

*For further information
on the Soviet Union's
efforts for peace*

SOVIET BOOKLETS—the most recent in the series dealing with peace questions are:

Efforts of the Soviet Union Towards Summit Talks (2s.), New Steps for Peace by Socialist Countries (4d.), Efforts of the Soviet Union for Summit Talks and Peace (2s.), and The Middle East—Soviet Statements (4d.).

Soviet booklets, dealing with practically every aspect of Soviet life, and varying in price from 2d. to 2s., are published at the rate of one or two per month. **An annual subscription of 5s. will bring them all to you, post free.**

SOVIET NEWS—a daily information Bulletin, free on request, published by the Soviet Embassy. Contains reports, speeches, documents and interesting news items.

SOVIET WEEKLY—an illustrated magazine published every Thursday at 3d. It contains authentic well-written articles and up-to-date photographs on Soviet industry, agriculture, sport, education, stage and screen—and intelligent comment on international affairs.

THE SOVIET UNION IN FACTS AND FIGURES—This new book of 215 pages, lavishly illustrated, and with a large folded map, is the most useful volume on the Soviet Union yet available.

Plastic cover 5s., Library edition 7s. 6d.
Invaluable for home or school.

All the above (except for **SOVIET NEWS**) will be found at many booksellers. All are available from:

SOVIET BOOKLETS, 3 ROSARY GARDENS, LONDON, S.W.7

The Situation in the TAIWAN AREA

★ **Position
of the
SOVIET
UNION**

**Soviet Booklet
No. 41. Oct. 1958**

3^d

Scanned / Transcribed by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus – London Bureaux

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/intro.htm>

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk/english/home/index.php>



*For further information
on the Soviet Union's
efforts for peace*

SOVIET BOOKLETS—the most recent in the series dealing with peace questions are:

Efforts of the Soviet Union Towards Summit Talks (2s.), **New Steps for Peace by Socialist Countries** (4d.), **Efforts of the Soviet Union for Summit Talks and Peace** (2s.), and **The Middle East—Soviet Statements** (4d.).

Soviet booklets, dealing with practically every aspect of Soviet life, and varying in price from 2d. to 2s., are published at the rate of one or two per month. **An annual subscription of 5s. will bring them all to you, post free.**

SOVIET NEWS—a daily information Bulletin, free on request, published by the Soviet Embassy. Contains reports, speeches, documents and interesting news items.

SOVIET WEEKLY—an illustrated magazine published every Thursday at 3d. It contains authentic well-written articles and up-to-date photographs on Soviet industry, agriculture, sport, education, stage and screen—and intelligent comment on international affairs.

THE SOVIET UNION IN FACTS AND FIGURES—This new book of 215 pages, lavishly illustrated, and with a large folded map, is the most useful volume on the Soviet Union yet available.

Plastic cover 5s., Library edition 7s. 6d.
Invaluable for home or school.

All the above (except for **SOVIET NEWS**) will be found at many booksellers. All are available from:

SOVIET BOOKLETS, 3 ROSARY GARDENS, LONDON, S.W.7

Published by Soviet News, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, S.W.7, and printed by March Publicity Press Ltd. (T.U. all departments), London, S.E.1.

The Situation in the TAIWAN AREA



Position of the SOVIET UNION

Soviet Booklet
No. 41. Oct. 1958

3^d

CONTENTS

Page

| | |
|---|----|
| The Situation in the Taiwan Area—N. S. Khrushchov's Message to President Eisenhower, September 7, 1958 | 3 |
| Soviet Government's Note to the Government of the Chinese People's Republic on the Extension of its Territorial Waters to 12 Miles, September 9, 1958 | 8 |
| Soviet Note to Japan on the Use of Japan by U.S. Forces as a Base against China, September 16, 1958 | 8 |
| N. S. Khrushchov's Message to President Eisenhower on the Situation in the Taiwan Area, September 19, 1958 | 10 |
| Tass Statement on the U.S. Rejection of the Message of N. S. Khrushchov, September 22, 1958 | 15 |
| China's Representation in the United Nations—Speech of U.S.S.R. Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko in the United Nations General Assembly, September 22, 1958 | 16 |
| N. S. Khrushchov Answers Question Put by Tass Correspondent on President Eisenhower's Incorrect Assertions, October 5, 1958 | 23 |
| Appendix: Communiqué on the Meeting between N. S. Khrushchov and Mao Tse-tung, August 3, 1958 | 25 |

SITUATION IN TAIWAN AREA

N. S. Khrushchov's Message to President Eisenhower

First Deputy Foreign Minister of the U.S.S.R. V. V. Kuznetsov on September 7 received Mr. R. H. Davis, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of the United States in the U.S.S.R., and handed him the following message from N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, on the situation in the Taiwan area, to be forwarded to President Eisenhower.

MR. PRESIDENT,

I am addressing you on a very important question which, we are convinced, is gripping the minds of all those who cherish the cause of peace.

As a result of the policy pursued by the United States with regard to China, and particularly the steps now being taken by the American government in the area of the Chinese island of Taiwan and the Taiwan straits, a dangerous situation has emerged in the Far East. Mankind is again confronted with a direct threat of war.

At this crucial moment the government of the Soviet Union has decided to call on the United States government to show reasonableness, to refrain from steps which could entail irreparable consequences.

You know full well, Mr. President, that the Soviet Union stands firmly for peaceful co-existence among all states, irrespective of social or political systems, and comes out for the creation of conditions throughout the world ensuring a tranquil life for the peoples and preventing military conflicts. I believe no one will question the fact that the principles of peaceful co-existence have already received broad international recognition, and it can be said that an overwhelming majority of nations hold them to be the basis of their relations with other countries.

In the postwar years, however, an extremely abnormal situation has persisted in the Far East owing to the aggressive policy of the United States government, a policy of war. The main reason for the prevailing tension, or to put it bluntly, for this extremely dangerous situation, lies in the fact that the United States has seized by force of arms the ancient

Chinese territory of Taiwan and the Penghuletao* Islands, is continuing the occupation of this territory—covering it up by references to its support of the traitor to the Chinese people, Chiang Kai-shek—and is also trying to extend its aggression to Chinese off-shore islands.

As has repeatedly been stated by the Soviet government in the United Nations, and also in its correspondence with the United States government and the governments of other powers, the situation is absolutely impermissible in which such a great power as the Chinese People's Republic is deprived, because of the attitude of the United States government, of the opportunity to take part in the work of the United Nations, and when it is not represented in this organisation in spite of its lawful right to representation. You know just as well as I do that the Chinese state is one of the foundation members of the United Nations and that for this reason alone the prevailing situation is absolutely abnormal and represents a gross injustice to the Chinese people.

The situation which has developed now as a result of United States actions in the area of Taiwan and the Taiwan straits is a great worry to the Soviet government and the Soviet people. It will not be an overstatement to say that this situation alarms the whole world—every country, irrespective of the distance separating it from the area of Taiwan. If we look reality in the face, we will have to admit that the United States is striving to assume the functions of some kind of world gendarmes in this area. We believe that it is unseemly for any civilised state, no matter how strong or

* Pescadores

influential it is, to assume this role, and, what is more, that it is risky.

The United States government is staging military demonstrations in an attempt to prevent the liberation of Taiwan and to retain this Chinese island as its war base, directed, above all, against the Chinese People's Republic, and also to obstruct the lawful actions of the Chinese People's Republic to liberate the Chinese off-shore islands where the Chiang Kai-shekites have entrenched themselves. One of the biggest formations of the United States navy—the United States Seventh Fleet—is now in the area of the Taiwan straits. Hasty steps are being taken to reinforce this fleet, and warships and aircraft are being rushed to the Far East from the United States, the Mediterranean and other regions.

Moreover, it has been announced that "joint manoeuvres" of the naval forces and the marines of the United States with the Chiang Kai-shek clique will be held in the Taiwan area shortly, and new contingents of American troops are being rushed to Taiwan under this pretext. The question arises whether these actions can be regarded, in the prevailing situation, as other than a direct provocation. We believe that no other evaluation can be given to these actions, even with the most charitable approach.

It should be pointed out that the practice of rushing United States warships from one place to another has in general become frequent of late. Indeed, it can be almost unmistakably determined where the next blackmail or provocation will occur by the movement of American naval units.

Quite recently the world has witnessed such demonstrations by the American navy in the Mediterranean, when the United States carried out its military intervention in Lebanon and when the United States Sixth Fleet trained its guns on the capital of Lebanon, and on the whole of the country for that matter. Today, when attempts are being made at sabre-rattling and threatening China, we think it is appropriate to recall that China is not little Lebanon, which has recently fallen victim to a foreign intervention overwhelmingly condemned by

the latest emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly.

China's great 600 million people are strong and invincible not only by virtue of their inexhaustible resources, but also by virtue of their unity behind their government. They are advancing firmly and confidently along the road of developing and consolidating their country and increasing their well-being, a fact in which we in the Soviet Union sincerely rejoice and which cannot fail to please all those who wish the Chinese people well. But I should like to emphasise not only this aspect of the matter, but also the fact that China is not alone, that it has true friends who are ready to come to its aid at any moment in the event of an act of aggression against China, because the security interests of People's China are inseparable from those of the Soviet Union.

The practice of dispatching naval fleets and air wings from one part of the world to another—for instance, to the Middle East, the Far East, Latin America and other areas—to bring pressure to bear now on some nations, now on others, and to try to impose a foreign will on them, raises the question whether it is not time to put an end to such actions which cannot, naturally, be recognised as normal methods in international relations. It is legitimate to ask whether the United Nations should not consider this and take a decision forbidding powers to undertake such movements of their naval and air forces for the purposes of blackmail and intimidation and obliging them to keep these forces within their national frontiers.

I should like to make one more remark in connection with the use of such methods in United States foreign policy.

Does it not seem to you, Mr. President, that such dispatching of warships now in one direction, now in another, today loses much of its sense, at least with respect to countries possessing modern weapons? I do not know what your military advisers tell you, but it seems to us they cannot but know that the heyday of surface navy powers is over. In the age of nuclear and rocket weapons of unprecedented power and rapid action

these once formidable warships are fit, in fact, for nothing but courtesy visits and gun salutes, and can serve as targets for the right types of rockets. This may hurt the pride of people closely connected with the navy, but these are incontestable facts one cannot ignore.

Hardly a day passes without certain political and military leaders of the United States hurling threats at People's China. This is the only meaning of the repeated statements of the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, on the United States' actions in the Taiwan area and, notably, the statement he made on your behalf and his own on September 4. This statement cannot but be strongly condemned. It represents an undisguised attempt at gross and uncerecerious infringement of the sovereign rights of other states. The government of the United States, having no right at all to do so, takes the liberty of arbitrarily fixing some limits of its own interests and of the spheres of operations of its armed forces on the territory of China. Such actions cannot be classed as other than aggressive, and will certainly be condemned as such by all peoples.

Nor can one assess in any other way the United States government's statement of September 6.

One cannot fail to note the provocative statement by United States Minister of Defence McElroy which contains barefaced threats against the Chinese People's Republic and attempts to justify the aggressive actions of the American armed forces in the Far East and to shield the Chiang Kai-shek clique. And the commander of the American armed forces in Taiwan, Vice-Admiral Smoot, lost all sense of proportion when he proclaimed the United States' intention of joining with the Chiang Kai-shek clique in defeating communist China.

Military leaders in the United States are also trying, with the tacit agreement of the American government, to resort to atomic blackmail against China, acting, evidently, under the lingering impression of the mood that reigned in Washington during the period of the United States' shortlived monopoly of atomic weapons.

Even at that time, it will be recalled, the policy of atomic blackmail was not a success, nor could it be. It is needless to say that the attempts to frighten other nations by atomic weapons are utterly hopeless in the present circumstances, with the United States having long lost the monopoly of atomic arms.

I say this because it seems to me that there are still some people in the United States who do not want to part with the policy of intimidation and atomic blackmail, although every day seems to furnish enough evidence that such a policy is for ever doomed to failure.

It can be said with full confidence that no threats or blackmail can scare the Chinese people. This has been made obvious, too, by the statement made by Chou En-lai, Premier of the Government Council of the Chinese People's Republic, on September 6. The Chinese people want peace and they are upholding peace. But they do not fear war. Should a war be forced on China, whose people are determined to defend their righteous cause, we have not the least doubt that the Chinese people will strike back at the aggressor in a fitting manner.

The United States' aggressive preparations in the Far East are not, judging by all indications, confined to the Taiwan straits. There are reports that Syngman Rhee, encouraged and egged on by the United States, is again preparing for war provocations and airing his intention to "march north." Some people in the United States seem to have definite plans for turning Korea into a field of bloody struggle once again. Is it not for this reason, by the way, that the United States government is so adamant in its refusal to withdraw its troops from South Korea? But there must be no repetition of the Korean tragedy and Syngman Rhee's criminal designs must be curbed. There can be no doubt that, should the Syngman Rhee clique risk another "march" of theirs, they would suffer the same fate that befell them when the Korean people and the Chinese People's Volunteers inflicted a real defeat on the aggressor and destroyed all their plans. It goes without saying that the responsibility for Syngman Rhee's provocations

lies entirely with the government of the United States.

At the recent emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly you spoke, Mr. President, of an alleged threat of some indirect aggression against certain Arab countries in the Middle East from other Arab states, and called for condemnation of this non-existent indirect aggression. Now the United States is itself carrying out, not only indirect, but also direct aggression in the Far East by occupying the Chinese island of Taiwan and propping up the anti-national clique of traitors to the Chinese people who have entrenched themselves on that island under the protection of American arms and are using it as a base for piratical attacks against China.

The United States is wont to make references to certain commitments "with regard to the defence" of the Taiwan area to justify sending its armed forces to the Taiwan straits and the adjacent waters of the Pacific. But have the Chinese people asked the American government to assume such commitments to which they now refer in obstructing China's exercise of its sovereign right to Taiwan and other Chinese islands?

The American people themselves had in the past to beat off the attempts of foreign powers to intervene in their home affairs and to impose their will on them by force of arms. It is well known that those attempts had a sad ending for those who made them. Would it not be right to draw the proper conclusions from this historical experience of the United States and end the policy of interference in China's affairs? For, indeed, if national independence is dear to the American people, why should it not be just as dear to the Chinese people, or to any other people for that matter?

You will, perhaps, consider what I have said as too sharp. I beg to differ. The only thing I want to do in this letter to you, just as on other occasions, is to speak my mind and to emphasise the full gravity of the situation which has developed in the area of Taiwan and China's off-shore islands as a result of the United States' actions. If we were to clothe our thoughts in outwardly cour-

teous diplomatic wording, we would find it, I think, more difficult to see each other's point. But we do want you, the government of the United States and the entire American people, with whom we want to have nothing but good relations and friendship, to have a correct idea of the consequences which the United States' current actions in the Far East may entail.

It would be a serious miscalculation for the United States to believe that one can make short work of China, just as some powers used to do in the past. Such a miscalculation would have grave consequences for the cause of world peace. Let us, therefore, make this quite clear, for any misunderstanding and equivocal statements are most dangerous things in such matters.

An attack on the Chinese People's Republic, which is a great friend, ally and neighbour of our country, is an attack on the Soviet Union. Loyal to its duty, our country would do everything to defend, jointly with People's China, the security of both countries and the interests of peace in the Far East and throughout the rest of the world.

Nothing could be more erroneous than to try to read in this message of mine an intention to lay the colour on too thickly, let alone any threats. All we want to do is to draw your attention to the situation which no one would be able to get out of, neither you, nor we, should a war break out in the Far East. We want to find a common language with you so as to end the present downward movement and so that the U.S.S.R., the United States, the Chinese People's Republic and other countries may join efforts in removing the tension which has now arisen in the Far East, and so that one could say that a good job for world peace had been done by combined efforts.

Of course, it is the business of the United States government to decide whether to "recognise" or "not recognise" the Chinese People's Republic. It can be only noted in this connection that neither the fact of the Chinese People's Republic's existence as one of the

world's great powers, nor the role which this state now plays in international relations are changed by this. But at present the United States government's policy with regard to China has brought about a situation in which the question of the United States' attitude to China has transcended the bounds of purely domestic affairs of the United States.

A situation has developed which affects the interests of many countries. The tension in relations between the United States and China, artificially kept up by United States policy, and even more so the steps now being taken by the United States in the Far East, tend to aggravate the relations between all the great powers—the founders of the United Nations. It is no exaggeration to say that the present policy of the United States with regard to China complicates the solution of many important international problems and greatly hampers the normal functioning of the United Nations as an international organisation charged with safeguarding peace.

There is only one Chinese state, and it is in China, not elsewhere; and Taiwan and the other Chinese islands where the Chiang Kai-shekites have entrenched themselves are a part of China.

Only the government whose seat is in the capital of China—Peking—and whom the many millions of Chinese people have charged with the administration of the country has the right and actual possibility to represent China in international relations. Only the unrealistic position of the United States government, which still prefers to close its eyes to the real state of affairs in China, prevents the United Nations members from taking the only correct decision—of evicting from this organisation the political corpse of the Chiang Kai-shek impostor and of giving the representatives of great China their lawful seat in the United Nations.

Will any one deny that China is striving to liberate its territory which has been turned into a foreign war base that is a constant threat to the peaceful

life of the Chinese people? China has every legitimate right to take all the necessary measures against the traitor Chiang Kai-shek. It is taking these measures on its own soil and is not dispatching troops to the territories of other countries. These actions of the Chinese People's Republic are nothing but a lawful measure of self-defence stipulated by the United Nations Charter. Absolutely different are the actions of the United States government, which is striving to assume the right to send its armed forces many thousands of kilometres away from the United States to retain the Chinese islands it has captured. It is not without reason that even the allies of the United States under military groupings criticise rather loudly American policy towards China and point out that it is unrealistic and dangerous.

I believe that every person who is really concerned for the fate of the world cannot but speak up in support of ending the abnormal and dangerous situation which has developed as a result of the present political line of the United States government in the Far East. The Soviet government is convinced that, for this purpose, it is necessary to give up, above all, the narrow-minded and absolutely unrealistic approach to the great historical changes which have taken place in China, it is necessary to recognise the lawful rights and interests of the Chinese People's Republic and to end once and for all the policy of provocations and blackmail against the Chinese people.

There can be no lasting peace in the Far East until the American naval forces are withdrawn from the Taiwan straits, until the American soldiers are recalled home from Taiwan. We are convinced that this view is shared not only by the Soviet Union and the other socialist states, but also by all the other nations which highly prize the cause of peace in the Far East and throughout the world.

Mr. President, in closing this message, which is dictated by the awareness of the great responsibility which our countries bear for safeguarding world peace,

I wish to emphasise strongly that it fully depends on the further actions of the United States government whether peace will prevail in the Far East or whether this area will remain a dangerous breeding ground of war. I should like to hope that you will receive this message of the Soviet government with due understanding. I also permit myself to express the conviction that this message will be correctly understood by all the American people who, we are convinced, as all the other

peoples, want peace and do not want war.

If the United States government takes the road of respecting the lawful and sovereign rights of the great Chinese people, this will undoubtedly be assessed with satisfaction by all the nations as a big contribution by the United States to the cause of consolidating universal peace.

Respectfully yours,

N. KHRUSHCHOV

Moscow. September 7, 1958.

SOVIET NOTE TO GOVERNMENT OF CHINESE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

ON September 9, U.S.S.R. Chargé d'Affaires in the Chinese People's Republic S. F. Antonov handed to Chang Han-fu, Deputy Foreign Minister of the Chinese People's Republic, a Note from the Soviet government to the government of the Chinese People's Republic.

The Note says that the government of the U.S.S.R. will fully respect the Chinese government's decision that the territorial waters of the Chinese People's Republic extend to 12 nautical miles, and that no foreign vessels of a military type or foreign aircraft may enter the republic's territorial waters or the air space above them without the permission of the Chinese government.

The U.S.S.R. government takes note of

the fact that the decision of the government of the Chinese People's Republic refers to all the territories of the republic, including continental China, Taiwan and the adjacent islands, the Penghu Islands (Pescadores) and all other islands belonging to the Chinese People's Republic.

The appropriate Soviet organisations, says the Note, have received instructions regarding strict adherence to the 12-mile zone of territorial waters of the Chinese People's Republic.

SOVIET NOTE TO JAPAN

Warns of Danger of becoming Accessory to U.S. Aggression

The Soviet Embassy in Japan, on September 16, handed the Japanese Foreign Ministry the following Soviet government Note to the Japanese government:

THE Embassy of the U.S.S.R. in Japan, on behalf of the Soviet government, has the honour to state the following to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan:

The government of the United States has recently taken a number of provocative and dangerous actions in the area of Taiwan aimed against the Chinese People's Republic.

The United States has alerted its Seventh Fleet, is reinforcing it with units of the Sixth Fleet and has transferred new air force units to Taiwan. Instances of American planes violating China's air

space have become more frequent.

With the support of the United States armed forces, the Chiang Kai-shek supporters, who have entrenched themselves on some of the offshore islands of China, have been subjecting the Chinese coast to artillery fire.

Leading members of the American Administration and some American generals and admirals have come out with aggressive statements with respect to the Chinese People's Republic.

In consequence of these actions by the United States the situation in the Far East has become aggravated and a situation has arisen which is fraught with a danger to peace.

In connection with the events in the Taiwan area, reports have appeared in the American and Japanese press and have been given out over the radio saying that the American military command has also alerted the United States armed forces stationed on the territory of Japan. The American *United Press International* reports that the American Fifth Air Force wing in Japan has been alerted. Speaking of the military preparations of the United States Seventh Fleet, which is in the Taiwan Strait, the Tokyo radio said on August 26, this year, that the United States naval forces stationed in Japan had also received orders to stand by.

The American newspaper *Christian Science Monitor* reported on August 30, this year, that the United States Seventh Fleet could put up to a thousand planes in the air. Moreover, the United States had aircraft based on the Philippines, Okinawa and Japan apparently capable of atomic delivery. The American press also reported the landing on Taiwan of 4,000 American marines moved from

Japan, and also Okinawa, to take part in landing operations.

These and similar reports show that Japanese territory is being used by the United States armed forces in their provocative, aggressive actions, a fact of which the Japanese government is naturally well aware.

The Soviet government considers it its duty to call the Japanese government's attention to the fact that if these reports are true, a situation is arising for Japan in which she might become, willingly or unwillingly, an accessory to the aggressive actions of the United States directed against the Chinese People's Republic and constituting a grave threat to peace in the Far East and throughout the world.

The Soviet government far from believes that Japan and the Japanese people want to become an accessory to these actions of the United States, in view of the grave consequences that this might have for peace and for Japan herself. Nevertheless, the Soviet government cannot ignore the aforementioned reports—reports, moreover, which the Japanese government has not denied.

The government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics expresses the hope that the Japanese government will give serious consideration to the situation and take the necessary measures to prevent the possibility of Japanese territory being used for aggressive actions by the armed forces of the United States. The Soviet government proceeds from the assumption that both sides, the U.S.S.R. and Japan, are interested—and, indeed, they cannot fail to be interested—in the Far East being an area of firm and lasting peace.

NIKITA KHRUSHCHOV'S MESSAGE TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER ON THE SITUATION IN THE TAIWAN AREA

On September 19, Vasily Kuznetsov, U.S.S.R. Deputy Foreign Minister, received the United States Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow, Mr. R. H. Davis, and handed him the following message from Nikita Khrushchov to President Eisenhower on the situation in the Taiwan area, in reply to the President's letter of September 12.

ON receiving your letter of September 12, and on studying it, I was sorry to note that, as I see it, you have failed to appreciate the essential meaning of my message to you. My message was meant to show the full extent of the danger that will face mankind unless the United States of America abandons its aggressive policy, which is creating centres of grave conflict, now in one area of the world, now in another, and has brought about the present particularly tense situation in the Far East.

While admitting in your reply that a dangerous situation has developed in the Taiwan area, you are at the same time seeking to absolve the United States government of the responsibility for the tension there which is endangering peace. Moreover, to whitewash the aggressive actions of the United States, your message completely distorts the actual state of affairs and draws a picture which has nothing in common with the realities.

If the existing situation is viewed soberly and on the basis of the actual facts, one is bound to admit that the only real source of the tension in that part of the world consists in the fact that the United States has seized inalienable Chinese territory—Taiwan and a number of other islands—and is maintaining under its armed protection the Chiang Kai-shek clique thrown out by the Chinese people, and encouraging its attacks and provocations against People's China.

The recent events are some of the numerous manifestations of this general aggressive policy of the United States with respect to China.

I am surprised at your remark that, while sending a message to you, I did

not send any communication to, as you put it, China's communist leaders, with respect to whom and to the Chinese People's Republic your message in a number of instances has a slighting and hostile tone. First of all, Mr. President, I should like to say the following in this connection:

No party or its leaders, and not a single government throughout the whole of China's history have enjoyed such confidence and boundless support of the entire Chinese people as are enjoyed by the great Communist Party of China and its leaders, and also by the government of the Chinese People's Republic. Yes, the Communist Party leaders are, indeed, the recognised leaders of the Chinese people.

It is they who are today not only at the head of the Chinese Communist Party but also at the head of the entire Chinese people and of the new people's democratic state—the Chinese People's Republic.

I addressed my message on the Taiwan events to the President of the United States and not to the government of the Chinese People's Republic for the simple reason that it is not China that is interfering in the internal affairs of the United States of America, but the United States which, trampling underfoot all the standards of behaviour of civilised nations, has grossly interfered in China's affairs and is trying by force of arms to have things all its own way in someone else's house, in this way creating a grave threat to peace in the Far East.

Moreover, Mr. President, to urge us, as you do, to exert some influence on the government of the Chinese People's Republic in connection with the Taiwan

events, means trying to induce the Soviet Union to interfere in the internal affairs of China. The Soviet Union would never be a party to such a shameful affair, as that would be fundamentally contrary to its peaceful foreign policy and would be incompatible with the relationship of unbreakable friendship and fraternal co-operation between the Soviet and the Chinese peoples.

As you found it fit to mention in your letter, I have been to Peking lately and had a chance to exchange views with the leaders of the government of the Chinese People's Republic on all matters of interest to the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic. I can tell you frankly and straightforwardly that the full unanimity of views of the U.S.S.R. and the Chinese People's Republic on the main thing, that is, on the necessity of continuing to struggle resolutely against all forces of aggression and of supporting the forces working for peace all over the world, was reaffirmed during our discussions in Peking.

The Chinese people are determined to develop their economy and advance their standards of living, which can only be done in conditions of peace and security. It is quite natural, therefore, that the people of China should feel grave concern at the situation which has developed in the Taiwan area.

It is solely because the United States government, interfering in the internal affairs of China, has taken the venal Chiang Kai-shek clique under its armed protection that the intolerable situation could persist in which a general, expelled by the Chinese people, who has defied the legal government of China and taken possession of some offshore islands lying within a few kilometres of big centres in China's coastal areas, has been ensconced in Taiwan for a number of years.

Who can deny that, but for United States support, there would long since have been no Chiang Kai-shek clique or the so-called Taiwan problem, and that but for United States interference the peoples of the whole area would have long since been living in peace and security. It is clear to all that the reason why the United States has illegally

seized those islands is that by keeping Chiang Kai-shek's clique in being on Taiwan it is able to maintain its own armed forces in that area and threaten the Chinese People's Republic with war. Only Chiang Kai-shek, traitor and betrayer of the Chinese people as he is, could let a foreign power—the United States of America—range its armed forces against China, against the Chinese people.

You are trying to substantiate the untenable claim that the United States government has some kind of moral and legal right to keep its armed forces in the Taiwan area. Everyone is free to interpret the facts to suit his own moral principles. But you cannot get away from the facts. They speak for themselves.

The facts are that the United States government has forcibly seized islands belonging to the Chinese people—lands which are 10,000 kilometres away from the American continent—and that it is bent on keeping them. Moreover, you want China to give up that part of her territory and resign herself to it being in foreign hands and used as a base for extending aggression against the Chinese People's Republic and other peaceloving countries of Asia.

But is it not obvious—and is it, indeed, not shown by the entire experience of the peoples' struggle for national liberation and independence—that such a great world power as the Chinese People's Republic will never agree to part of its territory being alienated and used as a place for massing foreign armed forces for aggression against it.

The United States government wants to maintain this situation as it is, as may be seen from your letter. What else can be meant by your remark to the effect that I did not address a letter to the leaders of the Chinese People's Republic urging them to moderation? Had we agreed with your point of view, we would, in fact, have been contributing to the preparations for a war against China, our great friend and ally. To imagine this possibility for a moment is enough to see how utterly absurd it is. How can one expect us, Mr. President, to lull the vigilance of our Chinese

friends and abet the aggressive forces in their preparations for an attack on the Chinese People's Republic, and thereby in their preparations for an attack on the Soviet Union? It is futile to expect us to do so.

In your letter you state that Taiwan and the offshore islands have never been under the control of communist China. This statement seems to be meant to justify the attempt to alienate these islands from the Chinese People's Republic.

However, the United States of America solemnly recognised China's sovereignty over those islands in the Cairo Declaration of 1943. This was reaffirmed in the Potsdam Declaration of 1945, which was signed by the United States and certain other great powers. These declarations bear the signatures of your predecessors—Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

But have these territories ceased to be Chinese since the victory of the people's revolution in China resulted in the creation of a government which represents the will of the entire Chinese people and guides itself by the ideas of communism? Of course they have not. To deny this is to interfere in the internal affairs of other peoples and to arrogate to oneself certain police functions.

It appears from your statement that the United States government does not, unfortunately, intend to desist from interference in the internal affairs of China and from an aggressive policy towards the Chinese People's Republic, and this is a very dangerous policy, fraught with the threat of an armed conflict in the Far East and in other areas. Indeed, if Britain, for instance, were to build her policy on such a concept, she might, if she could, start a war against the United States for the simple reason that what is now the territory of the United States was once a colony of the British Empire.

Nor can one fail to note that in opposing Taiwan and the offshore islands to the whole of China, as you do in your letter, an undisguised attempt is being made to create a situation of "two Chinas." Such attempts, which

are aimed at the dismemberment of China, are resolutely rejected by the people and government of the Chinese People's Republic, just as by all those who respect the sovereign rights of the peoples and the territorial integrity of states.

You seem, Mr. President, to be still proceeding from the assumption that Chiang Kai-shek represents something in China. In reality, however, he is no more than a hated shadow of the past in the eyes of China's 600 million people. And they want this shadow to disappear once and for all as soon as possible. There is only one government of China. That is the government of the Chinese People's Republic. To fail to see this means to base one's actions on illusions, which certainly cannot serve as a basis for any country's foreign policy.

Also unfounded is the assertion in your letter that the American armed forces are operating in the Taiwan area in pursuance of the United States' contractual commitments to a handful of traitors to the Chinese people, with Chiang Kai-shek at the head of these traitors. And this notwithstanding the fact that this handful of people—whom former U.S. Secretary of State Acheson described as early as 1949 as corrupt individuals who had forfeited the confidence of the people—have long represented no one but themselves. Today Chiang Kai-shek has no more reason to act as a representative of China than, say, Kerensky would have to act as a representative of the Soviet people. But to follow the logic of your letter one would say that so long as Kerensky is alive and is kept somewhere in the United States, and with whom, as the head of Russia's one time provisional government, you could also conclude a treaty, the United States might start a war against the Soviet Union, basing itself on such a treaty just as it is basing itself today on its treaty with Chiang Kai-shek. Is it not clear from this example that all references to contractual commitments like those the United States has as regards Chiang Kai-shek are absurd? It is for the purpose of covering up aggressive designs that

treaties of this kind are conceived and concocted.

You maintain in your letter that Chiang Kai-shek—who is in the pay of the United States government—is recognised by the majority of states. I would not engage in such arithmetics, Mr. President, for it can lead to serious miscalculations. But I must point out that the Chinese People's Republic has by now been recognised by more than 30 states with a population of over 1,000 million. As for the fact that the Chiang Kai-shek clique is recognised by a number of governments, you are very well aware of how hard it has been and is for the United States to keep this recognition alive. Your Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, is equally well aware of this. I will not be divulging any secret if I say that the states still maintaining relations with the Chiang Kai-shek clique are disturbed by this recognition and that it is in its final hour.

Surely, the majority of the states which, under pressure from the United States, still maintain diplomatic relations with Chiang Kai-shek will be glad when this situation—which is obviously contrary to common sense and the interests of the peoples of these countries—comes to an end and when China occupies her rightful place in international organisations.

You are, of course, aware of the fact that even those countries which do not dare to recognise the Chinese People's Republic, lest they evoke the displeasure of the United States, feel serious anxiety over the possible consequences of the present policy of the United States towards the Chinese People's Republic. This is only natural because the threats uttered by American statesmen against the Chinese People's Republic, and also the build up of American armed forces and other military preparations by the United States in the Taiwan area, actually create the danger of an armed conflict breaking out, with all the dangerous consequences that would entail.

As for blackmail and threats with regard to People's China, one must say

that they have not achieved and cannot achieve their purpose. As I noted in my previous message, certain American military leaders are even trying to threaten China with atomic weapons. Press reports say that units of the American air force, equipped with nuclear weapons, have been rushed to Taiwan together with various rockets and guided missiles of the "Nike-Hercules" type, and that missile-launching ramps are being built, and so on.

Such actions by the United States government cannot, naturally, reduce tension in that area, cannot improve the general climate or create the conditions for greater confidence. On the contrary, these actions tend to aggravate the situation and increase the danger of an outbreak of war involving the use of the most devastating modern weapons.

I must tell you outright, Mr. President, that atomic blackmail with regard to the Chinese People's Republic will intimidate neither us nor the Chinese People's Republic. Those who harbour plans for an atomic attack on the Chinese People's Republic should not forget that the other side too has atomic and hydrogen weapons and the appropriate means to deliver them, and if the Chinese People's Republic falls victim to such an attack, the aggressor will at once suffer a rebuff by the same means.

A war against China on the pretext of defending the security interests of the United States, or on any other equally artificial pretext, will gain nothing for the United States. To touch off a war against People's China means to doom sons of the American people to certain death and to spark off the conflagration of a world war. It means to assume a grave responsibility before mankind, before history. The responsibility for this will also rest with you personally, Mr. President.

Need one say that such an act by the American government would be unanimously condemned by the peoples of the whole world, including, I am convinced, the American people?

I told you earlier, and feel it necessary to stress once more, that an attack

on the Chinese People's Republic is an attack on the Soviet Union. We have a Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance with this great friend, ally and neighbour of our country, a treaty meeting the fundamental interests of the Soviet and Chinese peoples, the interests of peace, and let no one doubt that we shall fully honour our commitments.

Therefore I would like to appeal to you once more not to bring the atmosphere to red heat, not to create conditions which would trouble mankind, craving for peace as it is, and to weigh up all the circumstances before taking steps which might have disastrous consequences.

The governments, above all the governments of our countries, are duty bound to do everything necessary to ensure that international developments move in the direction of increasing peaceful co-operation, developing trade, economic ties and cultural relations among states, so that all the fruits of man's labour may go to improve the well-being of the peoples and to ensure continued progress.

After your election as President of the United States of America, Soviet statesmen pinned great hopes on you. Remembering the experience of excellent co-operation between the Soviet Union and the United States when you were the commander-in-chief of the armed forces of the United States, Britain and France in the war against fascism, against Hitler Germany, we hoped that this co-operation would also be possible after the war, in the present period, in the interests of preserving and consolidating peace.

However, the policy you are now pursuing as President has largely undermined these good feelings, and to an increasing extent strengthens our belief that the "brink of war" policy of Mr. Dulles is in fact inseparable from your name, is associated with it. This is highly regrettable.

In our times "the positions of strength" policy, the policy of balancing "on the brink of war," cannot be successful. In

contrast to the time when Hitler unleashed world war, the peace forces have now grown immeasurably and, what is more important, the international balance of forces has changed radically in their favour.

History will pass stern judgment on those statesmen who, against all common sense and the interests of the peoples of the whole world, embark on the road of military adventures.

It is universally known that the government of the Chinese People's Republic has repeatedly taken the initiative in putting forward proposals aimed at relaxing tension in the Far East, and at settling outstanding international problems in that area peacefully. Contrary to the contention in your message, in the course of the Chinese-American Ambassadorial talks in Geneva the representative of China repeatedly suggested that both parties, on the basis of the principles of mutual respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in one another's internal affairs, should make a statement concerning their readiness to solve disputes between the Chinese People's Republic and the United States in the Taiwan area by peaceful negotiation and not to rely on force or the threat of force. The Chinese-American talks in Geneva failed to yield positive results only because the United States refused to adopt this attitude and later on unilaterally broke off negotiations.

Mr. President, you declare in your message that you welcome the resumption of talks between the United States and the Chinese People's Republic. We also welcome the initiative taken by the Chinese People's Republic and are glad that the efforts of the Chinese people's government in this direction found a response on the United States government's part.

We also hope that at these talks the United States will at last take a reasonable, realistic attitude. The only reasonable and realistic attitude on the United States government's part would be to approach the present situation with due consideration for the historic

changes which have occurred in China, to stop supporting the Chiang Kai-shek clique and to draw the necessary conclusions from the fact that China is the Chinese People's Republic, whose government represents the Chinese state, the entire Chinese people.

If one does not wish to engage in a policy of preparing war, but really wishes to be guided by the ideal of peaceful co-operation, then the most important thing is to recognise the government of the Chinese People's Republic. Such a step by the United States government would clarify the international situation at once and would be welcomed everywhere as a highly valuable contribution to the cause of maintaining peace.

This approach to the solution of international problems from the standpoint of peaceful co-operation also makes it imperative to discontinue the tactics of obstruction in the United Nations and to refrain from raising obstacles to the solution of the most urgent problem of restoring China's rights in the United Nations. All the member-states of the United Nations would welcome such a decision, since without the Chinese People's Republic the United Nations cannot be a completely representative international body for maintaining international peace and security in confor-

mity with the United Nations Charter.

An end must be put once and for all to intervention in China's internal affairs. The American fleet must be recalled from the Taiwan Strait and American troops must leave Taiwan and go home. Without these steps there can be no lasting peace in the Far East. If the United States does not do that now, People's China will have no other recourse but to expel the hostile armed forces from its own territory which is being converted into a bridgehead for attacking the Chinese People's Republic.

We fully support the Chinese government and the Chinese people. We have supported and will continue to support their policy.

However, if the United States government adopts the course of respecting the sovereign rights of the great Chinese people and will be guided in its policy towards China by the principles of peaceful co-existence, we do not doubt that this will not only enable the present tension in the Taiwan area to be removed, but will also create the necessary conditions for reliably strengthening peace in the Far East and throughout the world.

Respectfully yours,

N. KHRUSHCHOV

Moscow. September 19, 1958

TASS STATEMENT

AS has been reported in the press, on September 19 N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, sent a message on the situation in the Taiwan area to President Dwight D. Eisenhower of the United States.

The message from the head of the Soviet government to the President of the United States, which was prompted by serious anxiety over the aggravation of tension in the Far East, dangerous to the cause of peace and brought about by the aggressive actions of the American ruling circles in the Taiwan Strait area, has been assessed by the public everywhere as another important initiative taken by

the Soviet Union in its consistent struggle for the maintenance and strengthening of world peace.

Quite different was the reaction to N. S. Khrushchov's message by those who bear the direct responsibility for the situation in the Taiwan area, a situation which places the cause of maintaining peace in jeopardy.

Tass has been informed that on September 21 the United States Embassy in Moscow, acting on the instructions of the American government, returned N. S. Khrushchov's message addressed to the United States President, alleging it to be unacceptable.

Such a step by the United States government can hardly be assessed in any other way than as evidence of the unwillingness of the American ruling circles to heed the voice of reason, as another instance showing how little these circles respect the demand of the peoples that an end be put to the policy of sabre-rattling which has brought the world to the brink of war, and that the road of settling outstanding international issues

peacefully must be taken. This reply confirms once again that "the truth hurts" the representatives of these circles.

As for the Soviet government, it will continue actively and consistently to uphold the cause of maintaining peace, and will speak the truth whether or not it is to the liking of those whose policy constantly creates centres of serious international conflict, now in one part of the world, now in another.

CHINA'S REPRESENTATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

USSR Foreign Minister's Speech in UN General Assembly on September 22

The following is the full text of the speech made by U.S.S.R. Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko on September 22 in the United Nations General Assembly debate on the question of placing China's representation in U.N.O. on the Assembly's agenda:

THE U.S.S.R. delegation fully supports India's motion to put the question of China's representation in the United Nations on the agenda of our General Assembly session.

The Assembly again has before it—for how many years already—this question which in general would never have come up had the spirit and the letter of the United Nations Charter been strictly abided by. Today, without a shadow of a doubt, the question of restoring the lawful rights of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations is a central issue in international affairs.

In defiance of the lucid, clear-cut provisions of the United Nations Charter, contrary to the universally recognised standards of international law, and finally, simply in defiance of common sense, the representative of China has been absent from our midst for many years, that is to say, the representative of a power which was one of the founders of the United Nations and in which a quarter of the world's population lives. This concerns

a great country, a state most rich in history and culture. It is enough to note that in many realms of science and culture China had already reached tremendous heights millenniums ago. These are the plain facts of history, which we cannot dismiss.

Even if we take this aspect of the matter alone, it is enough to show how nonsensical is the position of those preventing the lawful representatives of the Chinese people from occupying their seat side by side with us in the United Nations. Why, then, is China absent from U.N.O., a situation that is patently abnormal and impermissible? Naturally, I am revealing no secret when I say that the only reason for this is the United States government's hostile policy towards the Chinese people and their state, and the pressure that the American government has accordingly been exerting for a number of years now on many United Nations members as soon as the question of China's representation comes up.

The United States government apparently has its own reasons to fear

the restoration of China's rights in U.N.O. It is sufficient to recall that for eight years now the U.S.A. has been occupying part of Chinese territory—the island of Taiwan and the Penghu archipelago, the seizure of which was an act of outright aggression in relation to China. One can appreciate that it would not be particularly pleasant for the representatives of those who effected this seizure to come face to face here with the representatives of the country against which the aggression was carried out.

It is also a known fact that the United States government does not approve of the social system the Chinese people set up in their country after the people's revolution had done away with the domination of the foreign imperialists and their placemen.

For the United States government, with its "positions of strength" policy, not to approve of the internal system in one country or another spells in the majority of cases attempts at direct interference in the affairs of that country, in order to impose its will upon it and establish a regime to suit the United States ruling circles. Washington has still not abandoned such designs either on the Chinese People's Republic, although it should be clear to all that these are merely the vain hopes of certain American politicians whose appetites are evidently bigger than their stomachs.

These politicians never cease to hope for the disappearance of People's China. All one can say to this is that they might just as well call upon the ocean to dry up, for all the effect they could hope to achieve. However, one can legitimately ask another question: How long will the United Nations allow itself to be used as a vehicle of the U.S.A.'s policy of interference in the domestic affairs of other states, of a policy of outright aggression?

The question of restoring China's lawful rights in the United Nations is of great and fundamental significance. Two opposing approaches to international affairs clash here.

Those who believe that the provisions of the United Nations Charter should be strictly observed, that the principles of the equality of peoples and non-interference in the domestic affairs of other states should be adhered to in practice, demand that the Chinese People's Republic be immediately granted her lawful seat in the United Nations.

But those who consider it possible to base their foreign policy on arbitrariness with regard to the states they do not like, oppose the restoration of China's lawful rights in the United Nations and maintain that China's place there can continue to be held by a group of outsiders who have no connection with the Chinese people, and who at best could claim free visitors' tickets to the upper gallery of this hall.

The Soviet delegation has already stressed here, and I want to re-emphasise it, that substituting for the delegates of great China in the United Nations representatives of the Chiang Kai-shek clique cannot be considered in any other way than as a shameful farce.

If we look upon this question from the legal point of view, here too the case is just as perfectly clear. It is not a question of granting the Chinese People's Republic any favours or privileges, as United States political circles sometimes like to contend, but of *restoring* the long-existing legal rights of China as one of the founders of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council.

No subterfuges and no resolutions imposed by the United States through pressure on countries dependent upon it can alter the elementary fact that China has been and remains a great sovereign and independent country. And it is only of this China, the only existing one, that one can speak in international relations, no matter how much the advocates of American aggression against China may try to devise some sort of "theoretical basis" for this aggression, such as the false version of "two Chinas" which they have invented. China has been and remains China, and

Taiwan, with the offshore islands, are an inalienable part of Chinese territory illegally seized by the United States and awaiting liberation.

The United States government should not look so lightly upon the provocations it has launched in the East, striving to expand the aggression against China, including the area of the offshore islands. The aggressors must get out of Chinese territory, must get back to where they came from, and the sooner the better.

The efforts of a group of United States politicians to shut the eyes of the whole world to the existence of China, to declare it to be "non-existent," appear in a most unsavoury light today when it is precisely now that this great country has entered a period in which it has grown strong and is flourishing, since the victory of the People's Revolution in China put an end to the long period of division, constant civil wars artificially fomented from outside, and ruthless foreign exploitation of the country, and put an end to the backwardness and poverty of the people.

Suffice it to say that this country, which a short ten years ago did not produce any machines more intricate than a bicycle, is now manufacturing, on a large scale, its own motor cars, tractors, complex machine-tools and equipment. She is invincible not only by her inexhaustible resources, her large population and the support of her friends and allies, but, above all, by the unity of the Chinese people, who have rallied around their government and around the policy it pursues. Not a single government of China in the past ever enjoyed such boundless trust and such support of the entire Chinese people as is enjoyed by the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic.

Anyone acquainted with the facts will know full well that in its foreign policy the Chinese People's Republic invariably seeks to strengthen peace among nations, consistently upholds the basic aims and principles of the United Nations and strives to accomplish them.

From its very inception the Chinese People's Republic undertook to establish friendly relations with all countries on principles of equality, mutual respect and sovereignty, and now it has diplomatic relations with more than 30 countries, inhabited by about half of the world's population. The trade ties of the Chinese People's Republic encompass nearly the whole world, with the exception, naturally, of the U.S.A., which is obstinately continuing to cling to the idea of a trade embargo against China.

The principles of the peaceful co-existence of states proclaimed by the government of the Chinese People's Republic, together with the governments of India and Burma, were unanimously backed by the dozens of Afro-Asian states which took part in the Bandung Conference. They have also found approval in the resolution on peaceful and good-neighbourly relations between states that the U.N. General Assembly adopted at its last session.

The repeated proposals of the government of the Chinese People's Republic aimed at easing international tension in the Far East, at achieving a peaceful settlement of international issues in this area and at strengthening the security of the people of Asia are also well known. There is every reason to say that today the Chinese People's Republic has become a major factor for peace in international affairs.

If the United Nations wants to face reality and not to live in the world of illusions which have come to dominate the United States government as a result of the failure of its imperialist policy towards China nine years ago, the time has come for it to open its eyes to all these facts. Those who try to pretend "not to notice" these facts are only putting themselves in an awkward position. When the governments of certain states do this, we, as United Nations members, can of course only leave this to their conscience and sense of responsibility. It is the United States government's own affair whether it "recognises" or "does not recognise" China. China

will not cease to exist or suffer on that account and only the foreign policy and international prestige of the U.S.A. is harmed—and to no small extent at that. But we can on no account allow the inspirers of this policy to continue to drag the United Nations in their wake.

It is impermissible to confuse, either juridically or politically, the issue of the diplomatic recognition of the Chinese People's Republic by one state or another with the question of restoring China's lawful rights in the United Nations. On what grounds and for whose sake should the hostile and unrealistic policy the U.S.A. still thinks it necessary to pursue with respect to China become the policy of the United Nations and be imposed on its other members? For that matter, many United Nations members have long had normal, and in the majority of cases, intimate and friendly relations with the Chinese People's Republic. The interests of strengthening peace and international co-operation, for the sake of which the United Nations was founded, demand that the anomaly the United States has imposed be eliminated.

It would be absurd, of course, to think that the Chinese People's Republic cannot get along without the United Nations. Whether it is represented in U.N.O. or not, the Chinese People's Republic will continue to prosper and develop, day by day playing an ever-more outstanding part in international affairs. It is to be presumed that states still pretending not to notice China's existence will very shortly be compelled to reckon with the real China, as the United States government, which is generally known to be now conducting official negotiations with the representatives of the government of the Chinese People's Republic, is actually being forced to do.

But the fact that China's representatives are absent from the United Nations is doing this organisation harm, the significance of which it would be dangerous to underestimate. It can be definitely said that as long as the representatives of the lawful government of the Chinese people are not allowed to take their seats in this hall, and also

round the table of the Security Council and in other United Nations bodies, our organisation will fail to be a proper international organisation.

It is no secret to anyone that without China's representatives taking part many key international questions in general cannot be discussed with any effect. We are running up against this more and more, be it disarmament, problems of developing international economic ties, etc., or, naturally and primarily, questions connected with the situation in Asia.

Lastly, the absence of China's representatives puts the most important political organ of the United Nations, the Security Council, which bears the main responsibility for the maintenance of international peace, in an utterly false position. It will be remembered that, under the United Nations Charter, decisions of the Security Council on all questions except those of procedure are considered adopted only when they are supported by the coinciding votes of all permanent members of the council.

China is a permanent member of the Security Council, but it will soon be ten years since she was deprived of the possibility of taking part in the council's work. All these years China's seat in the Security Council has been held by people who do not represent China and have no connection with the Chinese government or people. Consequently, there are good grounds for saying that the council's decisions adopted during this period do not conform to the requirements of the United Nations Charter. You will agree with me when I say that if we prize the United Nations' prestige it is high time to put an end to this situation.

Furthermore, can one say that Asia, with its many states, both young and old, is properly represented in our organisation in the present circumstances, when the representatives of the Chinese People's Republic are not taking part of its work? I think every one of the delegates would have to agree that it is not. While the United Nations is without China's representatives, we cannot maintain that the interests of

Asia—the world's biggest continent, whose role in international life has grown immensely and is continuing to grow every day—are adequately represented here.

Even from this point of view, the present situation is profoundly abnormal, showing that the question is one that concerns more than simply China alone. Small wonder, then, that India, another great Asian power, has raised the issue of China's representation before the United Nations, and, moreover, not for the first time. Asia and its peoples will be properly represented in our organisation only when the lawful representatives of the Chinese People's Republic take their place side by side with us in the General Assembly, in the Security Council and in other United Nations bodies, and when the Chiangites are expelled from U.N.O.

In seeking to achieve the impossible, that is to say, somehow to substantiate and justify their utterly unwarranted aggressive policy towards the Chinese People's Republic, the representatives of the United States government are having recourse to the most senseless arguments, the spurious character of which literally hits one in the eye. Thus, as a pretext for barring China's representatives from the United Nations, an ill-famed resolution, unlawfully adopted eight years ago under United States pressure in connection with the Korean events, is being employed. References to this resolution appeared once again in last month's statement by the U.S. State Department about "non-recognition" of the Chinese People's Republic, a statement made with the obvious purpose of bringing fresh pressure to bear on the United Nations before the convening of the Assembly session.

The American statesmen's references to this resolution are only an attempt to shift to others the responsibility for their unsavoury activities. Actually, this is nothing less than applying in international usage the long known and not very cunning artifice of a thief calling "Stop, thief!" to divert attention from himself when running away with what he has filched.

As far as the Chinese People's Republic is concerned, its government is showing the utmost fortitude and patience in the present tense situation. While warning the aggressors and explaining to them the unwise and perilous nature of their actions, it has even consented to resume talks with the power that is perpetrating armed interference in China's internal affairs. All that remains is to hope that the United States government will prove able to understand and duly appreciate China's attitude and stop playing with fire in the Far East before it is too late.

One cannot fail to stop and think, in particular, of Britain's position on the question under discussion. We all know that Britain and the Chinese People's Republic have established diplomatic relations and that Britain recognised the Chinese People's Republic long ago. But what is happening? Notwithstanding this, the British government obstinately opposes the representatives of the Chinese People's Republic taking their lawful seat in the United Nations. The British government has been playing a double-dealing game on this question for several years already, probably not even noticing that it has overplayed its hand long ago. Perhaps the British, or rather, the British government—since in Britain there is known to be also different views on this question—believe that such a double-dealing game conforms to the traditions of British diplomacy? We shall not argue the point; perhaps that is really so.

The British government bears no little responsibility for the situation that has come about in the United Nations over the question of the representation of the Chinese People's Republic. Hardly anyone would deny that if Britain desired to be more objective on this matter, the United States government could obviously not but reckon with that. For that matter, it does indeed sometimes happen that Britain, now and again, has something of its own to say on one issue or another to which its ally, the U.S.A., has to lend an ear. We shall not give examples. All those taking part in the General Assembly—and, of

course, the Americans and British better than anyone else—are well aware of such instances.

In referring to this, the Soviet delegation only wants to stress that Britain cannot simply hide herself behind the back of her senior N.A.T.O. partner and shrug off responsibility for the present state of affairs in connection with China's representation in the United Nations.

The British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, will, we feel sure, defend the position of the British government. But it is a difficult task, because the ammunition the British government has to mobilise for its defence is rather meagre, to say the least.

We are, of course, aware of the fact that the majority of the countries supporting the United States government's stand on the question of China's representation in the United Nations are doing so only because they are under American pressure. No one would deny this, and there is hardly any need to dwell on this subject. It goes without saying that the United States government has hitherto succeeded in preventing the restoration of the lawful rights of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations—and even discussion of this question by the General Assembly—not by any arguments or reasoning capable of convincing anyone of the justice of Washington's policy. Here, less and less place is given to arguments, and more and more to crude pressure on those who succumb to it.

The United States is abusing its position in imposing its will on countries dependent upon it, countries enmeshed in a net of military and other treaties. As N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, said in his message of September 19 to the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, a message which, as is known, some people have not found to their liking: "States still maintaining relations with the Chiang Kai-shek clique are disturbed by such recognition and this recognition is in its final hour. Surely, the majority of states which, under pressure from the United States,

maintain diplomatic relations with Chiang Kai-shek will be glad when this situation—which is obviously contrary to common sense and the interests of the peoples of these countries—comes to an end and when China occupies her rightful place in international organisations."

It is not difficult to see that those countries which have been lassoed, so to speak, by the United States government, and are compelled to follow its policy with regard to China, consider this a burden. And there is, indeed, every reason for them feeling this way. For those taking part in the farce that is systematically being played in the United Nations each time the question of China's representation is raised, know full well what sentiments their policy on this question evokes in the Chinese people. They also know that this will be remembered by more than one generation of Chinese.

At the same time it would be wrong to draw the conclusion that these countries bear no responsibility at all for the position they take on the question of China's representation. For there are cases in the United Nations' activity—though not so often, it is true—when the overwhelming majority of states, including small countries dependent on the United States, show their character, so to speak, in spite of the fact that the United States government does not like it. An example of this kind is afforded by the General Assembly special session's examination of the question of the withdrawal of the American troops from Lebanon and the British troops from Jordan, and by its resolution. This example shows that small countries have no few opportunities of contributing to easing international tension, including the proper settlement of the present question.

No one has claimed that these countries, in considering the question of China's representation in the United Nations, may not act as they did when examining the question of the withdrawal of the American and British troops from the Middle East and, together with the other states pressing for ending the

unfair attitude to China, get a proper decision taken. Let us hope that this is not far off and that this will be done. Then we shall be able to say with conviction that new strength has been infused into our organisation. All this will benefit peace.

It is not accidental that in many countries whose governments usually back United States policy, the movement for the normalisation of relations with the Chinese People's Republic has recently gathered considerable momentum, while an awareness of the inevitable failure of the policy of barring the Chinese People's Republic from the United Nations' activity is becoming more and more apparent. One might note that even in the U.S.A. itself an increasing number of prominent political and public personalities are categorically demanding that an end be put to the provocations against China, and that a policy founded on hard facts and not on dangerous illusions be pursued.

China's absence from the United Nations is a gross violation of the lawful rights of the Chinese people and of the root principles of the United Nations Charter. It is common knowledge that the United Nations Charter lays down that U.N.O. is a centre for the co-ordination of actions of states to maintain peace and international co-operation. But, one may ask, what sort of a centre can this be if the representatives of a state numbering about a quarter of the world's population are deprived of the opportunity of expressing their views from this rostrum? Is it not clear that the continuation of this practice will turn the United Nations from a centre for co-ordinating the actions of states into a centre for intrigues, blackmail and pressure by one state on another? It is common knowledge that even now U.N.O. is far from free of these shortcomings, but one need have no doubt that if this goes on it can only make matters go from bad to worse.

The situation can be redressed only if the United Nations member-states raise themselves above temporary, time-serving considerations stemming from a reluctance to quarrel with the U.S.A. on this

score. Although one can understand why some United Nations members are in this mood, there is nevertheless no justification for it, as to follow such a road, to adapt the United Nations' activity to the tastes of certain circles in the U.S.A., will make still more widespread the sergeant-major practice of barking orders that we have seen American representatives use more than once in U.N.O. towards certain countries. We think this would be dangerous above all for the small countries, and for quite understandable reasons.

Dozens of states with widely differing social systems and forms of government are represented in the United Nations. This is justly regarded as one of the great merits of our organisation as an international forum for pooling the efforts of all these countries for the good of peace. But now, when there are governments who say that one state or another should be barred from taking its rightful place in the United Nations for the simple reason that they do not like the "regime," that is, the social system of a state, there are good grounds for declaring that they want to drag U.N.O. on to a slippery and perilous path.

If this path is taken it may happen that the only countries left in the United Nations will, let us say, be N.A.T.O. members. This might be very convenient for certain powers, who would then have full "freedom" to order things about as they please in the United Nations. But what would then remain of the United Nations Charter, of the international organisation, of the organisation's principle of its universality? There may indeed be politicians who would like to turn the United Nations members into a platoon of obedient, marching soldiers, who would not argue. These politicians may as well admit openly, then, that they are seeking the abolition of U.N.O.

Consequently, the question of China's representation in the United Nations, which the Indian delegation has proposed for the agenda of the present General Assembly session, is a question that has long ceased to be one concerning only two powers. Today it concerns all

powers and countries of the world, and largely touches upon the future of the United Nations itself. If we all really cherish the United Nations as an international organisation of equal states created for the preservation of peace, it is necessary to put an end to the unfair treatment meted out to the Chinese people and restore the rights of their lawful representatives in U.N.O. The United States government, which is inspiring and organising the sabotaging of the restoration of China's lawful rights in the United Nations, will naturally bear the responsibility for any further procrastination in deciding this matter. The United States government will merely show once again to the entire world that its policy is incompatible with the duties of co-operation among

states in conformity with the principles of the United Nations, to which, as is common knowledge, the United States government has also subscribed.

The Soviet Union maintains that in its activities the United Nations should be guided not by the dictates of the "positions of strength" and "cold war" policy—the world has already had enough of that policy—but by the principles of the peaceful co-operation of all countries, irrespective of their social systems, and of respect for the sovereign rights of each state. That is why the U.S.S.R. delegation gives its unconditional support to the Indian delegation's motion to restore China's lawful representation in the United Nations.

SOVIET GOVERNMENT'S STATEMENT ON DEVELOPMENTS IN TAIWAN AREA

N. S. Khrushchov Answers Question Put by Tass

*Correspondent on President Eisenhower's
Incorrect Assertions*

IN connection with certain statements made by President Eisenhower at a press conference on October 1, a *Tass* correspondent has asked Nikita Khrushchov, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, the following question:

"At his press conference on October 1, the United States President, Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower, asserted that the actions of the Chinese People's Republic in the Taiwan Strait, aimed at liberating Chinese territory from the Chiang Kai-shekites, could not be regarded as civil war, that is, as an internal affair of the Chinese people.

"In substantiation of his assertion, the President stated that if it was civil war why had Russia said, through Mr. Khrushchov in his message, that she was prepared to take part in that war. If it was a civil war, he added, then he failed entirely to understand the real

meaning of the term.

"How can this statement of the American President be regarded? As far as it is known, none of the statements made by the Soviet government has given any grounds for such assertions."

The following is the text of Nikita Khrushchov's reply to the *Tass* correspondent's question:

"I fully agree that at the aforementioned press conference President Eisenhower gave an absolutely incorrect interpretation of the statements made by the Soviet government on the developments in the Taiwan area. One can only be surprised at the cavalier fashion in which the Soviet Union's stand has been dis-

torted. I would never have believed that such methods would be used.

"I am still convinced that the President of the United States has a correct understanding of our statements pertaining to the situation in the Taiwan Strait. And if distortions are nevertheless made of the Soviet government's statements, statements which spring from a desire to preserve peace in the Far East, this merely proves that those who resort to such methods are guided, not by the interests of peace, but by the interests of a certain exclusive group in the United States which, for the sake of enrichment, is pursuing a policy of increasingly aggravating international tensions and preparing for a new war.

"But the assertions—patently at variance with the facts—with the aid of which certain people try to represent the Soviet government's stand in a distorted light cannot yield the results which their authors expect. The Soviet Union's stand is clear-cut, consistent and well defined.

"The Soviet government has unequivocally stated, in its messages to President Eisenhower in particular, that if the United States should unleash war against our friend and ally, the Chinese People's Republic, the Soviet Union would fully carry out its obligations under the Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance with the Chinese People's Republic, and that an attack on the Chinese People's Republic is an attack on the Soviet Union.

"Is there the slightest hint in this that the Soviet Union, as President Eisenhower insists, is prepared to take part in the civil war in China? We have declared, and declare once again, something that is entirely different—the Soviet Union will come to the assistance of the Chinese People's Republic if it is attacked from without, and, to put it more plainly, if the United States attacks

the Chinese People's Republic.

"The Soviet government found it necessary to sound such a warning because the situation in the Far East has been developing in such a manner that the American interference in China's domestic affairs has brought the United States to the very brink of direct military conflict with the Chinese People's Republic. And if the United States goes over the brink, the Soviet Union will not remain on the side lines. But we have never interfered, and do not intend to interfere, in the civil war which the Chinese people are waging against the Chiang Kai-shek clique.

"It is the inalienable right of every people to arrange their domestic affairs as they see fit. The intention of regaining their islands of Quemoy and Matsu and liberating Taiwan and Penghulletao is an internal affair of the Chinese people. It is common knowledge that these lands belonged to China long before Columbus discovered America. And the United States government's attempts to prevent the Chinese people from completing their struggle against the Chiang Kai-shek clique expelled from the mainland, and from liberating Chinese territory constitute gross and open interference by the United States in the civil war in China.

"This President Eisenhower prefers to ignore.

"In conclusion, I consider it necessary once again to underline that the United States government is assuming an exceptionally grave responsibility in the face of the peoples and of history for all the consequences which may result from the United States' intolerable interference in China's internal affairs and the aggressive actions of the American armed forces in the Taiwan Strait area."

5th October, 1958.

APPENDIX

COMMUNIQUE ON MEETING BETWEEN N. S. KHRUSHCHOV AND MAO TSE-TUNG

MEETINGS took place in Peking, over the period July 31 to August 3, between N. S. Khrushchov, first secretary of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., and Mao Tse-tung, chairman of the central committee of the Communist Party of China and Chairman of the Chinese People's Republic.

The meeting was attended, on the Soviet side, by Marshal R. Y. Malinovsky, U.S.S.R. Minister of Defence, V. V. Kuznetsov, acting Foreign Minister of the U.S.S.R., and B. N. Ponomarev, member of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union; the Chinese side was represented by Chou En-lai, Premier of the State Council, Marshal Peng Teh-hwai, Vice-Premier and Minister of Defence, Chen Yi, Vice-Premier and Foreign Minister, and Wang Chia-hsiang, member of secretariat of the central committee of the Communist Party of China.

In an exceedingly warm and cordial atmosphere, the two parties held all-round discussions and recorded complete identity of views on the urgent and important problems of the present international situation, on further strengthening the relations of friendship, alliance and mutual assistance between the U.S.S.R. and the Chinese People's Republic, and also on problems concerning the joint struggle for a peaceful settlement of international questions and concerning the safeguarding of world peace.

The two parties were unanimous in considering that the U.S.S.R. and the Chinese People's Republic, together with the other countries of the socialist camp, and with all peace-loving countries and peoples, have achieved great successes in the struggle to ease international tension and to defend peace. The peaceful policy of the U.S.S.R. and the Chinese People's Republic is receiving growing support

and sympathy from the peoples of all countries. India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic and other countries and peoples of Asia, Africa, America and Europe are playing an ever-growing role in strengthening peace. Everywhere, the forces of peace have grown immeasurably.

In contrast to this clear and consistent policy—a policy which corresponds to the vital interests of our two countries and of all peoples—aggressive imperialist circles, headed by monopolist groups in the United States, continue to reject peaceful co-existence and co-operation, stubbornly oppose the easing of international tension, obstruct the holding of a conference of the heads of government of the great powers, and intensify their preparations for a new war, threatening the peace and security of the peoples. These imperialist forces are acting as enemies of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. They are knocking together aggressive military and political blocs, enmeshing the world in their network of military bases, and interfering more often, and more brazenly, in the domestic affairs of other countries.

The armed aggression recently undertaken against Lebanon and Jordan by the United States and Britain, and the threats of force against the Republic of Iraq and the United Arab Republic, have sharply increased the tension in the Middle East and have made the war danger still more serious; they have aroused the protest and condemnation of

the peoples of all countries. The U.S.S.R. and the Chinese People's Republic strongly condemn the flagrant aggression by the United States and Britain in the Middle East; they demand the immediate summoning of a conference of the heads of government of the great powers, to discuss the Middle East situation; and they firmly insist on the immediate withdrawal of the United States troops from Lebanon and of British forces from Jordan.

The Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic give firm support to the just struggle of the peoples of the United Arab Republic, the Republic of Iraq and the other Arab countries, as well as to the national liberation movements of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The events in the Middle East and other parts of the world confirm that the national liberation movement is indomitable, that the age of colonialism has gone, never to return, and that any attempt to preserve or restore colonial domination, running counter to the course of history, is harmful to peace and is doomed to failure.

The all-round exchange of views on a number of important questions of the present international situation, facing both parties in Asia and Europe, led to the reaching of complete agreement on measures to be taken to combat aggression and preserve peace.

The Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic will do everything possible to ease international tension and prevent the horrors of a new war. Both parties declare once again that the right of the peoples of all countries to choose their own social and political systems must be respected; countries with different social systems must co-exist peacefully, in accordance with the well-known Five Principles, which have received wide international recognition; all controversial international issues must be settled peacefully, by means of negotiation; the development of economic and cultural relations among countries, on the basis of mutual benefit and peaceful competition—relations which promote

mutual understanding and are fully in line with the aim of easing international tension and preserving peace—must be encouraged.

The major task in preserving and consolidating peace at the present time is the achievement of agreement among states to reduce armaments, to end the tests and ban the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, to abolish all military groupings and bases on foreign territories, and to conclude a pact of peace and collective security.

Whether war can be averted does not, however, depend solely on the good intentions of the peaceloving peoples and their unilateral efforts. Right up to the present moment, aggressive circles of the western powers are refusing to take any genuine measures to preserve peace; on the contrary, they are senselessly aggravating the international tension, putting mankind on the brink of the catastrophe of war. If the sabre-rattling imperialist maniacs dare to force war on the peoples, however, they should realise that all the peaceloving and freedom-loving countries and peoples, closely united in a single unit, will put an end to the imperialist aggressors once and for all, and establish everlasting peace the world over.

Both parties note with great satisfaction that the fraternal relations of friendship, all-round co-operation and mutual assistance between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, between the Soviet government and the Chinese government and between the peoples of the two countries, are being developed successfully and are becoming more firmly established. The economic development of both countries is proceeding at a rapid pace and their strength is increasing daily. The unity and co-operation between the two countries based on complete equality and comradely mutual assistance, has great vitality. This unity and co-operation promotes not only the rapid progress of both countries along the road of socialism and communism, but also increases the strength of the socialist

camp as a whole. Both parties have decided to ensure the continued all-round development of the comprehensive co-operation between their two countries and to strengthen still further the unity of the socialist camp and the solidarity of all peaceloving countries and peoples; they have expressed wholehearted agreement on all questions which came under consideration.

Both parties are in complete accord in assessing the tasks facing the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist Party. The unshakable unity of our two Marxist-Leninist parties will always provide a firm guarantee of the triumph of our common cause.

The Soviet Communist Party and the Chinese Communist Party will defend this sacred unity untiringly; they will fight for the purity of Marxism-Leninism; they will defend the principles of the Moscow Declaration of the Com-

munist and Workers' Parties, and will wage an uncompromising struggle against revisionism — the principal danger in the communist movement. This revisionism has found its clearest manifestation in the programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

Both parties have expressed their full confidence that the steadily growing forces of peace and socialism will, beyond doubt, overcome all obstacles on the road ahead and will win a great victory.

N. KHRUSHCHOV

First Secretary of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers

MAO TSE-TUNG

Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and Chairman of the Chinese People's Republic

August 3, 1958.