

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



Wednesday, 6 December 1950, at 10.45 a.m.

Flushing Meadow, New York

CONTENTS

	Page
Inclusion of an additional item in the agenda: report of the General Committee (A/1628)	589

President: Mr. Nasrollah ENTEZAM (Iran).

**Inclusion of an additional item in the agenda:
report of the General Committee (A/1628)**

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): I shall be very brief. I simply have to transmit to you the General Committee's recommendation regarding the inclusion in the agenda of an additional item entitled: "Intervention of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea".

2. The General Committee recommends that this item should be included in the agenda of the current session and that it should be referred to the First Committee for consideration and report.

3. General ROMULO (Philippines): This problem comes to us under the broad powers conferred upon the General Assembly by Articles 10, 11 and 12 of the Charter. In view of its extremely urgent character, it is my understanding that we could deal with it in accordance with resolution A, section A, paragraph 1, adopted by the General Assembly on 3 November 1950 [302nd meeting]. This paragraph provides the following:

[The General Assembly]

"Resolves that if the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to Members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security . . .".

4. The situation so exactly anticipated by this paragraph has actually come to pass. On 5 November, General MacArthur, the United Nations Commander in Korea, reported the following to the Security Council¹:

¹ See document S/1884.

"The United Nations forces in Korea are continuing their drive to the north and their efforts to destroy further the effectiveness of the enemy as a fighting force are proving successful. However, presently, in certain areas of Korea, the United Nations forces are meeting a new foe. It is apparent to our fighting forces, and our intelligence agencies have confirmed the fact, that the United Nations [forces] are presently in hostile contact with Chinese-communist military units deployed for action against the forces of the Unified Command."

5. After enumerating precise instances of intervention, General MacArthur concluded his report with the following statement:

"The continued employment of Chinese communist forces in Korea and the hostile attitude assumed by such forces, either inside or outside Korea, are matters which it is incumbent upon me to bring at once to the attention of the United Nations."

6. On 10 November² a draft resolution³ was presented in the Security Council by the delegation of Cuba, Ecuador, France, Norway, the United Kingdom and the United States, affirming the policy of the United Nations to hold the Chinese frontier inviolate, and fully to protect legitimate Chinese and Korean interests in the frontier zone, and calling upon the Peiping régime to withdraw its forces from North Korea. On 30 November that draft resolution, although receiving the affirmative votes of nine members of the Security Council, was vetoed by the Soviet Union.⁴

7. There has been armed intervention in Korea by the troops of the People's Republic of China, and the Security Council has been prevented from acting to halt that intervention by the veto of a permanent member. The machinery provided in the General Assembly

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year*, No. 63.

³ See document S/1894.

⁴ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year*, No. 72.

resolution of 3 November to cope with just such a situation thus automatically is set in motion. No words are needed to emphasize the gravity of the international situation resulting from this act of intervention. Peace in the Far East—from where I come—and perhaps the peace of the whole world may well depend on what we do or fail to do here. The peoples of the world who desire peace above all things look to the General Assembly for guidance in this perilous hour.

8. I do not believe we should be detained by the now familiar argument that the Chinese communist troops are volunteer forces that have joined the North Korean armies in a struggle to ward off intervention by the United States. It is not the United States alone that is in this fight—it is the United Nations. Fifty-three Members of the United Nations have supported the action of the Security Council. This is the United Nations; it is not, I repeat, the United States alone.

9. All the official information that has come to us from the front, as well as the Press and radio reports of the fighting, confirm the presence of organized Chinese communist troops in Korea, and expose the fiction of volunteer troops. The remaining effectives of the North Korean army are such that it would have been utterly impossible for them to mount the present offensive on the scale we have seen. The charge of United States intervention is the reverse side of the fiction to which I have referred, but it is clear that the whole of the Korean question has been a United Nations affair. It has been a United Nations affair from the very moment it was submitted to the General Assembly. We have concerned ourselves with this question over a period of three years, in the political and security phases, and all the recommendations and decisions that have been taken fall logically into a common pattern of action. The defence of the Republic of Korea, which was established under the auspices of the United Nations, was the culmination of the series of recommendations and decisions made by us in this General Assembly.

10. Today the Korean problem comes before us in circumstances of unparalleled urgency. I am confident that we shall act in this new phase of the problem, as in the past, with serenity and courage, defending at all times the interests of peace and the interests of the United Nations.

11. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The General Committee decided yesterday to recommend to the General Assembly that it should include in the agenda and refer to the First Committee an item proposed by the delegations of Cuba, Norway, the United Kingdom, the United States, Ecuador and France and entitled "Intervention of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea".

12. The USSR delegation opposed that item yesterday, and showed that there was absolutely no reason for it. It maintains the same view today. That the proposal for the inclusion of this item is totally unfounded may be seen from the statement we have just heard from the Philippine representative, General Rómulo. General Rómulo said that the intervention by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea was a fact and that appropriate

steps must be taken to counteract it. He pointed out that steps to defend the Republic of Korea had already been taken under the aegis of the United Nations, and he demanded that that so-called defence should be strengthened. We all know, however, that it denotes utter contempt for facts to say that in Korea the Korean people and the Republic of Korea are being defended, when what has been taking place for over five and a half months, in plain sight of everyone, is a bloody intervention by United States armed forces against the Korean people. Therefore, to speak of defending the interests of the Korean people is an obvious mockery of the facts.

13. The USSR delegation pointed out yesterday that the proposal of the six delegations was entirely unjustified. As everyone knows, from the very beginning of the events in Korea, the United States representatives have taken various steps to distract the attention of world public opinion from those who really bear the guilt for those bloody events in Korea which have resulted in many thousands of casualties among the Korean people, the destruction of whole towns and villages, and the devastation of the entire country.

14. Having set out on the path of open aggression against Korea, the United States Government, in pursuance of its policy of conquest, did not scruple to commit acts of aggression against the People's Republic of China also. This is clear from the facts already communicated to the First Committee by the representative of the Soviet Union in connexion with the question of United States aggression against China⁵, a question which for some reason has been bogged down in the First Committee and on which, if I am not mistaken, no progress has been made for more than ten days.

15. Numerous air-raids over Manchurian territory by the United States Air Force, the United States naval blockade of the coasts of China, the Seventh Fleet's invasion of the territorial waters of Taiwan, which is an inalienable part of Chinese territory — these are the facts, incontestable facts, which made it essential to bring the question of United States aggression against China, which I have mentioned, before the First Committee.

16. The proposal of the six delegations, which was endorsed by the General Committee and is now under discussion by the General Assembly, concerning the so-called intervention of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea, is a new attempt to deceive world public opinion by substituting an imaginary intervention by the armed forces of the People's Republic of China for the real intervention of the United States armed forces in China.

17. In reality, there has been no invasion of Korea by the armed forces of the People's Republic of China, no so-called intervention in Korea by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, since that government has no armed forces in Korea. It has never sent such forces there and is not sending them.

⁵ For the discussion on this subject in the First Committee prior to 6 December 1950, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Session, First Committee*, 405th to 407th meetings inclusive.

18. What facts did the United States representative put before us yesterday in his explanations to the General Committee? What facts will be submitted today? None. Yesterday the whole question was reduced to three lines—a proposal for the inclusion in the agenda of the question of the intervention of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea. That was all. The so-called explanatory memorandum explains nothing; it does not add one word to what is contained in the proposal.

19. In support of the United States representative, whose own statement had been confined to a paraphrase of these documents—documents A/1618 and A/1621, if I remember rightly—the Cuban representative said that there was no need to speak of facts because everyone was familiar with the facts, which were being broadcast on the radio every day.

20. Yes, we know that the radio reports every day instances of abominable, barbarous and brutal acts committed against the Korean people in a war imposed upon them by United States armed forces. We know innumerable facts which indicate that the sovereign rights of the Chinese State, of the Chinese people and of the Chinese Government—of the legal government, the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China—are being violated by the air and naval forces of the United States. We all know these facts, but what they show is that there is intervention by United States armed forces in Korea and in China. We know no facts, however, which indicate that intervention by the armed forces of the Chinese Government is taking place either in China or in Korea.

21. I referred yesterday to the notorious report of General MacArthur—that evil genius of our times—which speaks merely of armed forces, of unspecified communist military units, and so on. Even this travesty of a report, this unobjective, biased and therefore entirely unreliable document transmitted by MacArthur—that bellicose maniac who is primarily, or if not primarily then secondarily, responsible for the events precipitated and now taking place in Korea—even this so-called report says not one word about the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

22. Thus no facts have been submitted as yet, and it is astounding that the General Committee should have had the audacity yesterday to approve the proposal of the six delegations in violation of the existing rules, in particular of rule 20 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which requires the submission of an explanatory memorandum, not of a poorly drafted document, not of a few lines which reproduce the original proposal without giving any reasons, facts or explanations, and which cannot and must not in any circumstances be considered an explanatory memorandum.

23. The Government of the People's Republic of China and the whole Chinese people desire a peaceful settlement of the Korean question. This is proved by the repeated proposals for peace addressed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, Mr. Chou En-lai, to the President of the Security Council and the Secretary-General; by the widely publicized statements emanating from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China on 20 August, 10 October and

12 November; by statements made by the democratic parties of China and by the statements made in the Security Council⁶ by the representative of the People's Republic of China, General Wu Hsiu-chuan. All these statements contain an ardent plea that the Korean question should be settled by peaceful means; they ask that the Anglo-American armed forces should be evacuated from Korea—which would represent a fundamental solution of the question; they ask that the war of aggression imposed on the Korean people by the ruling circles of the United States should be ended and that those ruling circles should give up their designs on Korean and Chinese territory.

24. But these appeals for peace from the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China have remained and still remain unanswered.

25. It is common knowledge that the United States armed forces crossed the 38th parallel with the approval, among others, of the authors of a statement issued by several Powers and published in the Press, in which they now plead that a halt should be called at the 38th parallel and that that line should not be crossed. Yet at that time they gave their full support to the northward march of MacArthur's legions beyond the 38th parallel and to the Manchurian border.

26. The whole history of United States foreign policy with respect to China is a warning to the Chinese people not to attach too little importance to the advent, in the neighborhood, of foreign interventionists. The Chinese people remember that for many years the ruling circles of the United States spared neither money, nor armaments, nor equipment in support of their enemies. The Chinese people also remember, and well remember, the years of Japanese dominion in China. Then, too, Korea was the starting point. That is why the Chinese people have secular ties of friendship with the Korean people—a friendship which prompts the Chinese liberation movement to support the Korean people at the cost of lives and property. It also explains the feelings which animate the Chinese people today with regard to the people of Korea.

27. The statement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China of 11 November,⁷ to the effect that the Chinese people's voluntary aid to Korea and their resistance to United States aggression had a moral foundation, was therefore fully justified.

28. The representative of the People's Republic of China, General Wu Hsiu-chuan, said quite recently in this connexion in the Security Council that the Chinese people could not remain unmoved in the face of the grave situation caused by the United States Government's aggression against Korea and the dangerous trend to broaden the scope of the war. These words deserve the attention of the United Nations, since they condemn any attempt to spread the war which is raging in Korea, whereas that is the purpose of the American interventionists.

29. General Wu Hsiu-chuan said that the Chinese people had with their own eyes seen Taiwan fall victim to aggression. They have seen the flames of United

⁶ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year*, No. 69.

⁷ See document S/1902.

States aggression in Korea approaching their own borders. In righteous indignation, large numbers of Chinese are going voluntarily to the aid of the Korean people.

30. These are the facts of the matter; this is how matters really stand. Hence the attempt of the six delegations, supported by some others, to depict the position and the action taken by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China as some kind of armed intervention by the Central People's Government in Korea, is completely unfounded. Such an interpretation of the question is at variance with all the facts and does not bear scrutiny. It defies all logic, and it is contrary to the principles of international law and the international agreements bearing on this question.

31. As I pointed out yesterday in the General Committee, there have been numerous instances in history when citizens of certain countries supported the liberation movements of other countries. In particular, I cited the instance which is familiar to everyone—and also, I trust, to the United States representatives—of the help which progressive Frenchmen, led by La Fayette and Beaumarchais, gave to the thirteen English colonies in America in their revolt against English domination; those colonies, following their victorious war of liberation against their English masters, formed the Republic of the United States of America.

32. I also pointed out, that among the defenders of the Spanish Republic who fought against Franco's fascists in 1936-1937 were citizens of many other countries; there was, for instance, the American Lincoln Brigade and many other volunteer brigades composed of nationals of many different countries. Yet it never occurred to anyone at the time to consider the participation of the foreign brigades in the war against Franco, and their support of the Spanish republican army, as an act of intervention by the governments of the countries to which the members of those brigades belonged.

33. It is clear that there is not and cannot be any reason to view the participation of the Chinese volunteers in the Korean people's war of liberation in any other light. The utter inconsistency of any such attempt is shown not only by the historical facts which I have cited, but also by a number of others which I could mention if I deemed it necessary to do so at the present meeting of the General Assembly. It is shown also by generally recognized principles, by the rules of international law and by international agreements.

34. I must again draw your attention, as I did yesterday in the General Committee, to two conventions concluded at The Hague, namely, conventions V and XIII which were signed by the same countries which are now raising the question of the intervention of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea. Those conventions were signed by all the States which are sponsoring this proposal; they were signed by the United States, the United Kingdom, Cuba, Norway, France and Ecuador. They signed those two conventions in 1907. Those conventions have a direct bearing on the question we are discussing, since what we are discussing is the intervention of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea, that is to say, the intervention of a government. I must therefore remind you of those two

conventions, albeit without the slightest hope that the authors of the recommendations which were submitted in the General Committee and which have now been submitted in the Assembly will be able to make any logical reply on this question, as these conventions and the articles which I am about to cite cut the ground from under the accusers' feet.

35. Article 6 of convention V states: "The responsibility of a neutral Power is not engaged by the fact of persons crossing the frontier separately to offer their services to one of the belligerents". Hence the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China can in no way be held responsible for any volunteers who may be fighting side by side with the Korean people's army of liberation.

36. Article 7 of the same convention states: "A neutral Power is not called upon to prevent the export or transport, on behalf of one or other of the belligerents, of arms, munitions of war, or, in general, of anything which can be of use to an army or a fleet". Thus the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China cannot be held responsible for, or charged with, having violated the principles of international law, even if it has supplied its Korean brethren with armaments. I say "even if it has supplied them with armaments", but no one has produced facts showing that it has, for no such facts exist—there are only conjectures and guesses. Yet, even if that were the case, under article 7 it is clearly absurd to bring charges against a government of a neutral Power on the grounds that it has provided one of the belligerent parties with armaments, as that can in no way be regarded as a breach of neutrality.

37. This is the opinion not only of those who signed the convention and who assumed the obligation not to regard such facts as a breach of international law and of its rules and principles, but also of all experts on international law.

38. Article 7 of convention XIII really does no more than repeat the provisions of article 7 of convention V. It deals with naval warfare and lays down the rules of such warfare, while convention V concerns essentially the rights and duties of States in war on land. Article 7 of convention XIII provides: "A neutral Power is not bound to prevent the export or transit, for the use of either belligerent, of arms, ammunition or, in general, of anything which could be of use to an army or fleet." Article 7 of convention V speaks of "munitions of war", whereas here the term used is "ammunition"—that is the only difference.⁸ It is clear beyond any doubt that these articles settle conclusively the question of the legal—not only the moral—right of neutral governments not to hinder individual members of their peoples from helping another country in its fight against its enemies, if they so desire.

39. In this case, therefore, there are no grounds whatsoever for levelling accusations against the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. All statements to the effect that the armed forces of the Central People's Government are fighting in Korea

⁸ This difference of wording occurs only in the English text. A further difference, which again occurs only in the English text, is that article 7 of convention XIII refers to "export or transit" while article 7 of convention V refers to "export or transport".

on the side of the North Korean Government are therefore unfounded and are idle fancies designed to serve sinister purposes, to delude world public opinion, and to cover up the armed intervention of United States forces.

40. The delegations of the United States, the United Kingdom and of four other countries are now trying to force the United Nations to deal with the question before us, and they are trying to represent the events in Korea as armed intervention by Chinese armed forces, while it is the armed forces of the United States and of its allies which in fact are intervening in Korea.

41. In view of these facts, the USSR delegation objects to the inclusion of an additional, fundamental item in the agenda, and also to the adoption of the General Committee's recommendation to that effect. The delegation of the Soviet Union will therefore vote against this proposal, which is devoid of any moral, political or legal justification.

42. Mr. YOUNGER (United Kingdom): My delegation was one of those which supported the proposal before the General Committee that this item should be discussed; my delegation will therefore vote today in favour of the report of the General Committee.

43. I wish to support in a very few words the vote which I propose to cast. I do not think it appropriate at the moment to enter into the merits of the matter; that can come later. We must all surely be deeply conscious that there arises from events in Korea, no matter how we may interpret those events, the very gravest possible danger, first, to the United Nations forces who are there, secondly, to the United Nations as a whole and, thirdly, to world peace.

44. As the General Assembly knows from the memorandum [A/1621] which has been submitted with the proposal for the inclusion of this item, there was a draft resolution before the Security Council which was designed to avoid the situation in which we now unfortunately find ourselves. That draft resolution obtained very strong support in the Security Council, but it could not be adopted because one of the permanent members, the Soviet Union, cast its vote against it. There seems to be very little prospect, at the present time, that the Security Council can take this matter any further.

45. I am sure that I shall carry the whole of this Assembly with me in saying that we cannot close our eyes to what is happening in Korea, and particularly to what is happening to the United Nations forces there who are, as we all know, simply doing their duty in pursuance of United Nations resolutions.

46. The USSR representative, in his recent remarks, has complained that there is no evidence before us on this matter. The evidence can be fully sifted in the First Committee. No doubt the Soviet Union representative will have one more opportunity to prove to the world, as he has so far so signally failed to prove, that his version of events in Korea is the correct one. However, we here in any case surely cannot close our eyes or our ears to what we all know is happening. Nor can we go back on the view which has been supported by the Assembly ever since it came together in September of this year, and indeed for several months before, that

the United Nations has responsibilities in Korea, first for limiting the conflict, secondly for ending the fighting, and thirdly, for promoting a peaceful solution.

47. I entirely agree that the Korean question is, as the representative of the Philippines said, a United Nations affair; that is an aspect which, if I may say so, was wholly ignored by the USSR representative.

48. It is with a view to limiting the conflict, stopping the fighting and promoting a settlement that the General Assembly should now discuss this item; not just to make propaganda, and least of all simply to inflame the minds of the peoples of the world who are already sufficiently anxious about what is going on. We should discuss it with a new sense of responsibility in order to seek a way out of the present most critical situation, to find a way out which will be in accordance with the principles of the Charter and in the interests of world peace.

49. Therefore my delegation has no hesitation whatever in recommending that this matter should be discussed, and that for that purpose the item should be referred to the First Committee.

50. Mr. HAJDU (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovak delegation is opposed to the inclusion of this item in the agenda. In our opinion there is not only no need to discuss this item, but there is nothing to discuss. From the juridical point of view there is no new situation; there is only the factual situation which has deteriorated for the aggressive United States army invading Korea. Apart from the fact that the aggressor has been put to flight and that disaster has befallen him, as he justly merited, the situation from the point of view of the United Nations has not changed.

51. This disaster has come upon the aggressor as the result of the aggression itself, and is a consequence which should have been foreseen by the majority of the Members of the United Nations at the time they illegally, by an illegal decision, subsequent to the event itself, gave their authorization and sanction to that aggression. It was also helped by the further illegal decision of this session of the General Assembly by which sanction was given—once again after the deed had been committed—to the crossing of the 38th parallel and the invasion of North Korea [294th meeting].

52. The disaster that is now taking place before our eyes is the result of a heroic stand and fight of the Korean people, who have been fighting alone for so long against all the might of the United States, and who have been holding fast against the aggressor in their fight for their independence and unification and against enslavement by a foreign Power and rule by the puppet government of a traitor.

53. For a short time, as the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China has officially stated, the Koreans have been aided by the best sons of the Chinese people who, in accordance with international law, have come voluntarily to the aid of that heroic people because they recognize that the whole adventure in the form of United States aggression in Korea is a direct threat to their motherland and is ultimately directed against the independence and territorial integrity of China.

54. Indeed, the whole Korean war is, in United States strategic plans, only a prelude in the preparations for

an even bigger adventure and aggression upon China. Korea was to be subdued first so as to be used as a stepping-stone, as a mighty United States military base from which forces could easily descend on the most exposed and at the same time most precious part of the Chinese mainland, Manchuria.

55. Did the Chinese people seek to encounter a United States army on their borders? Do they seek a clash with the United States? Was it or is it their fault that the United States launched a war of aggression in the vicinity of their motherland against a people friendly to them? Were not these justified fears of the consequences of the overrunning of their neighbour multiplied by other aggressive deeds of the United States pointed this time directly at the Chinese people in the form of aggression against an integral part of Chinese territory, Taiwan? And the more so in the form of the hundredfold bombardment of Chinese territory in violation of Chinese sovereignty and its territorial integrity?

56. No, it was only too natural that as a result of the above-mentioned deeds of American aggression the individual Chinese patriots acted as they did. Who could be astonished, who would have acted differently or who could object to this position of the Chinese patriots? Was it not their right and, indeed, their duty to defend their country, their very lives against an invader and an aggressor? They are not fighting the Americans on the Rio Grande or the St. Lawrence, and they did not descend upon Puerto Rico.

57. The authors of United States policy, influenced by the United States Commander-in-Chief and made drunk by momentary military successes, did not pay heed to the solemn warnings of the true representatives of the Chinese people, who warned that this people could not act otherwise than stand up to the menace to their very life and to their country as represented by the attempts to overrun a friendly, neighbouring country, and by the overrunning of Chinese territory itself in order to secure a position from which the Chinese mainland could be attacked. They did not pay heed and now they are facing the consequences. They are reaping the whirlwind which they sowed. No, nobody is to be surprised by the fact that the Chinese volunteers came to the aid of a Korean people. Of course it is not only their sacred right but also their sacred duty to act in this manner.

58. This is confirmed indirectly by the statement of President Truman. He said that the United States—mind you, he referred only to the United States and not to the United Nations, and by that he confirmed that this was an American war and not a United Nations war as the United States pretended and as the majority here has pretended until now—was fighting in Korea for its national security and for its survival. If the United States is doing that 5,000 miles away, what are the Chinese patriots fighting for? Is this not a confirmation that they have much to fight for on their borders, for the security and territorial integrity of their motherland against aggression by the United States, which is not and cannot be in Korea in order to fight for its survival, but is fighting for its own objective of domination?

59. Thus General Rómulo and Mr. Younger were directly answered by Mr. Truman, and the more so

because the so-called war of the United Nations is only a screen for American aggression in Korea. This was confirmed a second time in the statement of Mr. Truman when he said that the United Nations had no say in the matter of the use of the atomic bomb. Who, then, is conducting the war in Korea? Does this not confirm the fact that this is an aggressive war conducted by the United States, the correction to that speech having been given exceptional publicity, much greater, I think, than the statement itself?

60. The Chinese volunteers are fighting in accordance with acknowledged principles of international law, which have been always recognized in similar cases by all nations. History shows that these principles have always been recognized, beginning with the days of La Fayette, who fought for American freedom, up to the days of the Spanish International Brigade, which helped to defend democracy against Franco fascism.

61. So there is nothing to be contemplated, to be considered or to be speculated upon by the General Assembly, because, as we have said, juridically the situation has not been changed by the aid of the Chinese volunteers in the Korean fight. Of course, much has changed militarily, but the military disasters of the American aggressors are irrelevant, and must be irrelevant, to the position of the United Nations on this question. This Organization was not established to bolster up the falling prestige of the military might of the United States or to prop up that prestige among the allies of the United States and other nations. It would be a misconception of our whole Organization if the General Assembly were to do so, because any actions we undertook would be against the interests of this Organization, would be a help only to the United States aggressor, and would be against the basic principles of the Charter, as it would mean helping to rob a people of their independence. Such a decision could only be another illegal decision. By taking such a decision, our Organization would once more be misused in the service and in the interests of the American policy of seeking world domination. No, this Organization was not built for such a purpose.

62. The General Assembly, by a majority vote, has already taken an illegal decision. This decision has helped to bring about the conditions of today. Why should this majority try to change this decision now to another form and to a new illegal decision? We think it would have been wiser at that time, two months ago, to adopt a legal decision aiming at the ending of the war and at a peaceful settlement of the whole question, which would have resulted in an independent, unified and democratic Korea, as was proposed by the Soviet Union and four other delegations, among them Czechoslovakia.

63. At that time, the majority would not even hear of it, and would not even hear of the attempt at a compromise, which was suggested at that time by the Indian delegation.⁹ Had that proposal been adopted, the majority would not have had to face the consequences which are being faced today. Since this illegal decision exists, why does the majority not keep to it? The majority ought to keep to it, because nothing has changed juridically to prevent the application of this

⁹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, No. 29.*

resolution. The United States disaster is not in itself, and cannot be, a reason for the adoption of a new illegal resolution. Therefore we insistently assert that there is no reason to discredit our Organization once more by the adoption of such a new illegal resolution. There is no reason for it and there is no basis for it in the spirit or the letter of our Charter.

64. Nevertheless, even if the majority passes this or a hundred resolutions, they cannot turn the tide. Even less can they deter the patriots from fighting against the invasion and the aggression directed against their countries. This cannot be done by resolutions, and even less by threats made in statements, from whatever quarter or in whatever form they may come, even though they may be in the form of a threat to use the atomic weapon.

65. For these reasons, the Czechoslovak delegation is opposed to the inclusion of this item in the agenda.

66. Mr. AUSTIN (United States of America): The General Committee has recommended that the General Assembly should include in its agenda an item entitled: "Intervention of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea". I speak in support of the recommendation of the General Committee.

67. My government has joined with the Governments of Cuba, Ecuador, France, Norway and the United Kingdom in requesting that the General Assembly should consider this item as an important and urgent question. No representative here can have any doubt as to just how important and how urgent this question is.

68. The United Nations forces which are carrying out in Korea the task assigned to them by the Security Council are under attack by the armed forces of the Peiping régime. Little more than a month ago it seemed that the United Nations forces would soon complete their assigned task. Then came the intervention of the Chinese communist forces.

69. The Security Council immediately took up this new threat to the peace. On 10 November, the same governments which are now asking the Assembly to consider this item introduced in the Security Council a draft resolution designed to hasten the end of the conflict, to keep it localized in Korea, and to assure States and authorities on the other side of Korea's northern frontier that their legitimate interests would be protected.

70. The Security Council also invited a representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to attend its meetings on this question. The Council deferred its vote on the joint draft resolution until that representative arrived. Members of the Council then saw for themselves that the representative declined to answer questions relating to his government's actions in Korea. He said that the Chinese soldiers fighting there were volunteers. He also said that the Chinese People's Government considered there were no grounds for hindering the dispatch to Korea of volunteers. This same evidence appears in Security Council document S/1902.

71. The Security Council voted on the joint draft resolution on 30 November. The draft resolution was not adopted, because of the negative vote of one of the

permanent members, the Soviet Union. It seems clear to the six sponsors of the joint draft resolution that no fruitful action can be expected at this time from the Security Council, in view of this attitude of one of its permanent members.

72. In these circumstances, the governments which sponsored that draft resolution believe that the question of communist intervention in Korea should be considered by the General Assembly as an important and urgent matter.

73. The proposed agenda item puts before this Assembly one of the greatest questions faced by the United Nations. It may involve the whole future of the United Nations. It may involve the peace of the world. All the processes of the United Nations should be invoked in an effort to put an end to this threat to world peace.

74. My government believes that world opinion should be brought to bear on this question and that the full weight of that opinion should be made clear to the authorities of Peiping. Full and frank discussions by the General Assembly can best bring light upon the real nature of the Chinese communist intervention in Korea, its portent for the future of peace, the gravity with which it is viewed by the nations of the world, and how the processes of the United Nations can bring about a solution.

75. The fact that we ask the General Assembly to consider this question at this time is the symbol of our belief in the United Nations and in its ability to maintain international peace. My government, therefore, urges the General Assembly to include this item in its agenda, to proceed quickly and soberly to consider the situation, and to make the necessary recommendations.

76. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) (*translated from Russian*): The General Assembly has before it a proposal submitted by six States for placing on the agenda a new item, called by its sponsors "Intervention of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea".

77. The Polish delegation objects to the inclusion of this item in the agenda and will give its reasons for objecting.

78. The very name of the proposed item makes it quite clear that this item relates to problems of peace and security and is therefore a matter for the Security Council. The General Assembly may, it is true, deal with problems relating to the defence of peace and security. It is not difficult, however, to guess that those who propose that this item should be placed on the agenda intend also to submit a draft resolution recommending some kind of definite action—action, therefore, which only the Security Council is entitled to take.

79. The placing of this item on the agenda is not only a violation of the provisions of the Charter; it also violates even the principles of the Acheson Plan, which, from the point of view of the United Nations Charter, is illegal, but which was so recently extolled here as a miraculous cure for all the troubles which afflict our Organization. Even the notorious Acheson Plan stipulated that matters connected with security and the maintenance of peace should be submitted to the General Assembly only if the Security Council had failed to take appropriate action.

80. Everyone knows that the question of the so-called intervention of China in Korea was not on the Security Council agenda. During the debates in the Council on the question of the war in Korea only passing reference was made to the so-called Chinese detachments, but there was never any reference to intervention in that connexion. This, by the way, was confirmed today by Mr. Younger. He referred, among other things, to a sense of responsibility. I regret to say, however, that I do not think he showed such a sense of responsibility in his speech in the Assembly today. Those who raise the question of the "intervention of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea" clearly wish to place a new item on the Assembly agenda. And if that is so, they cannot possibly invoke even the consideration envisaged in the illegal Acheson Plan, namely, that the Security Council has not carried out its obligations. They have adduced no proof of such failure. Thus the inclusion of this item in the General Assembly agenda is a palpable violation of the principles of the Charter.

81. In objecting to the inclusion of this item in the agenda, however, the Polish delegation is not approaching the matter exclusively from a legalistic standpoint; the matter should, it feels, be regarded in the light of the present situation in the Far East and of the political aims pursued by the authors of the proposal.

82. I would venture to recall that quite recently [292nd meeting] five delegations, including the Polish delegation, submitted to the General Assembly a scheme for a peaceful settlement of the Korean conflict. That scheme included all the provisions necessary for restoring peace in Korea. My delegation, and the other sponsors of that draft resolution, were seeking in that way to put an end to the war caused by the intervention of the United States in the Korean civil war, a civil war provided by the Syngman Rhee régime which had been forced upon the Korean people.

83. At that time, my good neighbour here, General Rómulo, for some reason or other said nothing about peace, just as Mr. Austin said nothing then about the gravity of the situation on which he lays so much stress today. When we submitted our draft resolution, the United States representatives, of course, said nothing about the so-called Chinese detachments; the foreign detachments in the territory of Korea were, of course, the United States armed forces. Exploiting their numerical superiority over the heroic people's army of Korea, they crossed the 38th parallel and made no secret of their plans for imperialistic expansion on the continent of Asia.

84. Our draft resolution was at that time rejected. Instead of seeking peaceful means of settling this conflict, several delegations urged from this rostrum the continuance of military action, called for a crossing of the 38th parallel and dreamt, like my neighbour, General Rómulo, about American heroes decorated by the United Nations for their victory in Korea.

85. The situation, however, quickly changed. Surmounting its difficulties, the people's army of Korea managed to regroup and then began a counter-attack which forced the United States troops to effect a precipitate retreat. The situation changed radically. In spite of loud promises to rout the enemy and end the

war by Christmas, the United States forces are retreating—that is, of course, when they are not surrounded.

86. In these circumstances the United States is quite obviously looking for a scapegoat. It wants this scapegoat to be the Chinese volunteers, whose participation in the Korean war is described as intervention by the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China although, as everyone well knows, no forces of the People's Republic of China are to be found there.

87. Mr. Austin said that the representative of the People's Republic of China had not answered his questions. I disagree with Mr. Austin. The representative of the People's Republic of China did not consider it necessary to reply to the provocative questions put to him by Mr. Austin in the Security Council,¹⁰ since he had declared that his government was not agreeable to taking part in the discussion of General MacArthur's report.¹¹

88. Mr. Austin should not, I think, deceive himself; he did, in fact, receive a reply from the representative of the People's Republic of China in the Security Council, and I think it is vain for Mr. Austin to pretend that he did not understand that reply. He understood it perfectly well, and if he pretends not to have understood it, he does so because he does not want to understand the real reply, given by the representative of the People's Republic of China, when he so brilliantly confuted all the arguments which Mr. Austin adduced in support of the proposals he had submitted to the Security Council.

89. I should like to emphasize that neither in the telegram of the six States—their so-called memorandum—nor in the speeches made in the General Committee yesterday or in some of those made in the General Assembly today, was any proof furnished of direct or indirect intervention on the part of the People's Government of China.

90. As for the participation of volunteers, that cannot, under the existing rules of national law, be described as intervention. As Mr. Vyshinsky, the head of the Soviet Union delegation, has already pointed out, this is perfectly clear from the convention concluded at The Hague in 1907. On the various occasions on which volunteers have taken part in wars, their participation has never been described as intervention. Thus, for example, in the Spanish civil war, volunteers from fifty-eight countries fought on the side of the Republican government. No one, however, described as interventionists the States of which those volunteers were nationals. The history of many wars, including the American war of independence, provides not a few examples of this kind.

91. We Poles are familiar with the participation of volunteers in several wars of liberation. Poles fought for the freedom of the United States—I need mention only the names of Kosciuszko and Pulaski; they fought side by side with Garibaldi for the liberation of Italy; they fought in Haiti for the freedom of the Haitian people; they fought in 1848 in Hungary; and the Polish people, of course, is proud of the part its sons played in the struggles of other peoples to attain their freedom.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, No. 68.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, No. 72.

No one, of course, will have the idea to say that this was intervention by Poland, which at that time did not yet exist as an independent State. I think we should all defend the right of every human being, the right of every individual, to defend freedom wherever the representatives of reactionary governments, the representatives of reaction, attempt to suppress it.

92. Everyone can understand that the Chinese are worried by events in Korea. All the peoples of Asia are worried, for they regard the United States aggression in Korea and its attempts to impose a new colonial yoke on the Korean people as a threat to the peace and security of the whole of Asia. The Chinese people in particular have many grounds for anxiety. Their frontiers have been approached by the army of a country whose government has never concealed its imperialistic design on Asia. That government has intervened for many years in the internal affairs of China, seeking at all costs to maintain the Chiang Kai-shek clique in power. At the present time it is in occupation of part of the territory over which China has sovereignty—the island of Taiwan, which it is converting into a base for use against the People's Republic of China. Furthermore, the United States still regards the Chiang Kai-shek clique as a government, and is rendering it military and financial assistance. This means that the United States is expecting the return of that government to power, a return which cannot take place without an act of aggression against the People's Republic of China and without war in Asia.

93. Is it not perfectly clear from this that the Chinese people have good cause for anxiety? Both on grounds of its own security and because of its friendly feeling towards the Korean people, the Central People's Government of China is not hindering its sons from hastening to the assistance of the people's army of Korea, which is defending the freedom of the Korean people.

94. The United States as we know, has been accused of committing aggression in Asia. The People's Government of the Republic of China has requested the United Nations to consider the question of United States aggression, an aggression directed against the territorial integrity of China and the inviolability of its frontiers. Everyone knows about the occupation of the island of Taiwan and the piratical attacks by the United States

Air Force on Chinese territory. The charge has been made and proved. The United States has not replied to the charge. Mr. Dulles has still not made the speech which he was to have made in the First Committee. By lodging a complaint against the People's Republic of China at this point, the United States is merely trying to lay the blame at another person's door.

95. Almost six months have passed since the United States launched its aggression in Korea. For six months the Korean people have been fighting for their freedom and independence against the aggression which the United States, using the United Nations as a shield for its aims, has committed in Korea. I think it is now quite clear where the United Nations has been led by the blind and slavish compliance of the majority of its Members with the imperialistic plans of the United States. It is high time that the Assembly displayed more common sense and sagacity than we have seen hitherto. Instead of including in the agenda an item intended to widen the conflict in Asia, the United Nations should seek means whereby this dangerous conflict might be brought to an end.

96. The Polish delegation therefore considers that the General Assembly should reject the recommendation of the General Committee for the inclusion of the item proposed by the six States.

97. The PRESIDENT (*translated from French*): The Assembly has heard the six speakers authorized by the rules of procedure. Rule 23 of the rules of procedure stipulates that debate on the inclusion of an item in the agenda, "when that item has been recommended for inclusion by the General Committee, shall be limited to three speakers in favour of and three against the inclusion". There have been three speakers in favour of the recommendation and three against it.

98. I put to the vote the General Committee's recommendation that the General Assembly should include in the agenda the question of the intervention of the Central People's Government of the Republic of China in Korea and should allocate it to the First Committee for consideration and report.

The recommendation was adopted by 51 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.