observed.

LIE OFFERS A PLAN TO BRING BRADBROCK IN U.S. OVER CHINA (Continued)

Mr. Ide was also reported to have discussed with United States officials the possibility of asking for a special meeting of the United Nations Security Council, with the foreign secretaries of all states present. His idea, apparently, was that during such a meeting it might be possible to discuss either inside or outside the Security Council a number of questions dividing East and West.

Unless there was agreement, however, on the China question, he was said to have observed, the possibility of calling any such extraordinary meeting of the Security Council would not have the approval of the major powers.

The principle behind Mr. Ide's memorandum is understood and accepted, with some qualifications, in Washington. It was observed in official quarters here that the United States at one time cooperated in the United Nations with Kiangnan, though it did not have diplomatic relations with that country for a period.

It was also recalled that Britain cooperated with Israel and that various governments voted to grant Yemen in the United Nations, though they did not "recognize" Yemen or Israel at the time those governments were voted into the United Nations.

United States officials emphasized, however, that it was not the United States but the Soviet Union that was boycotting the agencies of the United Nations because of the recognition policy. It was recalled by State Department officials that Ernest A. Gross of the United States delegation was authorized to announce at Lake Success that the United States would abide by the majority decision on the question of the representation of the representative China, whereas the Soviet Union was now walking out of the United Nations in defiance of a majority that refused to unseat the Chinese Nationalists.

Though the attitude at the State Department was that the China representation problem would be solved, not by legal but by political considerations, the Ide memorandum may provide the basis for some progress toward a settlement.

The State Department is not likely to withdraw the recognition of the Chinese Nationalists in order to break the deadlock in the United Nations, but by agreeing with the Ide thesis that "recognition policy" and "United Nations representation policy" can be separated without inconsequence, the United States Government has indicated that it will not disapprove the action of any other government that wants to accept Mr. Ide's interpretation.

Five members of the United Nations Security Council already recognize Communist China: the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Britain, India and Norway. Four others on the Council do not recognize the Communist: Poland, Cuba, France and Egypt. The French delegate has been instructed to abstain in any vote to unseat the Chinese Nationalists.

Thus, if two nations in addition to the five that already recognize the Chinese Communists voted to unseat the Chinese Nationalists on the Security Council, they could do so with the legal support of the Secretary General, and with the acquiescence of the United States.

February 8, 1950

Memorandum to Files

A. C. Frost *mx*

Recognition of Chinese Communist Regime

The Soviet Representative on the Economic and Social Council proposed a resolution on February 7, 1950, calling for the expulsion of the "Kuomintang representative."

The voting was as follows:

Against: Australia
Belgium
Brazil
Canada
Chile
China
Iran
Mexico
Peru
United States

In Favour: Soviet Union
Czechoslovakia
Poland

Abstaining: United Kingdom
Denmark
France
India
Pakistan

On January 13 when a similar Soviet proposal was rejected by the Security Council, France voted against and India voted in favour.

Source: New York Times, February 8, 1950.

Miss Hodder

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



GENERAL

A/AC.18/107*
7 February 1950

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

INTERIM COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Third session

ITEM 68 OF THE AGENDA OF THE FOURTH REGULAR SESSION OF
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

China: draft resolution

The Interim Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of the following resolution:

The General Assembly,

Considering that it is the first purpose of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace,

Being of the opinion that the present crisis in China is in part due to China's sacrifices in the long resistance against Axis aggression in common with other freedom-loving nations,

Finding that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has persistently obstructed the efforts of the National Government of China in re-establishing Chinese national authority in the Northeastern Provinces (Manchuria) since the surrender of Japan and given military and economic aid to the Chinese Communists in their insurrection against the National Government of China,

Determines that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has, by obstructing the National Government of China and by giving aid to the Chinese Communists, violated the Charter of the United Nations and the Treaty of Friendship and Alliance between China and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of 14 August 1945;

The General Assembly,

* A few copies of this document were distributed erroneously during the 37th meeting under symbol A/AC.18/L.2, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace.

UNITED NATIONS
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Bureau
Lake Success, New York

SUB-COMMISSION ON PREVENTION OF
DISCRIMINATION AND PROTECTION OF MINORITIES
THIRD SESSION, 7th MEETING

Press Release SOC/829
16 January, 1950

MOVE TO UNSEAT CHINESE EXPERT VOTED OUT OF ORDER

V. I. FORMASHEV (USSR) and JOSEPH WINIEWICZ (Poland), expert members of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, this morning walked out of the meeting of the Sub-Commission when a proposal for the expulsion of Dr. C.F. Chang, the Chinese expert, was considered out of order.

Mr. FORMASHEV reminded the Sub-Commission that he had pointed out at the first meeting of this session that his delegation did not recognize the powers of the representative of the "Kuomintang group" as a participating member of the Sub-Commission in his capacity as/ ~~expert~~ ^{expert} for China. He added that in his capacity as a participating expert from the USSR he would consider the continuing presence of the representative of the "Kuomintang group" as illegal. He stated that he would not participate in the work of the Sub-Commission as long as the representative of the "Kuomintang" was seated in it and moved the following draft resolution:

"The Sub-Commission resolves to expel Mr. Chang, the representative of the Kuomintang group, from the Sub-Commission."

Mr. WINIEWICZ (Poland) formally supported this proposal and added that he gave his "heartly and energetic support" to it. If Dr. Chang continued to sit, Mr. WINIEWICZ said, he would not be able to participate in the work of the Sub-Commission.

M.R. MASANI (India), the Chairman, reminded the Sub-Commission that Dr. Chang was elected by the Economic and Social Council, subject to the consent of the Chinese Government, and that he was representing neither the Chinese Government nor the "Kuomintang group". Therefore, he added, the entire substratum of the arguments of Mr. FORMASHEV and Mr. WINIEWICZ and that of the draft resolution was "untenable".

REZAZADA SHAFaq (Iran) said expelling members was not within the jurisdiction of the Sub-Commission.

Miss ELIZABETH MONROE (UK) said Dr. CHANG was not a representative of the Chinese Government. If the resolution was adopted, she added, it would imply that the members of the Sub-Commission also considered that they were the representatives of their respective governments, which was not the case.

(MORE)

16 January, 1950

ERIC EINAR EKSTRAND (Sweden) observed that the mandate of the Sub-Commission had been given by the Economic and Social Council and that the members of the Sub-Commission had no right to alter the composition of the Sub-Commission.

S. SPANIEN (France) said the "cardinal rule" which guided the members of the Sub-Commission was a complete independence vis-a-vis their respective governments. As the mandate and composition of the Sub-Commission were imposed by the Economic and Social Council, he added, it was not for the members to expel anyone. (India)

Mr. MASANI said he came from a country the government of which had recognized the new government in China but added that, as he did not represent the government, this fact would not affect his attitude. "The Political changes which may occur have no relevance to the Sub-Commission," he said.

Mr. SPANIEN repeated his views that the institution and composition of the Sub-Commission were not subject to the approval or disapproval of the Sub-Commission and moved the following proposal:

"The Sub-Commission considers as out of order any proposal of expulsion of any of its members."

This proposal was put to a vote and was adopted by 9 votes in favor to 2 against.

Mr. FORMASHEV said that the "expert from the USSR" would not participate in the Sub-Commission as long as the expert who was recommended by the "Kuomintang regime" was present. He also added that the USSR would not recognize as legitimate any measures taken by the Sub-Commission with the participation of Dr. Chang. He then walked out of the conference room.

Mr. WINIEWICZ made a similar statement and also left the room.

The Sub-Commission then resumed its discussions on the item on Definition and Classification of Minorities.

Miss MONROE had introduced a draft resolution on this item (Doc.E/CN/4/Sub. 2/103). This proposed that for the purposes of protection of minorities the United Nations might wish to recommend the term "minority" should include "only those non-dominant groups in a population which possess and wish to preserve stable, inherited racial, religious, linguistic or cultural characteristics markedly different from those of the rest of the population" and that such minorities should be loyal to the State of which their members are nationals.

The Sub-Commission will continue its discussion on this proposal and on the item in general when it meets at 2:30 p.m. this afternoon.

#####



United Nations

GENERAL

A/C.1/551
26 November 1949

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fourth session
FIRST COMMITTEE
Item 68

TREATS TO THE POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE AND TERRITORIAL INTEGRITY OF
CHINA AND TO THE PEACE OF THE FAR EAST, RESULTING FROM SOVIET
VIOLATIONS OF THE SINO-SOVIET TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP AND
ALLIANCE OF 14 AUGUST 1945, AND FROM SOVIET VIOLATIONS
OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

China: Draft resolution

The General Assembly,

Considering that it is the first purpose of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace,

Being of the opinion that the present crisis in China is in part due to China's sacrifices in the long resistance against Axis aggression in common with other freedom-loving nations,

Finding that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has persistently obstructed the efforts of the National Government of China in re-establishing Chinese national authority in the Northeastern Provinces (Manchuria) since the surrender of Japan and given military and economic aid to the Chinese Communists in their insurrection against the National Government of China,

Determines that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has, by obstructing the National Government of China and by giving aid to the Chinese Communists, violated the Charter of the United Nations and the Treaty of Friendship and Alliance between China and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of August 14, 1945;

Urges all member States to desist and refrain from giving any military and economic aid to the Chinese Communists;

Recommends to all member States not to accord diplomatic recognition to any regime organized by the Chinese Communists;

Calls upon all member States to refrain from taking advantage of the present situation in China for any purpose that is incompatible with the political independence and territorial and administrative integrity of China.



UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



GENERAL

s/1462
24 February 1950

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 21 FEBRUARY 1950 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF YUGOSLAVIA
TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL CONCERNING TWO COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE
FOREIGN MINISTRY OF THE CENTRAL PEOPLE'S GOVERNMENT OF THE
PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF CHINA REGARDING THE REPRESENTATION
OF CHINA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Permit me at this time to request you to give the necessary instructions that the two latest cables from the Foreign Ministry of the Federal People's Republic of China, dated 20 January and 3 February 1950, concerning the representation of China in the United Nations, be issued as official documents of the Security Council and circulated among all members of the United Nations.

(Signed) Ales BIEBLER
Representative of the FPR of Yugoslavia
on the Security Council

/COMMUNICATION
s/1462

I

COMMUNICATION DATED 20 JANUARY 1950 TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE
UNITED NATIONS, AND MEMBER DELEGATIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS
AND THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 8 January 1950 I addressed to the United Nations a note demanding the United Nations and the Security Council to expel the illegitimate representatives of the Chinese Kuomintang reactionary remnant clique. Mr. Trygve Lie has kindly replied, acknowledging the receipt of this note of protest and stating that copies of it have been given to the member delegations to the Security Council. I would like to inform you further, Messrs President and Secretary-General, that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China has appointed Chang Wen Tien Chairman of the delegation of the People's Republic of China to attend the meetings and to participate in the work of the United Nations, including the meetings and work of the Security Council. Also, may I request you, Messrs President and Secretary-General, to answer the following two questions: (1) When will the illegitimate representatives of the Chinese Kuomintang reactionary remnant clique be expelled from the United Nations and from the Security Council? I consider the continued presence to this day of the illegitimate representatives of such a reactionary remnant clique in the United Nations and the Security Council as completely unjustified. They should be expelled immediately. (2) When can the legitimate delegation of the People's Republic of China under the Chairmanship of Chang Wen Tien attend the meetings and participate in the work of the United Nations and the Security Council? I consider that this delegation should attend the meetings and participate in the work without delay.

An early reply will be appreciated.

CHOU EN LAI

Minister of Foreign Affairs of the
Central Peoples Government of the
People's Republic of China

II

COMMUNICATION DATED 3 FEBRUARY 1950 TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND MEMBER DELEGATIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

On 19 January 1950, Mr. Chou En Lai, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, addressed to you a notification that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China had appointed Chang Wen Tien Chairman of the delegation of the People's Republic of China to attend the meetings and to participate in the work of the United Nations, including the meetings and work of the Security Council, and asked you to communicate it to the member delegations to the United Nations and the Security Council. Since then more than ten days have passed, and yet the illegitimate representatives of the Chinese Kuomintang reactionary remnant clique are still tolerated in the Security Council and in the other organizations of the United Nations, but not expelled immediately. I consider this as unjustified. Now that the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations is due to convene its session on 7 February, I would like to inform you further, Messrs President and Secretary-General, that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China has appointed Chi Chao Ting representative of the People's Republic of China to attend the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Please communicate this to the parties concerned, and give an early reply to the question: when can the legitimate delegation of the People's Republic of China under the Chairmanship of Chang Wen Tien, and when can Chi Chao Ting, attend the meetings of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations respectively?

LI KE NUNG,
Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs of the
Central People's Government of the
People's Republic of China

II

COMMUNICATION DATED 3 FEBRUARY 1950 TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND MEMBER DELEGATIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

On 19 January 1950, Mr. Chou En Lai, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, addressed to you a notification that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China had appointed Chang Wen Tien Chairman of the delegation of the People's Republic of China to attend the meetings and to participate in the work of the United Nations, including the meetings and work of the Security Council, and asked you to communicate it to the member delegations to the United Nations and the Security Council. Since then more than ten days have passed, and yet the illegitimate representatives of the Chinese Kuomintang reactionary remnant clique are still tolerated in the Security Council and in the other organizations of the United Nations, but not expelled immediately. I consider this as unjustified. Now that the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations is due to convene its session on 7 February, I would like to inform you further, Messrs President and Secretary-General, that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China has appointed Chi Chao Ting representative of the People's Republic of China to attend the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Please communicate this to the parties concerned, and give an early reply to the question: when can the legitimate delegation of the People's Republic of China under the Chairmanship of Chang Wen Tien, and when can Chi Chao Ting, attend the meetings of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations respectively?

LI KE NUNG,
Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs of the
Central People's Government of the
People's Republic of China



UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



GENERAL

S/1462/Corr.1
27 February 1950

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CORRIGENDUM TO

LETTER DATED 21 FEBRUARY 1950 FROM THE REPRESENTATIVE OF YUGOSLAVIA
TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL CONCERNING TWO COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE
FOREIGN MINISTRY OF THE GENERAL PEOPLES GOVERNMENT OF THE
PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF CHINA REGARDING THE REPRESENTATION
OF CHINA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Page 1, third line:

delete the word, "Federal".

UNITED NATIONS
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Bureau
Lake Success, New York

Press Release SG/61
10 March 1950

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY-GENERAL TRYGVE LIE ON THE QUESTION OF
THE REPRESENTATION OF CHINA

I wish to make perfectly clear my position as Secretary-General of the United Nations on the problems arising from the question of what Government should represent China in the United Nations.

First - I regard it as my duty as Secretary-General to assist in seeking a solution of these problems so that the United Nations can function effectively.

Second - For this purpose I have engaged in many conversations with delegations and I am continuing these conversations. I have also prepared a memorandum on the legal aspects of the problem of representation. In particular, I have called attention to the differences between representation in United Nations bodies on the one hand and diplomatic recognition by States on the other.

Third - The Members of the United Nations are divided on this issue. Some recognize one Chinese Government, some another. I am working for a solution based on the collective interests of the United Nations as a whole rather than on the interests of individual Members. I have suggested in my memorandum that an enquiry could be undertaken by the Security Council as a means of reaching a considered decision based on the facts as to which of the two governments "is in a position to employ the resources and direct the people of the State in fulfillment of the obligations of Membership."

Fourth - I have been asked to comment on Dr. Tsiang's attack upon me. I do not wish to engage in controversy with Dr. Tsiang. He is doing his duty as he sees it and I am doing mine as I see it. He calls my memorandum "bad law and bad politics."

(more)

10 March 1950

As to the law, I am quite willing to leave that to the judgment of any representative group of jurists or to the opinion of the International Court of Justice should it be decided to bring the question before the Court. As to the "politics" of my position, I am quite content to leave that to the considered judgment of the Member Nations and to history.

Fifth - I have also been asked to comment on the continued refusal of the Soviet Union to attend meetings of the Security Council and other United Nations Organs. I am surprised that some people do not seem to know my opinion about boycotts and walkouts and other acts by Member Governments harmful to the development and influence of the United Nations. At Hyde Park in 1948 when I spoke on the anniversary of the death of President Roosevelt I made my position clear on that issue and I have repeated it since.

All Members of the United Nations have an obligation to participate fully in its work. This is especially true of the Security Council which under Article 28 must be so organized as to function continuously. Refusal to participate in United Nations meetings is not the way to help solve such problems as the question of China.

Sixth - I think it is a negative and destructive policy to spend one's effort on placing the blame for the world's troubles instead of on trying to reach a constructive solution of them. There is always plenty of blame to be shared by everybody. The main question is not whether one nation or another should back down or change its position. The first concern of all the governments should be to uphold and strengthen the Organization that is the world's one hope for peace. For that purpose it is necessary to reach a decision on what Government is to represent China in the United Nations and to reach it soon.

#



UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL



GENERAL

E/CN.4/436
20 April 1950
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Sixth session

Item 4 (a)

DRAFT INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Yugoslavia: Amendment to the text of the articles proposed by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to precede the present Article 22 of the draft covenant (page 29 of the report of the fifth session of the Commission on Human Rights)

(E/1371)

Replace the first seven paragraphs by the following text:

"Every person has the right, irrespective of the nature of his work, to be protected against exploitation by others and it is the duty of the State to grant him the right to combat such exploitation, individually or collectively.

"Every person has the right to work which it is the duty of the State to guarantee to each person according to his aptitude and capacity. In the event of unemployment, it is the duty of the State to guarantee to every person sufficient livelihood to satisfy his material and cultural requirements.

"In labour relations, it is the right of every person to be guaranteed by the State decent conditions of work, in particular hygienic and technical protective measures and satisfactory conditions of life in accordance with his cultural and other requirements.

"Every person has the right to equal pay for equal work and to the other rights arising from labour relations.

"In labour relations, it is the duty of the State to guarantee to mothers special facilities for the protection of their interests and the interests of their children by establishing maternity clinics, nurseries, etc. It is also the duty of the State to guarantee to mothers the right to paid leave before and after confinement.

/"In labour
E/CN.4/436

"In labour relations, minors shall enjoy the special protection of the State which shall prohibit their employment under arduous or unhealthy conditions or under conditions which interfere with their normal development. Minors under the age of sixteen years may not normally enter employment.

"In labour relations, every person has the right to be assured regular working hours which shall normally be eight hours a day. If the working conditions are especially arduous or unhealthy, the working day shall be reduced and the wage shall be the same as the wage that would have been paid for a normal working day.

"It is the right of every worker to be ensured by the State of a rest period during his work, if the work is carried on continuously or in shifts, of a day of rest on Sunday as well as of annual paid holidays.

"Every worker is entitled to a guarantee from the State of insurance against sickness, exhaustion and old age, and in the case of risk to his health and life, to special coverage against accident, sickness, exhaustion and old age and to the care of his family in the event of his death.

"The cost of such insurance shall not be payable by the insured person.

"Every person has the right to be guaranteed by the State an opportunity to study in all cultural and academic institutions and to free education at all stages. Elementary education at least shall be compulsory for all.

UNITED NATIONS
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Bureau
Lake Success, New York

Press Release H/572
6 May 1950

CHINA WITHDRAWS FROM WHO

(The following was received at United Nations Headquarters from WHO, Geneva.)

The Chinese Government has notified the World Health Organization that it is withdrawing from the Organization.

In a cable to WHO Director-General Brock Chisholm, dated Friday (5 May) and datelined Taipeh, Formosa, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China, George K.C. Yeh, stated, "HAVE HONOR INFORM YOU ON BEHALF CHINESE GOVERNMENT THAT CHINA WILL WITHDRAW FROM WHO WITH EFFECT FROM MAY SEVENTH NINETEEN FIFTY WHENCEFROM CHINA WILL IN NO CASE BE REPRESENTED BY ANY DELEGATES, REPRESENTATIVES, OR ANY OTHER PERSONS WITH OFFICIAL CAPICITIES, IN ANY ORGANS OF WHO INCLUDING THIRD WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY."

The cable added that the Chinese Government would continue to adhere to the principles of the WHO, and requested Dr. Chisholm to transmit its withdrawal decision to the Assembly.

###

UNITED NATIONS
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Bureau
Lake Success, New York

Economic Commission for Asia
and the Far East
Sixth Session, Bangkok

Press Release EC/843
17 May 1950

ECAFE BEGINS SIXTH SESSION IN BANGKOK

USSR Withdraws Over Issue of Chinese Representation

(The following was received here from the UN Information Officer in Bangkok.)

The following developments marked the opening meeting of the sixth session of the UN Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) which convened yesterday in Bangkok:

1. The USSR representative withdrew from the meeting after unsuccessfully trying to unseat the "Kuomintang" representative.
2. The new Republic of the United States of Indonesia was admitted as an associate member of the Commission.
3. Phya Srivisar Wachu, chief of the Thai delegation, and U Kyin, chief Burmese delegate, were elected the sixth session's Chairman and Vice-Chairman, respectively.

Cornelio Balmaceda (Philippines), Vice-Chairman of the fifth session, opened the sixth session. Following a welcome address by Thai Premier, Phibul Songgram, and a statement by Dr. P. S. Lokanathan, ECAFE Executive Secretary, the Soviet delegation, headed by S. S. Neutchina, presented the following resolution:

"The sixth session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East resolves to exclude the Kuomintang representative from its midst and to recognize as the legal representative of China the representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China."

Thailand submitted the following amendment to the Soviet proposal:

"Without raising the question of the competence of ECAFE to decide upon the matters set forth in the motion proposed by the delegate of the USSR calling for the expulsion of the representative of the Nationalist Government of China and the seating in his place of the representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, it is, nevertheless, the wish and desire of this Commission that the matters set forth in the motion of the USSR should be decided by a higher body."

(more)

Following statements by the representatives of China, France, United States, Indonesia, Burma and the Philippines, the Thai amendment was voted upon and passed, 8 to 3 with two abstentions. Voting in favor were Australia, China, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Philippines, Thailand and the United States; against, Burma, India, and the USSR; abstentions, Pakistan and the United Kingdom.

A Soviet demand for a paragraph by paragraph vote on the resolution as amended provided a lengthy debate which revolved around the Commission's rules of procedure. The Soviet delegate insisted on the Commission's voting first on his proposal as part of the amended resolution and, this failing, on the Soviet proposal itself because the Soviet delegate from the start had considered the Thai amendment as a separate resolution.

The Chairman finally proposed a combined resolution containing the Soviet proposal as a qualifying clause and incorporating the Thai amendment as the second paragraph. Over Soviet objections that the procedure was unconstitutional, the resolution was nevertheless approved, 8 to 1, with 3 abstentions. The Soviet representative did not participate in the vote. Australia, China, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Philippines, Thailand, United States^{voted}/for. Burma voted against. Pakistan, India, and the United Kingdom abstained.

After the voting, Mr. Nentchina announced that the Soviet Union would not participate in the work of the session so long as the "Kuomintang representative" was there.

The admission of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia as an associate member was proposed by the Netherlands. Australia, United Kingdom, Pakistan, India, Philippines, France, Malaya and British Borneo, New Zealand, Burma, Viet Nam, and Thailand supported its admission. China abstained.

Dr. Ansgar Rosenberg, of the UN Department of Economic Affairs, who recently headed an exploratory technical assistance mission to Indonesia, addressed the afternoon meeting which adopted the session's provisional agenda with minor changes.

The ECAFE's Committee on Industry and Trade also met today and adopted its report to the Commission.

#

UNITED NATIONS
Department of Public Information
Press and Publications Bureau
Lake Success, New York

Press Release H/586

19 May 1950

COMMITTEE OF WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY AMENDS RESOLUTION ON CHINA

Votes to Reduce United States Contribution to Budget

(The following was received at U.N. Headquarters from WHO, Geneva.)

As a consequence to doubts expressed by several delegations as to the exact interpretation of the resolution on China which was passed by the World Health Assembly's Committee on Administration, Finance and Legal Matters on 16 May, the original sponsors of that resolution, Liberia, the United States of America and Iran, sponsored an amendment which was adopted yesterday by a vote of 26 to 0, with 3 abstentions. The amendment substitutes the following: "The third World Health Assembly will welcome the resumption by China of full participation in the work of the organization," for the original wording in which the Committee said the Assembly would welcome the resumption of participation in WHO by the government of the Republic of China."

In presenting the amendment, Dr. J. N. Togba (Liberia) stressed the fact that the World Health Assembly is primarily interested in people and not in the nature of their governments. Dr. Togba added that the sponsors of the resolution intended to express the wish for full participation of the government which represents the Chinese people, whatever government this may be when China resumes participation.

A resolution sponsored by Venezuela reducing the contribution of the United States of America to the 1951 budget of the World Health Organization from 36 per cent to 35 per cent was adopted by the Committee by a vote of 19 to 6, with 8 abstentions.

Walter H. Judd, member of the United States House of Representatives from the state of Minnesota and adviser to the delegation of the United States of America, thanked the Committee for its action showing a genuine desire of the majority of the Committee members to reduce the United States contribution ultimately to one-third of the budget as resolved by the Second World Health Assembly in Rome last year. Mr. Judd added that the Committee's gesture would influence the attitude of Congress not only toward technical assistance but also towards a bill now before Congress to raise the ceiling of the contribution of the United States to the budget of the World Health Organization from \$1,920,000 to \$3,060,000.

(more)

The resolution was opposed by the representatives of the Union of South Africa, Australia, United Kingdom, Brazil and New Zealand, who pointed out that the contributions of many members had been raised by one-third as a result of the devaluations which took place last September. Contributions to WHO are payable in hard currency.

After studying the organizational structure of WHO, the Committee also approved the present staff level, recommending no undue or further increase until the finances of the organization improve.

The Australian proposal to change the status of the Executive Board from a body comprising 18 technically qualified persons designated by as many member states elected by the World Health Assembly, into a body of direct representatives of 18 governments, was defeated by a vote of 17 to 4, with 4 abstentions. In opposing the proposal, Dr. Karl Evang (Norway) said that many people today are suffering from a virus disease called "Q" fever. The proposed change would introduce into the World Health Organization "P" fever, he said, the letter "P" standing for political.

#

NOTE:

The above resolution on China as adopted now reads as follows:

"Whereas the Director-General of the World Health Organization has received a telegram from the Foreign Minister of the Republic of China indicating that the government will withdraw from WHO;

"Whereas the Third World Health Assembly has adopted a resolution indicating the World Health Organization will always welcome resumption of full participation in the work of the organization by members who are not-so participating;

"The Third World Health Assembly will welcome resumption by China of full participation in the work of the organization."

#

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

February 6, 1950

To: Mr. Frank Coe

Information received from British
Embassy and checked with
State Department.

Copies sent to Mr. Scott,
Mr. Van Langenhout and
Mr. Cripe.

AF

cc: Southard 2-8-50
you may be interested

Mr. Frost

Records

February 6, 1950

Memorandum to Files

A. C. Frost *MX*

Countries who have recognized Chinese Communist Government

Fund Members

Czechoslovakia
Denmark
Finland
India
Norway
Poland
United Kingdom
Yugoslavia

Non Members

Albania
Afghanistan
Bulgaria
Burma
Ceylon
Hungary
Pakistan
Rumania
Switzerland
Sweden
U.S.S.R.

Other

Israel
(unverified
U.P. notice
Jan. 9)
Outer Mongolia
North Korea
Eastern Germany
Democratic
Republic of
Indo-China
(Hochiminh)
{Ukraine
Byelo-Russia
(Position
unclear)

Members of Security Council

(those who have extended recognition are marked with an asterisk)

China
Cuba
Ecuador
Egypt
France
India*

Norway*
U.S.S.R.*
United Kingdom*
United States
Yugoslavia*

*no change as of Feb. 27.
AM*