

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



FIRST COMMITTEE 441st

MEETING

Wednesday, 7 February 1951, at 10.45 a.m.

Lake Success, New York

CONTENTS

Page

Complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding aggression against China by the United States of America (*concluded*) 619

Complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding the violation of Chinese air space by the air force of the United States of America and the machine-gunning and bombing of Chinese territory by that air force, and against the bombardment and illegal inspection of a merchant ship of the People's Republic of China by a military vessel of the United States (*concluded*) 619

Chairman: Mr. Roberto URDANETA ARBELÁEZ (Colombia).

Complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding aggression against China by the United States of America (*concluded*)

[Item 70]*

Complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding the violation of Chinese air space by the air force of the United States of America and the machine-gunning and bombing of Chinese territory by that air force, and against the bombardment and illegal inspection of a merchant ship of the People's Republic of China by a military vessel of the United States (*concluded*)

[Item 75]*

1. Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia) said that the prolonged interruption in the consideration of the USSR complaint (agenda item 70) had been caused by the discussion regarding the United States complaint of the so-called intervention of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea. That debate had been concluded (438th meeting) with the adoption of the United States "war resolution" (A/C.1/654) which was aimed against peace, the Korean people and the People's Republic of China.

2. Both the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union (407th meeting) and General Wu (A/C.1/661) had exposed the continuous acts of United States aggression against the People's Republic of China. They had also declared that the armed intervention waged by the United States ruling circles against Korea had marked the first stage in a change in United States

foreign policy from threats to acts of further aggression, and that the second stage in that policy had been the extension of the war in the Far East through the systematic violation of the territorial integrity of the People's Republic of China, the blockade and occupation of Taiwan (Formosa) and the bombing of Chinese territory.

3. It had been the duty of the United Nations to submit those acts of military intervention by the United States to a thorough examination and to take the necessary measures to restore the territorial integrity of China, thus preventing further acts of aggression against that country. Unfortunately, the majority of the Anglo-American bloc in the United Nations had not examined the complaint of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China but had attempted instead to brand China as the evil spirit causing the present tension in the Pacific area, thereby following the policy of the American monopolists and giving effective aid to the immediate requirements of United States armed intervention in the Korean peninsula.

4. Mr. Dulles (407th meeting) and Mr. Austin (439th meeting) had sought to justify the imperialistic policy the United States ruling circles towards China by making references to the traditional Sino-American friendship. But the question before the Committee was the complaint of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China regarding the violation of its territorial integrity by United States armed intervention, by the bombing of Chinese schools and hospitals and by the blockading of Taiwan. References therefore to the remote past and future could not relieve United States ruling circles of their responsibility for their present aggressive policy towards China.

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

5. Indeed, the present policy of the United States had its roots in the history of the relations of the United States ruling circles towards China. The much vaunted "open door" policy and similar policies advertised by Mr. Dulles and Mr. Austin as the truest democracy were in reality the expression of the efforts of American capitalist circles to open the door to China, which had been closed by European colonial policy, and thus to avail themselves of equal opportunities to exploit the Chinese people and the mineral resources of China. Moreover, after the Second World War, American imperialism had eliminated the influence of the European colonial Powers and had taken the lead in replacing the "open door" policy by one of strengthening the military and economic grip on China.

6. The Soviet Union delegation (407th meeting) had rightly pointed out the fact that the aggressive and hostile acts committed by American monopolists and militarists against the People's Republic of China represented a gross violation of the Charter, which forbade all Member States to use armed force against the political independence or territorial integrity of another State. The United States aggression in the Far East could, at the present stage, bring about a spreading of the war which was being waged against the Korean people.

7. The nature of the traditional Sino-American friendship, Mr. Nosek said, had been exposed by General Wu, by the head of the Soviet Union delegation and again by the USSR representative at the 439th meeting. The resolution (A/1770) adopted by the General Assembly, under United States pressure, was an eloquent example of that friendship in that it gave the aggressive forces of the United States a free hand to force their friendship upon the Chinese peoples by means of arms, murder and terror. The presence of United States forces in Korea and Taiwan was not to carry out a police action but was part of a thoroughly planned and prepared attack upon China.

8. The representative of Czechoslovakia then quoted excerpts from an article by Mr. Reid in the *Tribune* of February 1899, from a book entitled *The Chinese Open Door* and from a speech by Senator Albert J. Beveridge to the United States Senate in 1900, in order to prove that as long ago as the beginning of the century, efforts were being made by the agents of American imperialism to secure the Chinese market. Today, fifty years later, the spokesmen of the American ruling circles, both in the United Nations and elsewhere, reiterated the same story, varying it with demagogic phrases about freedom, democracy and the protection of the so-called Western civilization.

9. The representative of Czechoslovakia contended that the United States had tried to retain the Chinese market by supporting the reactionary and bankrupt Chiang Kai-shek clique. To that effect he quoted from an article in *The New Statesman and Nation* of 23 November 1946. The United States, having failed, turned to open acts of aggression. Mr. Nosek also quoted excerpts from *The New York Herald Tribune* of 2 February 1932, and from a letter addressed to *The New York Times* by the late Secretary of State Stimson on 6 October 1937 to prove that the United States had even used the Japanese invasion of China

to further its aims. It was not surprising, therefore, that the Japanese Foreign Minister Hirota had found that "America's attitude towards the Chinese incident is fair and just". Today, after twelve years, Mr. Dulles together with the "war-adventurer" MacArthur, were planning the remilitarization of Japan, thus giving further proof of the friendship of the United States ruling circles towards the Chinese people.

10. The aim of the United States imperialists to conquer Chinese and other Asian markets and to obtain cheap labour and control of raw materials had been supplemented by another goal, namely, to conquer Korea and to obtain Chinese bases for future attack on the Soviet Union, which was the main obstacle towards the world conquest contemplated by the United States. Mr. Nosek then quoted excerpts from an editorial which appeared in the *Los Angeles Times* of October 1950 to the effect that the United States had not only become the mightiest military nation but had also become master of the world. Such was the ultimate aim of the United States, and the United Nations was to become its instrument.

11. The representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China had submitted irrefutable facts showing that the island of Taiwan was an integral part of Chinese territory, both from the historical point of view and from the point of view of existing international agreements. According to the international agreements of 1943 and 1945, Taiwan had become an inalienable part of Chinese territory and the United States had confirmed that fact by the ceding of Taiwan to China following the surrender of Japan. The measures undertaken by the United States with regard to Taiwan were tantamount, therefore, to an attack upon the territorial integrity of the People's Republic of China.

12. Moreover, from the point of view of international law, the blockade and invasion of Taiwan were all the more serious since, by that hostile act, the United States had violated the agreement to which it had been signatory and which had been confirmed by its President a few months prior to the attack upon Taiwan. The President's statement, to the effect that Taiwan belonged *de jure* and *de facto* to China, had been followed by a statement by Secretary of State Acheson¹ who had declared that the United States stood for principle and that it had not put forward words only to throw them overboard when some change in events made the United States position difficult. But after those solemn declarations, it was Mr. Acheson himself who, at the fifth session of the General Assembly, had spoken (279th plenary meeting) of doubts with regard to Taiwan and no longer considered the legal situation to be in conformity with existing commitments, after the United States armed forces had carried out the blockade and occupation of Taiwan.

13. To throw overboard international obligations as soon as they turned out to be obstacles to its expansive aims was in full accord with the post-war policy of the United States, such as the establishment of Western Germany as a spearhead for United States aggressive

¹ See *Department of State bulletin*, Vol. XXII, No. 550, page 79.

policy in Germany instead of building up a unified and democratic Germany. Similarly, the United States ruling circles had paid no attention to their international obligations calling for the demilitarization and democratization of Japan. Instead, they were endeavouring to remilitarize Japan with the help of the reactionary forces, thus turning it into their principal military and strategic base in the Far East.

14. President Truman's order of 27 June 1950, in which he explained the motives of the hostile acts against the People's Republic of China, had claimed that the seizure of Taiwan had been forced upon the United States because of the Korean conflict and that such a step was inevitable in order to protect the safety of the United States forces carrying out their legal police action in the Pacific Ocean. Moreover, President Truman had declared that the United States did not seek to obtain special rights or privileges in Taiwan. Those same arguments had been reiterated by Mr. Dulles before the First Committee (407th meeting) to justify the blockade of Taiwan, but the blockade and occupation of that island was a logical result of the United States Far Eastern policy since the end of the Second World War. The American imperialists had made great efforts to turn China into a semi-colony. After the Chinese people had countered those efforts by expelling the Kuomintang clique from the Chinese mainland, the American aggressors had spared no effort to save at least the southern part of China for their base and to place it under Chiang Kai-shek's rule. It was, therefore, highly unreasonable to pretend that the aggression against Taiwan had been forced upon the United States by the situation in Korea. Even if historic facts were disregarded, United States aggression against China could not be justified by the aggression against the People's Democratic Republic of Korea.

15. Furthermore, it was a well known fact that according to an agreement concluded in 1943 between the United States and Chiang Kai-shek, the American imperialists had obtained control of the economy of Taiwan; that the Japanese had built sixty airports in Taiwan and that the Americans, assisted by Japanese experts, had increased that number with additional air and naval bases all over that island long before the outbreak of the Korean conflict; that the United States mission, headed by General Wedemeyer, had requested from the Chiang Kai-shek régime in 1947 eight new military bases and had also asked that Taiwan should be placed under Sino-American administration; and that long before the outbreak of the Korean conflict the United States had set up the entire island of Taiwan as a huge military training centre for Kuomintang armies under the leadership of American instructors and with the participation of Japanese instructors. All those facts served as proof that the United States imperialists contemplated maintaining the occupation of Taiwan in order to prevent the People's Republic of China from carrying out its executive and administrative rights, and utilizing the remnants of the Kuomintang forces, still on Taiwan, for the imperialists' aggressive ambitions against the free people of China. In the light of those facts, the statement that the number of United States army officers on Taiwan did not exceed forty-four was con-

trary to reality since the entire United States Seventh Fleet was blockading the shores of Taiwan.

16. The representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, in his statement on 11 November 1950,² had enumerated a series of air raids carried out by the United States air force which confirmed the repeated violations of the Chinese air space. The barbarous bombings were repeated day after day, thus causing heavy losses of lives of Chinese people and property. The United States representative, in his communication to the Security Council of 2 October 1950,³ had also admitted such violations ascribing them, however, to the fact that American fliers had lost their way and thus had flown, by mistake, over Chinese territory and opened fire on an airport in the southwest of Antung. That explanation could be accepted only by means of the greatest self-delusion, considering that American fliers had been "losing their way" almost every day and had bombed "by mistake" Chinese towns and villages.

17. Moreover, Mr. Dulles had stated (407th meeting) that the purpose of bombing bridges across the Yalu River had been to prevent the crossing of Chinese volunteers into Korea. When Mr. Dulles' statement was compared with the list of hostile air raids submitted by the People's Republic of China, the conclusion could be drawn that the bombing of Chinese territory had occurred as early as August 1950, long before the United States forces had reached the Chinese border, thus presenting a threat to the territory of the People's Republic of China. The Chinese volunteers had joined with their Korean neighbours in the struggle against American imperialists and such a step could not justify the bombardment of Chinese territory. To fight on the side of an attacked nation was a sacred and patriotic task and was in complete conformity with international law.

18. In conclusion, Mr. Nosek stated that the United Nations was faced with an unprovoked and gross act of aggression committed by United States air and naval forces. The Organization's task was therefore to condemn the United States aggression against China and to adopt effective measures to compel the United States Government to lift the blockade of the island of Taiwan, to withdraw its naval and air forces, and to refrain from all actions that might violate the sovereignty of the People's Republic of China. To those ends, his delegation supported the draft resolution submitted by the USSR (A/C.1/637 and A/C.1/660).

19. Mr. DEMCHENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) said that Mr. Vyshinsky (407th meeting), General Wu (A/C.1/661) and a number of other representatives had proved with irrefutable facts that the United States Government had committed an act of aggression against China; that such aggression was committed by the invasion and blockade of the island of Taiwan, by armed intervention in the internal affairs of China and by the systematic violation of Chinese air space by the United States air force.

² See document S/1902.

³ See document S/1832.

20. According to the generally recognized rules of international law, such acts constituted aggression and the State which committed them was an aggressor. In that respect, the Ukrainian SSR representative observed that a definition of such an aggressor⁴ had been adopted in May 1933 by the Committee on Security Questions of the League of Nations. However, Mr. Dulles (407th meeting) and Mr. Austin (439th meeting) had attempted to deny all those obvious facts. Except for the empty references to President Truman's statement, the Committee had heard nothing to refute the fact of United States aggression. Moreover, both Mr. Dulles and Mr. Austin had asserted that the United States had not invaded Taiwan since, in their words, the United States military personnel there consisted only of about fifty persons. But the United States representatives were silent regarding the strength of the forces with the United States Seventh Fleet, which had been ordered by President Truman to occupy Taiwan. It was well known that since 27 June 1950 the Seventh Fleet had invaded the Chinese territorial waters of Taiwan and had undertaken military activities to prevent the liberation of that island. Subsequently, the ports of Taiwan had been converted into bases for United States naval, military and air forces and those facts could not be denied.

21. With regard to Taiwan's blockade, the United States representatives had denied its existence and in support of their argument had quoted an excerpt from the instructions given by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the Commander-in-Chief in the Far East. Those instructions, however, recognized in substance that the basic task of the Seventh Fleet was to prevent access to Taiwan by the only legitimate Government of China and no one could deny that such an act constituted a blockade, within the rules and principles of international law. Thus, even those instructions did not refute, but actually confirmed, the USSR contention.

22. The Ukrainian SSR representative said that Mr. Austin (439th meeting) had denied that there had been armed intervention by the United States in the internal affairs of China. That was a distortion of the truth, considering the long history of United States intervention in the internal affairs of that country. Since the surrender of Japan in 1945, the United States had been aiding the Kuomintang clique in its war against the Chinese peoples. During the last five years, the United States Government had appropriated enormous amounts of money, up to six thousand million dollars, to grant military and economic assistance to the bankrupt group of Chiang Kai-shek. It had used United States naval and air forces to transport more than a million Kuomintang troops to those fronts where the civil war was to begin. The United States Government had also equipped 166 army divisions, had aided the Kuomintang clique to set up nine squadrons with 1,720 planes and had given to its fleet more than five hundred ships. Besides supplying unlimited quantities of arms and ammunition, the United States Government had sent American military advisers to prepare military plans for Chiang Kai-shek.

23. Even at present that aid was being continued. According to a secret agreement concluded at the end of 1949, the United States Government agreed to provide the Chiang Kai-shek clique with sixteen naval vessels, supplies and equipment for five divisions, radar, ammunition and other supplies. On 30 December 1949, the Associated Press had announced that during the month of December Taiwan had received 250 American tanks and that 200 more tanks had been sent in January 1951. From the information available in the American Press, it could be gathered that the United States and Canada had sent to Chiang Kai-shek, during the first nine months of last year, several hundred military planes and more than 700 tanks. It was obvious that the ruling circles of the United States were training the Kuomintang troops to fight against the People's Republic of China.

24. Mr. Demchenko further stated that, soon after the United States aggression in Taiwan, General MacArthur and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek had reached an agreement whereby the land, naval and air forces of the United States and the Kuomintang would be transferred to a single united command under General MacArthur for the purpose of the "joint defence of Taiwan". That fact was revealed by the statements made by Chiang Kai-shek and General MacArthur. The latter had especially gone to Taiwan to conclude that agreement. Thus, it was clear that the United States was not only continuing its intervention in the Chinese civil war, but had also resorted to overt use in that struggle of its own armed forces, and that was a typical manifestation of aggression.

25. In their statements, Mr. Dulles and Mr. Austin had admitted that the United States air force had violated Chinese air space. They tried, however, to make out that it was merely a case of a few accidental crossings of the frontier due to pilots' errors. That assertion was also contrary to the facts. Beginning on 27 August 1950, and up to the present time, there had not been a day in which American planes had not violated Chinese air space and had not carried out bombing and strafing of cities, killing Chinese citizens and causing enormous damage to property. Those facts were available to the Committee in the documents submitted to the Secretary-General by the People's Republic of China.

26. A statement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, and various dispatches in the Chinese Press, had given details of violations of Chinese air space by the United States air force. Mr. Demchenko quoted as an example a statement in the Chinese Press disclosing that, during the month of December 1950 alone, there had been sixty-two incidents of violation of Chinese air space by 169 United States aircraft. Those aircraft had continued their raids in January 1951. The detailed accounts in the Chinese Press of those attacks proved conclusively that the United States was deliberately carrying out air raids in accordance with prepared plans and was thus committing an act of open aggression against China.

27. Mr. Demchenko recalled that Mr. Austin had mentioned in his statement of 2 February 1951 (439th meeting) the readiness of the United States Government to pay compensation for the damage caused by

⁴ See League of Nations, Conference for the Reduction and Limitation of Armaments, Report of the Committee on Security Questions, Conf. D/C.G. 108, published in *Conference Documents, Vol. II*, page 679 (Series League of Nations, 1935.IX.4).

the United States bombings of China. But no amount of dollars could compensate for the lives of the people lost as a result of those air attacks. General Wu, the representative of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, had made a similar observation in his reply to Mr. Dulles.⁵ Mr. Demchenko quoted from a statement by General Wu (A/C.1/661), to the effect that the sovereignty of the People's Republic of China could not be bought by United States dollars.

28. In conclusion, Mr. Demchenko stated that his delegation would support USSR draft resolutions (A/C.1/637 and A/C.1/660).

29. Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the United States representative (439th meeting) had referred to certain documents which the latter considered offered sufficient refutation of the charge of aggression against the United States. Those documents were, on the contrary, irrefutable proofs of the opposite fact, namely, that the United States had committed aggression against China. For instance, the United States representative had referred to the statement made by President Truman on 27 June 1950 and also to the order issued on 29 June 1950 by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States to the Supreme Commander of the Far Eastern forces. It was well known that on 27 June the President of the United States had ordered the Seventh Fleet to enter the Straits of Taiwan and to prevent any action on the part of the Government of the People's Republic of China with regard to Taiwan. The order by the Joint Chiefs of Staff was also to the same effect. Such acts represented an open and crude armed aggression against China. In the light of the facts available, Mr. Tsarapkin did not understand how the United States representative could maintain that the documents in question proved that the United States had no aggressive designs or ambitions in respect of Taiwan.

30. In spite of the assertions of the United States representative, it was a well known fact that the aggressive plans of the United States against Taiwan had been put into operation long before the events in Korea had begun. There were insistent demands for the seizure of Taiwan during 1949, both in the United States Congress and in United States military circles. Those demands had created concern in international circles. In order to remove that concern and also the doubts regarding the real purpose of United States foreign policy in the Far East, the President of the United States and the State Department⁶ made official statements in January 1950 to the effect that the United States recognized Taiwan as Chinese territory and did not intend to occupy or in any way to threaten or endanger the rights of China to that island.

31. However, the United States ruling circles did not give up their plan to seize Taiwan; a week before the attack by the Syngman Rhee régime upon the People's Democratic Republic of Korea, the question of the United States occupation of Taiwan was discussed in Tokyo between Mr. Dulles and General MacArthur.

Besides Mr. Dulles, the United States Secretary of Defence Mr. Louis Johnson and General Bradley were also in Tokyo at the same time. While Mr. Dulles discussed the political aspects of United States aggression against Korea and China, Mr. Johnson and General Bradley discussed its military aspects. A dispatch in *The New York Times* on 21 June 1950 stated that Mr. Dulles had submitted a report to President Truman on the basis of which the President was to take certain decisions. On 27 June 1950 President Truman issued his order concerning the invasion of Formosa by the United States fleet.

32. The same dispatch in *The New York Times* on 21 June also stated that Major-General Earle Partridge, at that time American Commander of Far Eastern forces had informed the United States Secretary of Defence, Mr. Johnson, and General Bradley, of the possible threat to Japan, Okinawa and the Philippines, if Formosa were to fall into the hands of the Chinese communists. For that reason, General MacArthur and his aide wanted to send help to Chiang Kai-shek to prevent Formosa from falling into the hands of the Chinese communists. That point of view was also stated at length in General MacArthur's message to the convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars held in Chicago in August 1950. Thus, the United States aggression against Taiwan was not directly connected with the United States aggression against Korea, and was a separate and independent act of aggression against the People's Republic of China.

33. The United States representative had also stated that General MacArthur, in order the better to fulfil his responsibility for the maintenance of peace in the Far East, had sent a military observation group to Formosa. That statement, which was brought to the notice of the United Nations, raised the question as to who had authorized the United States and General MacArthur to take upon themselves the responsibility of maintaining peace and security in Formosa. The defence of Formosa was the right of China and the Chinese people, and no one had transferred that right to the United States.

34. Moreover, the occupation of Taiwan and the establishment of a blockade of that island had created a threat to peace and security which the United States allegedly desired to preserve in the region of Taiwan. In fact, those arbitrary acts of the United States in regard to Taiwan were a practical implementation of a long-standing plan of the United States, aimed at creating a situation which would extend the war in the Far East. That was clear from General MacArthur's message to the convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in which he stated that the United States control all of the Pacific Ocean to the shores of Asia "by a chain of islands extending in an arc from the Aleutians to the Marianas. . . From this island chain we can dominate with air power every Asiatic port from Vladivostok to Singapore . . .". General MacArthur had included Taiwan in that chain of islands spread out like an arc, and its occupation was in accordance with the plan to have mastery of the shores of Asia "from Vladivostok to Singapore".

35. If the United States aggression against China was not halted by the United Nations, it threatened to

⁵ See *Official Records of the Security Council*, No. 69, 527th meeting.

⁶ See *Department of State bulletin*, Vol. XXII, No. 550, page 79.

spread all over Asia. Already, as the statements published in the United States Press on 7 February 1951 disclosed, General MacArthur, in an effort to extend the war, had asked for permission to invade China with the help of the remnants of the Chiang Kai-shek forces and for the right to bomb China. He had declared that a war had started in Asia against communism and that now "there can be no turning back", adding that he had in mind the whole of the East and not merely Korea. Those were the words of one who was carrying out the foreign policy of the United States in the Far East. In formulating those plans, however, the United States imperialists were ignoring the fact that the peoples of Asia had awakened and wanted to be free and independent. Quoting from Victor Hugo, who said that nothing in the world was so powerful as an idea whose time had come, Mr. Tsarapkin declared that the time of the liberation of the peoples of Asia and the other peoples who had been oppressed in the past had come, and that idea could not be stifled any more.

36. In conclusion, Mr. Tsarapkin remarked that the two draft resolutions submitted by the USSR delegation (A/C.1/637 and A/C.1/660) were in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter and their adoption by the First Committee and the General Assembly would be the right solution to a situation which had arisen as a result of United States aggression in the Far East.

37. The CHAIRMAN announced the closure of the debate on items 70 and 75.

38. FAWZI Bey (Egypt) wished to make a statement on his delegation's position with regard to the USSR draft resolution. The charges contained in that draft were of a very serious nature and required a thorough and impartial investigation of the facts and a study of the legal questions involved. Since such facts and knowledge were not available to the Committee, the Egyptian delegation was of the opinion that the United Nations should not be made to subscribe to a

condemnation which was not based upon ample and impartial investigation and proof. Accordingly, his delegation would vote against the USSR draft resolution. However, he wished to go on record as reserving his government's position in respect of the legal questions involved, particularly those relating to the meaning and implications of the Cairo and Potsdam declarations.

39. Mr. DAYAL (India) said that his delegation, together with eleven other nations, had recently sponsored a draft resolution (A/C.1/642/Rev.2) seeking a conference of the interested Powers for the peaceful settlement of Far Eastern problems, including Taiwan. His government considered that the question of Taiwan should be settled on the basis of the Cairo and Potsdam declarations. Although the joint draft resolution which sought, among other things, a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question had been rejected (438th meeting) the Indian delegation still felt that the best way to solve all Far Eastern problems was by negotiation, and that consequently an exchange of charges of aggression was not conducive to a peaceful settlement. For those reasons, his delegation would vote against the two USSR draft resolutions.

40. Faris EL-KHOURI Bey (Syria) stated that his delegation would vote against both USSR draft resolutions because of the absence of evidence in support of the complaints contained in them.

41. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/637) submitted in connexion with item 70 of the General Assembly agenda, and the USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/660) submitted in connexion with item 75.

The USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/637) was rejected by 49 votes to 5, with 3 abstentions.

The USSR draft resolution (A/C.1/660) was rejected by 50 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.