

CHALLENGE TO THE UN

Mao-lan Tuan

Chinese Ambassador to the Philippines

The most serious challenge which confronts the world today is the so-called question of China's representation in the United Nations in New York. To appreciate the situation in a lucid perspective, it is necessary to start with a brief resume of the historical background.

The Chinese communist party, with its nucleus members trained in Russia, was organized, financed and directed by the Soviet Union. At first it infiltrated into the Nationalist Revolutionary Army but very soon it started an open rebellion and occupied a small stronghold in Kiangsi in Central China. It was about to be entirely liquidated when the war of resistance against Japanese aggression broke out in 1937 and gave it a new lease of life. Throughout the eight years of war, it sought expansion at the expense of government troops. When the long war of resistance was drawing to

a victorious conclusion, Soviet Russia participated in the war for a few days only to occupy Manchuria, equip the Chinese communist army and convert Manchuria into a huge trap in which the best Chinese armies were annihilated in complete disregard of the Sino-Soviet treaty of amity solemnly signed only a short while before. This flagrant violation of a sacred treaty was condemned by the 6th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. After this treacherous blow, the Chinese communists, in making full use of the war weariness and economic exhaustion as a result of the long war, succeeded in gobbling up the mainland in 1949 and the Chinese government moved its seat to Taipei.

For the last twelve years, the Chinese communists have transplanted into the Chinese soil the whole Russian system, with all its accessories: brain-

washing, firing-squads, concentration camps together with the alien ideology of class-struggle and dictatorship of the proletariat. The traditional Chinese virtues, of which all Chinese should justifiably feel proud, such as filial piety, family love, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, etc. have been ruthlessly suppressed. The Chinese communists have not only the effective control of the mainland but they have succeeded in converting the country into a huge prison. They impose upon the people the most tyrannical rule heretofore unknown in China's long history and at the same time are subservient to foreign power. They are indeed the most faithful disciples of a foreign ideology and determined to carry out its implementation without any regard for the appalling suffering of the people. This brief historical review should convince any fair-minded observer that the present communist regime on the Chinese mainland is a result of Soviet Union's indirect aggression against China.

Should the civilized world give recognition to the fruit of aggression, direct or indirect? This is the question that calls for an immediate answer, as the question of

China's representation in the United Nations implies the argument whether a regime created by a foreign power and for the implementation of a foreign ideology should be internationally recognized. As to diplomatic recognition, there seem to be three schools of thought, namely the English school, the French school and the American school.

The English school bases its argument on a realistic policy and therefore favors recognition of any regime which exercises effective control over its territory. In the mind of the English school, recognition does not imply approbation of the regime recognized. This is wrong as we know a *de jure* recognition will inevitably carry with it a legalized title which necessarily connotes approbation of such regime.

The French school insists upon certain conditions before recognition is accorded to any regime. These conditions are: 1) the regime must show evidence that it can achieve stability, 2) the regime has the support of the nation by holding free elections, 3) the regime must express its willingness to abide by international law, and 4) the regime must undertake to respect human rights. Evidently the present communist

regime is unable to fulfill these conditions, as it simply cannot hold really free elections, nor is it willing to abide by international law, nor will it respect human rights.

The American school, prompted by a sense of justice, champions the doctrine of "non-recognition" of any regime created by force of aggression. Before the Second World War, Secretary Stimson elaborated this doctrine in regard to the puppet state of "Manchukuo" created by the Japanese militarists. After the Second World War, faithful to this doctrine, the United States has consistently withheld recognition to the present communist regime that occupies the mainland.

At this juncture, it must be pointed out that the defunct League of Nations, impotent and weak as it was, never once countenanced a regime brought into being by force of aggression. Now the United Nations is essentially a moral forum. Should it give up its dedicated principle in favor of a realistic appeasement? Two popular arguments are heard in favor of the admission of the Chinese communist regime into the United Nations. First, it has the effective control over the mainland. Second, the 600,000,000 people should not be

deprived of their voice in the United Nations .

Should effective control be the criterion for recognition, then we might as well give up the rule of law and revert back to the jungle doctrine that might is right. In the past, force of aggression created many puppet regimes which did exercise effective control over the conquered territory, yet no jurist would conscientiously give them the blessing of recognition.

It is preposterous to assume that the communist regime can be the spokesman for the oppressed people in their grip. If the people on the mainland could voice their sentiment freely, it would be against the tyrannical regime. The general unrest in the mainland, the great exodus of refugees, the strong anti-communist aversion manifested by the oversea Chinese living in neutral countries, the overwhelming majority of the communist-trained soldiers, who, having been taken prisoners in the Korean war, chose to come to Taiwan for freedom instead of going back to the communist enslavement — all these are unmistakable indications that the Chinese people hate communism. To assume that the communist regime can speak for the people under its yoke

would be tantamount to say that a Nazi gauleiter is the benefactor and legal guardian of the inmates he put in a concentration camp. It is adding insult to injury.

Before making any move for appeasement, it is prudent to think of the consequence that such move will entail. History shows appeasement has only whetted the appetite of the aggressor. This was the case with Hitler, yet in comparison with the present Soviet bloc, Hitler was really a very modest man who only claimed a "Lebensraum" or "living space" for his Nazis. The Japanese militarists were also comparatively modest, as they only wanted a co-prosperity sphere in East Asia. When regimes of modest pretensions could be encouraged to start war by appeasement, how much more dangerous to abet the present Soviet block which has time and again avowed to bury the free world? Lenin once said the shortest road from Moscow to Paris would be via Peiping and Calcutta. It means to conquer Europe the Soviets must conquer Asia first. It is evident that the Chinese communist regime has bent every energy to carry out this strategical plan laid down by the Russian master. Appeasement in the form of admitting the

Chinese communist regime into the United Nations would only reveal the weakness and disunity of the free nations, thus giving tremendous impetus to the communists to accelerate their march of conquest.

The Republic of China is one of the founding members of the United Nations and her constitution provides that her foreign policy shall be based on respect for the Charter of the United Nations in order to promote international cooperation, advance international justice, and ensure world peace. Throughout the past sixteen years, the Republic of China has given her full support to the United Nations Charter and observed all obligations required of a member state under the Charter. She has played a significant role and achieved an honorable record. But ever since the removal of the seat of the Chinese government to the province of Taiwan, the Soviet bloc and pro-communist countries have attempted to have the United Nations admit the Chinese communist regime in place of the government of the Republic of China. Their pernicious efforts have so far been fruitless. However, at present the disunity among the free nation members coupled with

the rapid increase in membership in the United Nations provides the communist bloc with a better opportunity. By blackmail and extortion, the Soviet bloc has succeeded in having the puppet Outer Mongolia admitted into the United Nations. Encouraged by this appeasement, the Soviet bloc's next step will surely be an intensified campaign to bring the puppet Peiping regime into that world organization. For the sake of the security of the free world, the logical question is whether one can afford to get rid of a loyal front-door guard and admit into his household a gangster with the avowed intention to destroy it.

The fate of the free world is now seriously at stake.

Whether the United Nations will still function as an arbiter of justice and guardian of peace, or simply as a broker to portion out appeasement which will eventually lead to world catastrophe depends upon the outcome of the present issue. At this critical moment, the firm support given us by the Philippine government and its people is especially a source of great encouragement in the belief that our closest neighbor is wholeheartedly with us in waging this gigantic struggle against world enslavement. It is this spirit of solidarity which gives me faith that the free world in spite of some ominous portents will yet vanquish its foe!

* * *

HOW OLD IS ANTARTICA?

Numerous samples of rock collected from the eastern coastal regions of the Antarctic continent have been subjected to radioactivity tests by Soviet scientists to find out their approximate age.

According to the scientists, rocks from the center of Eastern Antarctica proved to be the oldest among samples tested, having been formed 1,350,000,000 and 1,840,000,000 years ago. Further analysis of rock specimens, the scientists believe, may show that parts of the continent are more than 2,000,000,000 years old. (UNESCO)