



Monday, 13 December 1954,  
at 3.10 p.m.

**New York**

**CONTENTS**

Agenda item 71:

Complaint of violation of the freedom of navigation in  
the area of the China seas (*continued*)..... 255

**Chairman: Mr. Thor THORS (Iceland).**

**AGENDA ITEM 71**

**Complaint of violation of the freedom of navigation  
in the area of the China seas (A/2741,  
A/2741/Add.1, A/AC.76/L.24) (*continued*)**

1. Mr. SKRZESZEWSKI (Poland) regretted that the Committee had left its consideration of the question of the freedom of navigation in the China seas until the very end of the session and that some delegations were even attempting to prevent any discussion on the substance of that important problem.
2. The United Nations was bound under its Charter to deal with threats to the peace and situations endangering friendly relations between nations. The acts of piracy being committed by Chiang Kai-shek's supporters in the China seas with the assistance of the United States Navy and Air Force had created precisely that kind of situation in the Pacific.
3. The Polish delegation had on several occasions drawn the attention of the United Nations to that situation. Piracy, which had disappeared from international life early in the 19th century, could not recur in modern times except with the participation of a State. A recrudescence of piracy during the Spanish civil war had had the support of General Franco and piracy during the Second World War that of Hitler. During the last few years, it had reappeared again in the Far East thanks to the combined efforts of Chiang Kai-shek and his protectors.
4. According to incomplete data, Chiang Kai-shek's navy had seized 470 Chinese ships between 1949 and 1954 and had committed 111 other acts of piracy against sixty-seven merchant vessels of other nationalities. Of those vessels forty-three had been British, fourteen Panamanian, two Polish, two Greek and the others had belonged to the USSR, Norway, Italy, Denmark and the Federal Republic of Germany. All those vessels had been attacked; some had been sunk and the cargo of many others had been looted. The master of the British ship *Rosita* had been killed on board.
5. Those acts of piracy were breaches of the most elementary rules of international law. They infringed the principle of the freedom of the seas. The seizure of vessels, the confiscation of cargo and the removal of crews were violations of the rights and interests of the States to which those vessels belonged. The penal codes of more than fifty States authorized those States to

proceed against pirates regardless of the place where the crime had been committed.

6. Moreover, those acts intensified international tension in the Far East and constituted a threat to the peace, as they were designed to interfere with trade relations between Asian countries and countries in other continents.

7. As two Polish ships, the *Praca* and the *Prezydent Gottwald*, had been seized by Chiang Kai-shek's forces, he would give an account of the circumstances of those illegal arrests.

8. On 4 October 1953, one of Chiang Kai-shek's gunboats had hailed the *Praca* at a point 125 nautical miles to the east of Taiwan (Formosa). Long before that attack, aircraft carrying the identification marks of the United States Air Force had been following the vessel. Armed troops of Chiang Kai-shek's forces had boarded the vessel and had forced it to proceed to Taiwan. Its cargo had been looted and the crew arrested.

9. On 13 May 1954, the *Prezydent Gottwald* had been the victim of a similar incident. After two American aircraft had followed it for some time and photographed it, one of Chiang Kai-shek's gunboats had appeared on the scene, opened fire and forced the *Prezydent Gottwald* to stop. The ship had been boarded and taken to Taiwan, where the cargo had been confiscated and the crew placed under illegal restraint. Despite the repeated protests of the Polish Government, neither the vessel nor the cargo had been returned to their lawful owners and the crew had not been released.

10. The Taiwan authorities had subjected the crews of those two Polish ships to intimidation, blackmail, moral pressure and corruption designed to force them to betray their country. Thanks to the efforts of the Swedish Red Cross — which he wished to thank once again — some of the crew of the *Praca* had been repatriated after nine months of detention. These sailors had since stated that right at the outset an officer of Chiang Kai-shek's forces had come on board and had threatened one of the ship's officers, saying that he would never see his family again. The military police standing guard on board the *Praca* had told the Polish sailors that the Chinese members of the ship's crew had been shot. In October 1953, the Taiwan authorities had taken the fingerprints of all the members of the ship's crew. In January 1954, two officers of the Taiwan secret police had begun interrogating the sailors on such questions as their military service, the equipment and name of the unit in which they had served and so forth.

11. After intimidation had failed, other means had been tried. It was significant that the Taiwan authorities had asked the sailors whether they wished to establish contact with the American Embassy and had promised them that they would be able to proceed to the United States if they made the necessary statements. Those authorities had said that a third world war was imminent and that only a United States victory

would enable the sailors to return home. Representatives of the "Free Europe" organization had specially come from New York to persuade the sailors to betray their country. The American Embassy had organized a reception for those who had yielded, and photographs of the reception had been shown to other sailors in order to encourage them to commit treason. One of the sailors who had yielded had committed suicide out of despair on learning that some of his comrades would be repatriated. The sailors who refused to give way had gone on hunger strike in February 1954; they were being terrorized, kept in isolation and detained like criminals under the guard of military police armed with sub-machine guns.

12. The entire Polish population condemned those acts of banditry and was urging the Government and international organizations to stop them. The Polish delegation protested vigorously against the arrest of the ships and the detention of the crews. It was not protesting only to safeguard the interests of its country and to protect its nationals, but also because Poland, in signing the United Nations Charter, had undertaken to do everything in its power to maintain peace and to ensure respect for the principles of international law.

13. The Soviet tanker *Tuapse* had suffered much the same fate as the two Polish vessels. The Polish Government therefore unreservedly supported the USSR request to the United States Government for the immediate return of the *Tuapse* and the liberation of its crew.

14. The Polish Government felt compelled to blame the United States for the situation which had arisen in the China seas. The United States Government exercised full control over the Kuomintang group. In June 1950, the Seventh Fleet and the Air Force of the United States had occupied the island of Taiwan. United States political and military leaders had repeatedly stressed that the very existence of the Kuomintang and its ability to act depended solely on United States aid. The weapons used by the pirates in committing their acts of aggression were of United States origin. By supplying Chiang Kai-shek with weapons, warships and aircraft, the United States Government was endeavouring to increase his military potential. Only recently, the United States Government had announced that six torpedo boats had been sent to Taiwan to strengthen Chiang Kai-shek's navy and the Press had reported that on 17 December two destroyers would be delivered to the Taiwan authorities.

15. It was consequently clear that the seizure of the ships and the attacks committed by Chiang Kai-shek's navy against vessels of various nationalities could only take place with United States approval. It was equally obvious that the United States was responsible for every military action in the Taiwan area. It could not deny that United States military aircraft had directly taken part in the attacks against the *Praca* and the *Prezydent Gottwald*. Neither could it dispute that on 26 July 1954 United States aircraft had attacked two other Polish vessels, the *Przyjaźń Narodów* and the *Pokój*.

16. The United States Government had repeatedly tried to force other countries to place an embargo on trade with the People's Republic of China. Having failed in its attempts, it was using Chiang Kai-shek's navy to interfere with shipping and trade in that part of the Pacific.

17. The conduct of the United States Government was seriously at variance not only with the rules of international law, but also with the legislation of the United States itself. Section 8 of article I of the United States Constitution provided for the punishment of acts of piracy. Under the criminal law of the United States pirates were liable to life imprisonment. Under the draft convention on piracy prepared in the United States in 1932 not only the actual offenders but also accessories to the crime of piracy were to be liable.

18. The Polish Government had also requested the release of the Chinese citizens among the crew of the Polish ships seized by the Taiwan authorities. It was the duty of the United Nations to take steps to free those innocent men who had been imprisoned by Chiang Kai-shek's police and whose lives were in danger.

19. Believing that all international disputes should be settled by direct negotiation his Government had approached the United States Government. It had energetically protested to the United States Government against the flagrant violation of the Polish flag and had reserved the right to claim damages. In its explicit notes to the United States Government dated 12 and 26 October 1953 and 15 May and 20 November 1954, the Polish Government had asked for the release of the ships and their crews, for the return of their cargoes and for the punishment of the guilty. It had also reserved the right to ask for the reimbursement of the losses suffered.

20. In its notes of 20 October and 20 November 1953 and 20 May and 8 December 1954, the United States Government had replied, however, that it had had no connexion with the detention of the ships in question. It had not denied those acts of piracy or even its own complicity. It had simply placed the entire responsibility on the Taiwan authorities. Furthermore, the latest United States note referred to the right of asylum which the United States authorities had allegedly granted to a certain number of Polish seamen. The hypocrisy of the United States was obvious, as the whole world knew how those unfortunate men had been persuaded to renounce their fatherland and how they had subsequently been treated by the United States authorities: they had been taken to the United States and used as weapons by those who sought to vilify the Polish people.

21. His Government had not been alone in trying to negotiate directly with the United States. The USSR Government, too, had tried to settle the *Tuapse* case by direct negotiation, but the United States Government had avoided giving any direct reply and had once more taken shelter behind the Taiwan authorities.

22. All the Members of the United Nations should protest against those violations of the freedom of navigation, human dignity and international law, regardless of whether or not they themselves had been victimized by the illegal activities of the Kuomintang and the United States armed forces.

23. His delegation would support the USSR draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.24) the object of which was to restore normal conditions in the China seas. At the same time his delegation protested against those illegal acts and asked the United States Government to make the necessary arrangements for the return of the seized ships and cargoes to their lawful owners, for the release of the crews who were in prison and for facilitating the establishment of peaceful relations in the Far East. In

addition, it reserved the right to seek damages for the seizure of the ships. His country was convinced that if all the Members of the United Nations supported joint action they would be able to prevent the recurrence of acts of piracy. His people expected all civilized nations to help in securing the release of the victims of that piracy and their return home. If the United Nations wished to fulfil its duties it should take the necessary steps to stop piracy in the China seas, and the sufferings inflicted on innocent people and reduce tension in the Far East.

24. Mr. JACKSON (United States of America) said that the question under consideration was the natural sequel not only of the USSR complaint about alleged acts of aggression against the People's Republic of China (A/2756) but also of the Czechoslovak item on prohibition of propaganda in favour of a new war (A/2744). The Committee had already dismissed the accusations made against the United States in connexion with those two items. The complaint of alleged violation of the freedom of navigation in the area of the China seas, which was now before the Committee, was another manoeuvre in the cold war, as the French representative had demonstrated at the 51st meeting.

25. The Committee should not forget that it was at the Soviet Union's request that France had offered its good offices in the settlement of the case of the Soviet tanker *Tuapse* nor should it forget that the Government of the Republic of China had immediately accepted that offer. In those circumstances, the Soviet Union should have withdrawn its request for the item's inclusion in the agenda but it had felt that the opportunity to use the United Nations as a propaganda forum was too good to be missed.

26. The arguments advanced by the Soviet Union had a familiar ring: it was contended that the United States was forcibly occupying Formosa and hence was responsible for every action taken by the armed forces of the Republic of China. The Chinese representative had justified the military actions taken by his Government in the China Sea. He (Mr. Jackson) reserved the right to return to that question later. He would first deal with the allegations that the United States Government was a party to those actions.

27. When agenda item 70 was being discussed by the Committee, his delegation had pointed out (48th meeting) that the United States had not occupied Formosa by force. It had indicated that the sole purpose of the presence of the United States Seventh Fleet in the China seas was to maintain stability in the area. Now, although the United States Government had categorically rejected all the accusations made against it by the Polish and Soviet Union Governments with regard to Polish and Soviet ships, the Soviet Union was trying to link those incidents to the presence of American warships in the China seas. In that connexion he quoted extracts from the notes exchanged between his Government, on the one hand, and the Governments of Poland and the Soviet Union, on the other hand, concerning the detained ships showing that the United States had rejected categorically any complicity or responsibility for the acts.

28. The Soviet Union Government had also charged that United States military aircraft had interfered with the freedom of merchant shipping in the China seas. In that connexion he read the text of a note which his Government had sent to the Government of the Soviet Union on 29 November categorically rejecting the ac-

cusation that United States military aircraft had engaged in hostile acts towards Soviet merchantmen on the high seas in the North Pacific. His Government's note indicated that the incidents mentioned apparently referred to the identification by United States naval aircraft of such vessels operating on the high seas around the Island of Formosa. His Government had explained that such identification was not a violation of the freedom of commercial navigation on the high seas nor a violation of international law. The object of the identification of all vessels in that area was to detect the presence of ships whose mission might be hostile to the United States Seventh Fleet which was patrolling the China Sea in order to ensure the maintenance of peace and stability in the Far East.

29. Quite possibly the Government of the Soviet Union was upset because there had been some interference with the supply of fuel for the air force of Communist China. The Soviet tanker *Tuapse* and the Polish tanker *Praca* had undoubtedly carried kerosene, but it was well known that a certain grade of kerosene — and that was in fact the grade carried by the *Praca* — could easily be transformed into fuel for jet aircraft. That fact had been confirmed by the master of the *Praca*, who had admitted that he was tired of the Communist régime and had asked the Government of the Republic of China for asylum; he was now in New York with twenty-one members of the crew of his ship and of the Polish ship *Prezydent Gottwald*.

30. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) speaking on a point of order, said that the defection of a traitor, to which the United States representative had just referred, was irrelevant to the item under discussion.

31. Mr. JACKSON (United States of America) said he would not press the point as he did not wish to irritate the representative of the Soviet Union. He would reply to the Polish representative's insinuations by pointing out that the statements made by the master of the *Praca* could easily be verified by that or any other representative, unlike the statements to which the Polish representative had alluded in his intervention. The master of the *Praca* had said that he had realized that his vessel was carrying a military cargo and before leaving Singapore he had received secret orders concerning the route to be followed by that vessel in the China Sea. It was obvious that the fuel carried by the *Praca* and by the *Tuapse* had been intended for the MIG-15 jet aircraft of the Chinese Communist Air Force, furnished by the Soviet Union to that country and similar to those delivered by the USSR to North Korea during the Korean War. The Government of Communist China was not concealing the use which it intended to make of the material thus furnished to it by the Soviet Union. The Chinese Communist Minister of Defence had said on 1 October 1954 that the battle for the liberation of Taiwan was not yet over. The Prime Minister of Communist China had also said that Taiwan must be "liberated" and Chiang Kai-shek's Government promptly liquidated. Those threats had been backed by open exhortations to the Chinese Communist forces on the coast facing Taiwan to prepare for combat. In the meanwhile, the Soviet Union was pouring thousands of tons of jet fuel into storage depots on the Chinese mainland. During 1954, seventeen tankers with approximately 90,000 tons of fuel from the USSR had unloaded at Chinese Communist ports.

32. It was in those circumstances that the Soviet Union was submitting to the United Nations complaints of alleged aggression against the People's Republic of China and of alleged interference with freedom of navigation in the China Sea. In the face of the serious threat to his country, the representative of China had adopted an eminently reasonable position. He had reminded the Committee that in the past incidents of the type referred to in the explanatory memorandum of the USSR delegation (A/2741) had always been settled by negotiation, in the light of the circumstances of each case. The attitude of the Government of the Republic of China paved the way for the settlement of incidents which might arise in connexion with the activities of Chinese naval vessels in the waters surrounding Formosa.

33. The USSR draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.24) would, he hoped, be treated in exactly the same way as the draft resolutions proposed by the USSR on items 69 and 70 of the Committee's agenda. His delegation would, of course, vote against that draft resolution.

34. Mr. PINK (United Kingdom) said that the statement made by the representative of the USSR at the 51st meeting showed clearly that the item introduced by the USSR delegation was part of a methodical campaign against the United States intended to increase international tension. The item, however, involved the principle of the freedom of navigation on the high seas, which had always been upheld by the United Kingdom. The livelihood of countries like the United Kingdom and other maritime countries was largely dependent on freedom of international trade. That was why the United Kingdom was opposed to any restrictions on navigation on the high seas, but it insisted on freedom from interference by any Government in any sea.

35. He did not deny that the authorities in Formosa had been responsible for a great many cases of interference with British merchant vessels; but many incidents in which British vessels had been interfered with were attributable to the forces of the Government of the People's Republic of China. It was strange that the Soviet delegate, in quoting from a statement made in the House of Commons, had omitted the passage which pointed out that the Chinese People's Government had been responsible for a considerable number of those incidents, including one in which a Royal Naval launch was attacked and seven members of the crew were killed. It was only fair to put on record that since July 1953, interference by the Formosa authorities had been mainly confined to stopping ships for the purpose of identification and allowing them to proceed afterwards. In that connexion, he had been glad to note the Chinese representative's assurance (51st meeting) that the latter's Government was prepared to make good any damage caused to ships which were stopped and whose cargo was found in order. Accordingly, while the United Kingdom Government did not admit the right of the authorities of Formosa to stop British ships, it would not fasten the blame for that interference only on those authorities. The USSR representative's speech at the previous meeting clearly showed that the USSR was less concerned with freedom of navigation on the high seas than with making accusations against the United States, upon which it intended to lay responsibility for all the incidents reported.

36. The Polish representative had said that it would be absurd to suppose that the acts of piracy of the Kuomintang could take place without the consent and support of the United States authorities. But surely the Polish representative could not seriously believe that the United States authorities had encouraged the authorities of Formosa to stop and search British ships in the area in question. The United Kingdom Government was in a position to give the assurance that the United States had not committed any act of piracy against the vessels of the United Kingdom, nor encouraged the authorities of Formosa to commit such acts.

37. Although the Government of the United Kingdom attached great importance to the principle of freedom of navigation on the high seas, his delegation could not vote for a resolution which accused the United States Government of acts which it had not committed. It would therefore vote against the USSR draft resolution.

38. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that the complaint of violation of the freedom of navigation in the area of the China seas should be carefully examined by the United Nations. The USSR delegation had produced evidence showing that for several years the merchant vessels of many countries had been subjected in the China seas to acts of piracy by Kuomintang ships. It was the duty of the United Nations to condemn such acts and to take the necessary action to put an end to them, for they jeopardized relations between nations and constituted a threat to peace and security in the Far East.

39. Several speakers had pointed out that the responsibility for those acts was attributable not only to the partisans of Chiang Kai-shek, but also to the Government of the United States, which controlled those partisans, directed their activities, supplied them with arms and material and had sent its Seventh Fleet to patrol the China seas, an area considered to be an American possession by certain military leaders and journalists in the United States. Everyone knew that without the protection of the United States, Chiang Kai-shek could not have committed his acts of piracy with impunity and the situation in the Taiwan area would not have become a threat to the peace. The United States representative had denied that his Government was responsible; he was obviously relying rather on the credulity of his hearers than on the truth of his words. In any case, he had not been able to disprove the evidence showing that acts of piracy had been committed, or to deny that the United States was in control of the area. By flying over merchant shipping proceeding through the China seas, the American Air Force was not only violating the freedom of navigation on the high seas: it was carrying out reconnaissance flights for Chiang Kai-shek's navy, which, on the strength of the information so obtained, could then attack. The circumstances of the seizure of the USSR tanker and the Polish ships furnished striking proof; the reply of Admiral Felix B. Stump, the officer commanding the naval forces in the area, to a question put by a correspondent of the *U.S. News & World Report*, was corroborating evidence. The United States Air Force had even gone so far as to intervene directly: for example, in July 1954, American aircraft had opened fire on two Polish merchant ships. Those were undeniable facts. No argument could justify them or prevent the Assembly from taking the decision which had to be taken to ensure



respect for freedom of navigation and so to safeguard the interests of all countries and world peace.

40. Being unable to refute the facts which had been laid before the Committee, the representative of Chiang Kai-shek had hurled mischievous accusations at the USSR and had spoken on a side issue quite irrelevant to the item under discussion. He (Mr. Palamarchuk) would abstain from replying to those slanderous allegations by a person who represented only himself and was illegally occupying the seat of the People's Republic of China. He thanked the representative of France for the consideration which he had shown for the crew of the USSR tanker. It would be a mistake to suppose that only USSR or Polish ships were involved. Ships of many other nationalities had also been the victims of such acts of piracy.

41. It had been said, with justification, that the Committee was not a tribunal. It was an organ of the General Assembly, which was bound to condemn those violations of the freedom of navigation and to take measures to prevent their recurrence. The principle of the freedom of navigation on the high seas was one of the basic principles of international law. It was of the utmost importance for the maintenance of normal relations and particularly the free exchange of goods, among nations, and for the promotion of international co-operation. Any violation of that principle was an infringement of the sovereign rights of States. Those were the conclusions of eminent experts on international law. According to Oppenheim's *International Law*, even before the existence of a law of nations in the modern sense of the term a pirate had been considered an outlaw, a *hostis humani generis*.

42. It was the task of the United Nations to ensure observance of the rules of international law and to protect the interests of peace-loving States in the development of international commercial relations; consequently, it could not remain silent when acts of piracy were committed in the China seas which constituted violations of international law and were a serious threat to peace and security; its condemnation should be all the more vigorous as those acts had been committed not by private individuals but by naval units under the control of the United States.

43. For those reasons his delegation unreservedly supported the USSR draft resolution; its adoption would serve the interests of all countries that desired to maintain normal relations between peoples.

44. Mr. OFTEDAL (Norway), speaking as the representative of a maritime Power, said his Government knew of nothing to indicate that the United States was in any way responsible for the acts of piracy to which reference had been made. His delegation would therefore vote against the USSR draft resolution (A/AC.76/L.24).

45. Mr. TSIANG (China) protested against the charge that his Government had subjected the crews of the vessels in question to cruel and inhuman treatment. On 17 October, the French *Chargé d'affaires* in Formosa, whose impartiality was unquestioned, had carried out an on-the-spot investigation by visiting the crew of the *Tuapse*. In his report, copies of which had been sent to the Chinese and the USSR Governments, he had stated that on the whole the crew had not complained about the physical conditions under which they were living; the men had asked for more tea and sugar; none had reported maltreatment. The Chinese Govern-

ment had arranged for supplementary rations of tea and sugar to be issued to the crew.

46. It was merely for the purpose of propaganda that the Committee had been presented with a picture, bearing no relation to fact, based on statements allegedly made by sailors who had been repatriated to Poland. The captain of one of the Polish vessels and several members of its crew were in the United States and could provide any additional information that might be desired concerning the treatment they had received. His Government would welcome any request for such additional information.

47. He himself had arranged for the members of the crews of the Polish vessels to correspond with their families. The Chinese Government had made the necessary arrangements for their correspondence to be transmitted through the Swedish Red Cross or the International Committee of the Red Cross, but the Polish Government had refused the assistance of those organizations and had asked the Secretary-General of the United Nations to deal with the matter. On two occasions the Secretary-General had asked him to transmit to the competent authorities mail addressed to the crews which had been delivered to him by the Polish delegation. The Secretary-General had informed him that the families of the crew members had received replies to their letters. His delegation attached great importance to that aspect of the problem and could not allow aspersions to be cast on his Government's reputation by false accusations.

48. Mr. DERINSU (Turkey) said that his delegation would vote against the USSR draft resolution. He pointed out that there was a marked discrepancy between the claims of the representatives of the Soviet bloc to the effect that they desired a relaxation of international tensions, and the fact that they presented items intended solely for propaganda purposes for inclusion on the agenda. Several representatives of maritime Powers had flatly stated that the accusations made against the United States were completely groundless.

49. Mr. COLLIARD (France) thanked the Chinese representative for his tribute to the impartiality of the French *Chargé d'affaires* at Taipeh. It was out of a sense of discretion, in keeping with the role that France had assumed on the request of the USSR Government, that he had not mentioned the report in question. As the report, which was quite long, had been transmitted to the Chinese and the USSR Governments, it was not for the French delegation to quote part of it; each of the two Governments concerned was free to quote any part of it.

50. Mr. Y. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the United States delegation, being unable to disprove the events recounted by the USSR and Polish delegations, had followed its customary practice of evading the issue by accusing those delegations of making propaganda. That allegation was completely unfounded. If the United States and the Chiang Kai-shek partisans had not committed the acts in question, the problem would not have come before the United Nations. As the Indonesian representative had pointed out in the discussion on another item, what Member States expected of the United Nations in such cases was moral support. It was with precisely that aim in view that the USSR delegation had approached the Assembly.

51. Contrary to what the United States representative had asserted, the Soviet tanker *Tuapse* had been carry-

ing paraffin. China's economic development was not so advanced as that of the United States and other colonial countries which had prospered by exploiting the Chinese and other peoples. The Chinese people still used oil lamps, and that was the purpose for which the *Tuapse's* cargo had been intended. Furthermore it was difficult to understand how the United States representative could claim that in view of the USSR Government's approach to the French Government, which the USSR delegation wished to thank once again for its help, the case should not have been brought before the United Nations. The USSR delegation's motive was not a selfish desire to reach a satisfactory settlement purely for the benefit of a group of Soviet sailors; it was appealing to the United Nations to put an end to all the crimes and violations of international law committed against ships, not only of the Soviet Union but also of many other countries. It was surprising to find that, in a case involving the inhuman treatment of peaceful sailors—and the Polish representative had given numerous examples of such treatment—the United States and United Kingdom delegations and their supporters completely disregarded the principles of humanity and respect for human dignity, about which they had felt so keenly in the case of the thirteen United States spies who had been justly convicted, a matter which the United States delegation had laid before the Assembly for propaganda purposes.

52. The claim advanced in some quarters that the United States had no responsibility in the matter was incomprehensible. The United States representative had refuted none of the particulars furnished by the Soviet Union and Poland as to the circumstances of the case and as to the fact that American Air Force aircraft had flown over the ships concerned. The United States Government itself had stated in official notes that the United States Seventh Fleet was patrolling the waters of the region, and the United States representative had even told the Committee how many tankers had arrived at the ports of the People's Republic of China. Beyond any question, the United States Navy knew everything that was going on in the area, followed the movements of all shipping very closely, and could certainly not have missed observing the actions of Chiang Kai-shek's partisans.

53. Moreover, the United States representative himself had stated that the Seventh Fleet had been sent to the Formosa area to maintain stability there. As the United States Navy had illegally assumed the right to maintain such stability it had a duty to suppress the acts of piracy committed by Chiang Kai-shek's partisans and was therefore responsible for the crimes committed by Chiang Kai-shek's navy, which was under its control, was equipped by the United States, and was operating in a region dominated by the Seventh Fleet.

54. The United Kingdom representative had taken rather a surprising position. The United Kingdom had for centuries upheld the principle of freedom of navigation on the high seas, but now that that principle was in jeopardy its delegation adopted a negative attitude. It was even more surprising that the United Kingdom representative should assert that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, with which his Government was in diplomatic relations, bore almost sole responsibility for the incidents which had occurred.

55. Perhaps the United Kingdom representative would say how many ships and members of British crews the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China was holding. So far as he knew none were being held.

56. The representative of the Chiang Kai-shek group had tried to reduce the problem to a question of tea and sugar rations. That was an intolerable attitude: the problem before the Assembly concerned the fate of crews who had been illegally detained in violation of international law and who were being subjected to coercion in an effort to make them deny their country and their convictions.

57. In reply to the United States representative he could have stated all the steps the Soviet Union had taken to reduce international tension. It might well be asked what the United States Government had done in that direction, particularly on the Far East. That question could be simply answered: it had concluded a treaty with Chiang Kai-shek to legalize the unlawful occupation of Taiwan, and now disclaimed all responsibility for acts of piracy committed in the waters under its control.

58. The principle at stake was that of freedom of navigation on the high seas, a principle which was acknowledged by every member of the Committee. Therefore there was nothing to prevent the Assembly from taking steps to ensure respect for that fundamental principle which was violated by the Chiang Kai-shek group and their protectors, to put a stop to the acts of piracy which that group was committing, and to remove the threat to peace and security which such acts represented. It was with precisely that aim in view that the USSR delegation had approached the United Nations.

59. The CHAIRMAN proposed that the list of speakers should be closed at the end of the meeting to be held in the afternoon of 14 December, on the understanding that the last speaker would be the USSR representative.

*It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.