



CONTENTS

	Page
Allocation to the First Committee of two additional agenda items (A/C.1/557/Add.2 and A/C.1/557/Add.3)	395
Priority to be given to item 76 of the General Assembly agenda	395

Chairman: Mr. Roberto URDANETA ARBELÁEZ (Colombia)

Allocation to the First Committee of two additional agenda items (A/C.1/557/Add.2 and A/C.1/557/Add.3)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the First Committee's attention to two letters from the President of the General Assembly. One, dated 2 December 1950 (A/C.1/557/Add.2), concerned the allocation to the First Committee of General Assembly agenda item 75;¹ the other, dated 6 December 1950 (A/C.1/557/Add.3), concerned the allocation to the First Committee of item 76.² The First Committee had to decide on the order in which it would deal with the new questions that had been referred to it by the General Assembly.

Priority to be given to item 76 of the General Assembly agenda

2. Mr. CHAUVEL (France) recalled that the General Assembly had decided (319th plenary meeting), by 51 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions, to place on its agenda the question of the "Intervention of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea" and had instructed the First Committee to consider it.

3. The delegation of France proposed that that question, item 76 on the agenda of the General Assembly, should have priority over items 70³ and 71⁴ and that the First Committee should begin to discuss it at the current meeting. Without wishing to prejudge the First Committee's opinion on item 70 before a vote had been taken, and setting aside the Committee's views on whether there even had been any United States aggression against China, he did not think that the discussion

¹ Item 75 of the General Assembly agenda, "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".

of that agenda item was particularly urgent. Similarly, item 71 dealt with the study of a complex problem rather than the solution of a critical situation.

4. On the other hand, item 76 related to an immense and immediate threat to the peace of the world. All the Members of the United Nations were directly affected by that item of the agenda because they were jointly the guarantors of the Charter and because the intervention of Peking's forces in Korea was contrary to the Charter. The responsibility of the United Nations was involved because United Nations forces, which morally belonged to all the Member States, were in danger.

5. The French delegation therefore called upon the First Committee to consider item 76 of the agenda of the General Assembly as a matter of priority, in order to fulfil its responsibilities with respect to the Charter, to Korea and to the men who had responded to the appeal of the United Nations and who each day were dying in Korea.

6. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that the proposal of the delegation of France had no precedent in the annals of the United Nations. The First Committee had already begun to consider the complaint of the Soviet Union on 27 November (407th meeting), and after a preliminary statement by the representative of the USSR, the United States representative had spoken. But the Committee was now being asked to postpone the consideration of that problem, on the pretext that another question was urgent, although the General Assembly had not mentioned the fact that any priority should be assigned to

² Item 76 of the General Assembly agenda: "Intervention of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China in Korea".

³ Item 70 of the General Assembly agenda: "Complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding aggression against China by the United States of America".

⁴ Item 71 of the General Assembly agenda: "The question of Formosa".

the latter question. In view of the absence of any precedent whatsoever, the procedure recommended by the representative of France would constitute a violation of the rules of procedure and of all the traditions and practices of the United Nations.

7. Moreover, the problem on which it was proposed to postpone discussion, that of American aggression and of the criminal conduct of the United States Government, which had already sown death and destruction throughout one country, was of no less urgency than any other. Any delay in the discussion of that problem would therefore constitute a flagrant and intolerable violation of the practice of the United Nations. Certain delegations had wished to pose as guarantors of peace, but were they not rather attempting to guarantee the success of the aggression committed by the United States of America?

8. The USSR delegation considered that the First Committee should continue the consideration of the agenda item entitled, "Complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics regarding aggression against China by the United States of America". The delegation was therefore categorically opposed to the French proposal, which would involve a violation of the rights of the delegation which had proposed an item for inclusion in the agenda. There had never been a case in which the discussion of any problem had thus been interrupted and the item relegated to another place on the agenda. The USSR delegation therefore submitted a formal protest against the illegal character of the French proposal.

9. Mr. MALIK (Lebanon) considered that the arguments of the delegation of France concerning the urgency of agenda item 76 were perfectly valid. Moreover, the USSR representative's assertion that there was no precedent for the proposed procedure was erroneous. Actually, the President of the General Assembly had been authorized on at least three occasions that same year, and even during the consideration of an item, to change the order in which the Assembly should consider the various items on its agenda.

10. In order to take a step which was in no way extraordinary, the First Committee should follow the procedure laid down in rule 115 of the rules of procedure, which provided that "two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against" the adjournment of the debate.

11. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was surprised that the representative of Lebanon should have lost all sense of logic.

12. Although it was true that the President of the General Assembly had proposed the adjournment of debate on a question under consideration, that could only take place with the unanimous consent of the General Assembly. In the present case, on the contrary, categorical objections had been put forward, in view of which the adjournment of the debate on the question would indeed be unprecedented and would constitute a flagrant violation of the elementary principles of the rules of procedure.

13. In certain cases, if there were no speakers on the list, or in order to permit of preliminary negotiations or the settlement of certain disagreements, as in the

case of the Palestine question, for example, the consideration of a question could indeed be postponed. In other cases, long debates might prove to be unproductive and a Committee might decide to consider another question, in the hope that the parties concerned might reach agreement. Those were the cases provided for in rule 115 of the rules of procedure, which was merely intended to enable a Committee to end a deadlock. The representatives of France and Lebanon, however, did not see that rule 115 referred to the adjournment of debate, rather than to the temporary withdrawal of an item from the agenda and its replacement by another item; the rules of procedure said nothing about that.

14. In the case at issue, however, the essential condition for a temporary suspension of the consideration of a question, namely, the consent of those who had submitted it, was far from being fulfilled. In those circumstances, the proposed procedure would constitute a flagrant violation of the rights of the delegations concerned, whose objections had never been ignored in the past, whatever the representative of Lebanon might think.

15. The delegation of the USSR had not waited for the six-Power proposal (A/C.1/638) to be formulated to make known, in conversations with the Chairman of the First Committee and in public meeting (319th plenary meeting of the General Assembly), that it maintained that consideration of its complaint should be expedited. Thus, when item 76 had been placed on the agenda, the USSR delegation had again stated that consideration of item 70 should be resumed immediately. The delegation of the USSR could therefore only reiterate its formal protest. It was inadmissible to invoke the precedent of decisions taken with the general consent of all delegations in order to prejudice the sovereign rights of a Member State of the United Nations.

16. The delegation of the Soviet Union would therefore maintain its formal protest against a procedure which would show absolute disregard for its rights and for the rules of procedure.

17. The CHAIRMAN pointed out to the representative of Lebanon that the restrictions provided for in rule 115 were not applicable and that discussion should be unlimited in the present case. It concerned not merely the suspension of the debate on an item under discussion; the order in which various items should be placed on the agenda was also being discussed, as a result of the General Assembly's decision to refer two new items to the First Committee.

18. Sir Keith OFFICER (Australia) supported the proposal made by the representative of France. He did so for one reason and one reason only, and did not wish to complicate an already difficult debate.

19. The General Committee of the Assembly had decided, in spite of the late date, that item 76 was so important and so urgent that it should be included in the agenda of the present session. That recommendation had been approved by the General Assembly by a very large vote. Consequently, it would be illogical to place item 76 at the bottom of the First Committee's agenda.

20. Mr. WIERBLOWSKI (Poland) pointed out that, on 22 September 1950, the General Committee

(70th meeting), at the request of the delegation of the USSR, had decided to place on the agenda of the present session the complaint of United States aggression against China; in so doing, the General Committee had acted in pursuance of a communication from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Central People's Government which itemized more than eighty violations of Chinese territory by American aircraft and numerous examples of the bombardment of Chinese territory. The communication had also informed the United Nations of the number of casualties and the extent of the damage.

21. If the purpose of the United Nations was to curb aggression, it was legitimate to expect that steps would be taken to put an end to such obvious acts of aggression and to punish the culprits. Moreover, those events were linked to the armed attack by the United States on the freedom and independence of the Korean people.

22. Nevertheless, not only had item 70 been relegated to the bottom of the First Committee's agenda, in an attempt to minimize its significance but, after three meetings (405th, 406th and 407th meetings) at which the item had been considered, the proceedings of the First Committee had been interrupted and had not been resumed, even though there had been no plenary meeting of the General Assembly for several days. Mr. Dulles had had ample time to reply to the charges made by China and the Soviet Union (407th meeting), but the twenty-four hours he had requested had proved to be remarkably elastic.

23. The French delegation was now resorting to a new delaying tactic, that of giving priority to an item dealing with the alleged intervention of the People's Republic of China in Korea; however, that item was concerned with an absolutely unfounded accusation of the United States whereas the other items concerned the occupation of inalienable Chinese territory and murderous air raids. To encourage the American aggressors by further delay, to continue their criminal operations would be all the more inadmissible because the situation in Asia was grave and the sixty-eight violations committed from 25 to 30 November alone showed how great was the need, in the interest of the Far East, for prompt action to put an end to such acts of provocation.

24. The Chinese complaint ought therefore to be considered immediately, so that recommendations could be made to the Security Council. Any failure of the United Nations to do so would be harmful to international peace and security.

25. Despite the patience shown by the delegation which had submitted agenda item 70, the United States of America, having no answer to the charges made, had resorted to the good offices of the delegation of France to defer consideration of that item still further. The delegation of Poland could not, however, be a party to a violation of international law, democratic principles, the Charter and the General Assembly's rules of procedure. The delegation called upon the First Committee to continue forthwith its consideration of the complaint against the United States, and to take action likely to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security.

26. Mr. KYROU (Greece), referring to the remarks of the representative of Australia, submitted that the French proposal was in complete conformity with the rules of procedure. The reason why the General Assembly, as the representative of the USSR had pointed out, had not requested the First Committee to give priority to item 76 was that rule 98 of the rules of procedure stipulated that each of the main Committees should settle its own priorities for dealing with items referred to it.

27. Mr. HAJDU (Czechoslovakia) said that the manner in which the First Committee had dealt with the Soviet Union's complaint was absolutely unprecedented. It would be interesting to know why the First Committee, without any explanation having been given, had held no meetings for nearly a fortnight. Surely, some guidance should be given by the General Assembly to the Committees concerning the desirability of taking up such and such an item. In the present case, the consideration of the complaint of the Soviet Union had been obstructed, and it was now proposed to give priority to the alleged Chinese intervention. The reason perhaps was that the American armies were fleeing so rapidly that, in a few days, the draft resolution (A/C.1/638) would hardly be of even platonic interest. That was not, however, a reason for changing the agenda of the First Committee since the advance of the North Korean forces, far from endangering peace, represented the defeat of an aggressor. By contrast, American aggression in China and Korea was a threat to the peace; and if the maintenance of peace was the concern of the United Nations, the complaint of the Soviet Union should be considered as an urgent matter.

28. The Czechoslovak delegation opposed the French proposal to give priority to the so-called Chinese intervention, and requested the First Committee to confine its attention to the really important matter, which was the complaint made by the Soviet Union.

29. Mr. SANTA CRUZ (Chile) considered that, despite all arguments to the contrary, every organ of the United Nations had sovereign power to decide the urgency of the problems referred to it. Moreover, at the request of the Soviet Union, Poland or Czechoslovakia, the First Committee had in the past been asked to give priority to the consideration of the problem of executions of prisoners in Greece, and the delegations of those countries had not appeared to regard the procedure as in any way unusual.

30. Apart from the considerations mentioned by the representative of France, item 76 ought to receive priority because the majority of the members of the Security Council, which had the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace, regarded the problem as urgent and had submitted it to the General Assembly.

31. Although that reason was more than sufficient, it might be added that world public opinion was anxiously waiting to see how the United Nations would behave when confronted by aggression committed by an army of nearly one million well-equipped men who were fighting against the United Nations forces. The First Committee was answerable to world public opinion and hence should promptly consider the question referred to it by the General Committee of the General Assembly.

32. Mr. MUNIZ (Brazil) supported the request of the representative of France that agenda item 76 should receive priority. The Soviet Union's complaint did not involve danger to human life; and world public opinion, as the representative of Chile had declared, would not understand a procedure whereby the alleged violation of the territorial integrity of China was dealt with before more urgent problems, and for the purely formalistic reason that the former item was listed on the agenda above those other problems.

33. Grim dangers threatened the ideal of peace for which the United Nations had fought for five years. With such cases in view, it had been provided that the General Assembly could act if the Security Council failed to do so. That provision naturally implied that the General Assembly's action should be as prompt and as effective as the action which the Security Council was empowered to take under the Charter.

34. Mr. SARPER (Turkey) agreed with the delegation of Australia. The overwhelming majority by which the General Assembly had voted (319th plenary meeting) to include item 76 in the agenda demonstrated its importance and urgency. The delegation of Turkey, which felt that there was nothing irregular in giving precedence to an item for reasons of urgency and importance, would vote for the French proposal.

35. Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) stated that the issue before the First Committee was to decide what place on the agenda was to be given to item 76, which had been referred to the Committee by the General Assembly. Items 70 and 71, as well as the Soviet Union's complaint regarding the violation of Chinese air space by the United States of America (item 75) had not yet been dealt with. It might be asked, therefore, why priority should be given to the item which was the last to be put on the agenda. It would be interesting to know what logical reason the representative of France could advance in favour of such a procedure. Everybody knew whose armed forces had invaded Korea, had committed atrocities and savagely bombed peaceful cities while the invader's navy had blown up trading ports and fishing villages; it was the United States which had invaded and devastated Korea and which was still continuing to massacre its inhabitants and to bombard its shores. Consequently, the Chinese people, whose security was being threatened by the United States, had every reason to make grave charges against the United States, which had been guilty of provocation and aggression against Korea and China. Its patience exhausted, the Chinese people had accused the United States of America before the Security Council, and was now making that accusation before the First Committee.

36. A hearing should therefore be granted that very day to the representatives of the People's Republic of China during the continuation of the discussion on item 70. The Committee would then learn who had invaded Korea and who was devastating Chinese towns. That was the procedure demanded by world opinion, which called for the cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of American interventionist troops. However hard the representative of Chile might try to close his eyes and cover his ears, he could not be unaware of the turmoil of world public opinion or the reasons for Mr. Attlee's visit to the United States.

37. In the opinion of the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR, the First Committee was bound to consider the items on its agenda in the following order: item 70, item 71, item 75 and item 76. Accordingly, Mr. Kiselev formally moved that the Committee should do so.

38. Mr. ANZE MATIENZO (Bolivia) observed that the delegation of France had stated its proposal in the most measured terms. Mr. Vyshinsky had sought refuge in the maze of procedure, but the delegations of Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Byelorussian SSR had argued on the basis of urgency, which was enough to justify the French proposal. Furthermore, those delegations had wished to inject an emotional element into the debate; they had made wholesale accusations and had tried to deal with aggression and the threat to international peace generally. That was another reason why the delegation of Bolivia would vote for the French proposal. As the representative of Chile had stated, the First Committee must try to allay the fears which had been caused by the large-scale aggression against the forces of the United Nations in Korea.

39. Mr. ARMAND UGON (Uruguay) said that various speakers had stressed the importance of item 76. In the present grave international crisis, moreover, the First Committee should realize the urgency of the problem.

40. Yet, postponement of the discussion of the Soviet Union's complaint would in no way change the subsequent course of the procedure. As it was proposed to refer the matter to the Security Council, the complainants would still, in case of urgency, have the opportunity to submit the question to the Security Council.

41. Furthermore, in so far as item 76 was concerned, application to the Assembly was based on the resolution concerning united action for peace (A/1456, resolution A). If a threat to the peace was involved, any other consideration was secondary, particularly when the aggressor opposed an international police action taken by the United Nations.

42. The delegation of Uruguay considered that the First Committee, which dealt with political and security questions, should accede to the request of the representative of France for priority. That request took due account of the real international situation. The Uruguayan delegation would vote for the French proposal.

43. Mr. YOUNGER (United Kingdom) supported the French proposal with regard to the priority which should be given to item 76 of the agenda. The representative of the USSR had countered that proposal by merely procedural arguments, without touching upon substance. Rule 98 of the rules of procedure enabled the Committee to give priority to the consideration of any question which was of an urgent nature. The Committee alone was competent to decide its priorities. However, the General Committee (74th meeting) and the General Assembly (319th plenary meeting) had stressed the importance and the urgency of the matter. What was involved was not a question of procedure. The reason for postponement of the discussion of one question and the opening of discussion on another was linked to facts pertaining to the outside world, from which the USSR wished to divorce the debate, which it used only as a forum for propaganda. The objective

of the Committee however was, first and foremost, to deal with threats to peace and to meet those threats.

44. The representative of the Soviet Union had already addressed the First Committee (407th meeting) on the complaint of the alleged aggression committed against China by the United States of America. The question had nevertheless been postponed since the Security Council had been dealing with the same problem. The Security Council⁵ had since taken the view, by an overwhelming majority, that there was little connexion between the complaint of the Soviet Union and the realities. That did not mean that the discussion of the question would not be continued; but the intervention of Chinese communist troops in Korea demanded priority as a grave and urgent question. The facts were undeniable. The Chinese troops which had intervened in Korea opposed armed forces of the United Nations which had been sent there as a result of a United Nations resolution.⁶ As the representative of Chile had said, the First Committee had a special responsibility toward public opinion in that matter. The Committee could not shirk such a particularly urgent task.

45. Mr. BARANOVSKY (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) observed that there could be no question of the First Committee deciding at that time which of the items on the agenda should have priority, since the discussion of item 70 had already begun. That discussion had, in fact, been suspended at the request of Mr. Dulles (407th meeting), who had asked for a postponement so that he could prepare his reply to the accusations made by the representative of the USSR. Ten days had passed since then. Hence, consideration of that question should now be resumed.

46. The ten days' delay in the Committee's proceedings had not taken place by accident. In fact, the postponement of the discussion of the USSR complaint was closely related to the attempt presently being made to give priority to consideration of the slanderous complaint concerning the alleged intervention of Chinese communist troops in Korea. The United Kingdom representative had even pointed out that the Korean situation was well known; that implied that the Committee's decision was also known beforehand and that it would be merely a formality. The delegation of the United States was so convinced that the complaint of the Soviet Union against the United States would not be considered at that meeting that Mr. Dulles, despite his promise to reply to the accusations made by the Soviet Union, was not attending the present meeting.

47. The delegation of the Ukrainian SSR could not accept such a procedure and protested against the attempt to suspend consideration of an item on the agenda against the will of those who had proposed it. The delegation requested that the Committee continue the consideration of item 70 of the agenda and then deal with the next item.

48. FAWZI Bey (Egypt) considered that, in the circumstances, the French proposal was not only wise but necessary.

49. The representative of Egypt observed that, only two days previously, his delegation had joined with the

delegations of Afghanistan, Burma, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Yemen, in addressing an appeal to the North Korean authorities and the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to declare immediately that it was not their intention that any forces under their control should cross the 38th parallel. Such a declaration by them would make it possible, in the meantime, to seek some means of solution and to avoid the danger of a third world war. The urgency of the situation demanded that the Committee should not waste time on procedural questions; it should immediately consider item 76, as had been proposed by the representative of France.

50. Mr. SCHICK (Nicaragua) considered that the blood being shed in Korea fully justified giving priority to the question of the intervention of Chinese communist forces in Korea. Moreover, the question involved no procedural difficulties, since the Committee was competent to discuss the order in which it would deal with the items on its agenda. The representative of Nicaragua therefore supported the French proposal.

51. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq), noting that the intervention of Chinese communist troops in Korea constituted a serious threat to world peace, considered that the Committee should not waste time discussing questions of procedure. He appealed to the delegation of the USSR to agree that priority should be given to item 76 of the agenda.

52. Faris EL-KHOURI Bey (Syria) also felt that the intervention of Chinese communist troops in Korea seriously threatened world peace. In order to allay the prevailing anxiety, he asked that the question should be given priority. Besides, he could not understand why the delegation of the USSR objected, since it was in the interests of the USSR to have the question discussed as soon as possible.

53. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), referring to what had been said by the representative of Chile, pointed out that, while there was indeed nothing abnormal in the adjournment of a question when all the representatives agreed to it, lack of agreement among the representatives made such an adjournment abnormal. The proposals of the Soviet Union in connexion with the death sentences imposed upon Greek patriots had always been presented before the beginning of—and not during—the consideration of another item. Once those proposals had been rejected, the Soviet Union had waited for the Greek question to come up before resubmitting them. The argument presented by Mr. Santa Cruz was therefore unfounded.

54. The representative of Brazil had remarked that the question of the intervention of Chinese communist troops in Korea was an urgent one, since human lives were at stake. Was he oblivious of the fact that the bombing of Chinese territory by air forces of the United States equally endangered the lives of the population of China; or did he employ a double standard for the lives of South Koreans and Americans, on the one hand, and for the lives of the Chinese, on the other?

55. The representative of Turkey had used the argument that the question of the alleged intervention of Chinese forces in Korea ought to be examined first

⁵ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, No. 72, 530th meeting.*

⁶ *Ibid.*, No. 16.

because it had been adopted by the General Assembly (319th plenary meeting) by 51 votes to 5, with 4 abstentions. If that was so, it was clear that the item which should be examined first was the complaint made by the USSR regarding aggression against China by the United States of America, since the General Assembly's adoption of the inclusion of that item in the agenda had been unanimous.

56. The representative of Uruguay considered that the complaint of the Soviet Union was not urgent, since the delegation of the USSR had requested that the matter be referred to the Security Council. Had the representative of Uruguay forgotten that, under the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council was not only the one organ which could take effective steps to stop the aggression of the United States of America against China, but also that the Council was the only organ which could take all necessary action in an emergency, since it was continuously in session?

57. The United Kingdom representative, for his part, had confined himself to blaming the USSR delegation for having examined only the procedural aspect of the matter. In doing so, the Soviet Union had merely been following the directions of the Chairman of the General Committee, who at its last meeting (74th meeting) had urged members not to depart from that aspect of the question. If, however, the United Kingdom representative wished for a discussion on the substance of the question, it would perhaps be as well to remind him that, for the last five and a half months, war had been raging in Korea at the instigation of the United States and its allies. That war was linked to the aggressive policy of the United States with regard to China and involved especially attacks on Chinese territory by United States aircraft. In that connexion, it made little difference that the bombings that had taken place had been reconnaissance bombings, as had been claimed by Mr. Dulles (407th meeting). Whether strategic bombings or reconnaissance bombings, they had none the less cost the lives of a large number of victims. Such were the facts that made the proposal of the USSR an urgent one.

58. Mr. Younger had cited rule 98 of the rules of procedure in support of his view that priority should be given to the new item inscribed on the agenda. The provisions of that rule were not applicable to the case in point, because the First Committee had already established the order in which it would examine the various items of the agenda; and that order should be observed. When a new item was put on the agenda, rule 15 provided that it could not be considered until seven days had elapsed since it had been placed on the agenda. Clearly, in the present case, the majority

of the Committee would consider that the item was urgent and that a delay of seven days was not necessary for its consideration. That did not mean, however, that the new item ought to be examined at the expense of another one which was of an undoubtedly urgent nature. The delegation of the USSR had lost no opportunity of stressing the gravity and urgency of the question of United States aggression against China. The existence of a more urgent question had yet to be demonstrated.

59. On 8 November 1950, the representative of the United States of America had announced in the Security Council⁷ that the Chinese communist regime had intensified its assistance to the North Koreans and that General MacArthur had been confronted with Chinese armed forces. Thus, a month had elapsed since that very question had been submitted to the Security Council, without, however, any accusations having been made by the United States against the Chinese Government. For a month, therefore, the question had not been an urgent one. If it had now so suddenly become urgent, that was due solely to the military debacle suffered by the American interventionist troops.

60. An editorial which had appeared in the *New York Herald Tribune* on 6 December clearly indicated that no confidence could be placed in the figures given by General MacArthur's staff concerning the number of Chinese troops in Korea, since that staff had been guilty of a series of errors which had caused regrettable confusions of fact. Mr. Vyshinsky concluded that the United States delegation was stressing the urgency of the question in an attempt to save its face over the defeat of the American armies in Korea, and in order to avoid having to reply to the accusations advanced ten days previously (407th meeting) regarding American armed intervention against China.

61. In those circumstances there could be no question of renouncing the prior examination of the question of United States aggression against China and of American intervention in Korea. The policy of the United States was, in fact, a direct threat to the peace of the world. Accordingly, it would be wise to refer the matter to the Security Council, so that it might be examined calmly and without any feeling of panic.

62. The delegation of the USSR, though it was aware that most members of the Committee were ready to support the proposal of the representative of France, nevertheless appealed to the Committee to respect the principles of the United Nations and to reject the French proposal. That proposal was not justified by considerations of good sense or logic, of justice or equity, of a love of peace or a desire for true co-operation.

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.

⁷ *Ibid.*, No. 61, 519th meeting.