

## Statement by Andrei Gromyko (4 July 1950)

**Source:** The Soviet Union and the Korean Question: Documents. London: Soviet News, 1950. 99 p. p. 93-99.

**Copyright:** All rights of reproduction, public communication, adaptation, distribution or dissemination via Internet, internal network or any other means are strictly reserved in all countries.

The documents available on this Web site are the exclusive property of their authors or right holders.

Requests for authorisation are to be addressed to the authors or right holders concerned.

Further information may be obtained by referring to the legal notice and the terms and conditions of use regarding this site.

**URL:** [http://www.cvce.eu/obj/statement\\_by\\_andrei\\_gromyko\\_4\\_july\\_1950-en-3e0c341f-ad8d-4981-969f-1be30d707934.html](http://www.cvce.eu/obj/statement_by_andrei_gromyko_4_july_1950-en-3e0c341f-ad8d-4981-969f-1be30d707934.html)

**Last updated:** 02/07/2015

## Statement by A. A. Gromyko (4 July 1950)

The events now taking place in Korea broke out on June 25 as the result of a provocative attack by the troops of the South Korean authorities on the frontier areas of the Korean People's Democratic Republic. This attack was the outcome of a premeditated plan.

From time to time Syngman Rhee himself and other representatives of the South Korean authorities had blurted out the fact that the South Korean Syngman Rhee clique had such a plan.

As long ago as October 7, 1949, Syngman Rhee, boasting of success in training his army, stated outright, in an interview given to an American *United Press* correspondent, that the South Korean Army could capture Pyongyang in the course of three days. On October 31, 1949, Sin Sen Mo, Defence Minister of the Syngman Rhee Government, also told newspaper correspondents that the South Korean troops were strong enough to act and take Pyongyang within a few days.

Only one week before the provocative attack of the South Korean troops on the frontier areas of the Korean People's Democratic Republic, Syngman Rhee said, in a speech on June 19 in the so-called "National Assembly" where Mr. Dulles, adviser to the U.S. State Department, was present: "If we cannot protect democracy in the cold war, we shall win in a hot war."

It is not difficult to understand that representatives of the South Korean authorities could only make such statements because they felt that they had American support behind them. One month before the present developments in Korea, on May 19, 1950, Mr. Johnson, chief American administrator of aid to Korea, told the American Congress House of Representatives' Appropriations Committee that 100,000 officers and men of the South Korean Army, **equipped with American weapons and trained by the American Military Mission**, had completed their preparations and could begin war at any time.

It is known that only a few days before the Korean events, the United States Defence Secretary, Mr. Johnson, the Chief of the General Staff of the United States Armed Forces, General Bradley, and the State Department adviser, Mr. Dulles, arrived in Japan and had special conferences with General MacArthur, and that afterwards Mr. Dulles visited South Korea and went to frontier areas on the 38th parallel.

Only one week before the events — on June 19 — Mr. Dulles, adviser to the State Department, declared in the above-mentioned "National Assembly" of South Korea that the United States was ready to give all necessary moral and material support to South Korea which was fighting against Communism.

These facts speak for themselves and need no comment.

The very first days showed, however, that events were not developing in favour of the South Korean authorities. The Korean People's Democratic Republic gained a number of successes in the struggle against the South Korean troops, which are directed by American military advisers.

When it became clear that the terrorist regime of the Syngman Rhee clique, which had never enjoyed the support of the Korean people, was collapsing, the United States Government resorted to open intervention in Korea, ordering its air, naval and subsequently its ground forces to side with the South Korean authorities against the Korean people. Thereby the United States Government went over from a policy of preparing aggression to outright acts of aggression and embarked on a course of open intervention in Korea's domestic affairs, on a course of armed intervention in Korea. Having taken this course, the United States Government violated peace, demonstrating thereby that far from seeking to consolidate peace, it is on the contrary an enemy of peace.

The facts show that the United States Government is only disclosing its aggressive plans in Korea step by step. First it declared that the United States intervention in Korean affairs would be confined to the shipment of war and other materials only. Then it was announced that air and naval forces, but without ground troops,

would also be sent. Following this, it was stated also that United States ground forces would be sent to Korea.

It is also known that at first the United States Government declared that American armed forces would take part in operations in South Korean territory only. Hardly had a few days passed, however, when the American air force transferred its operations to North Korean territory and attacked Pyongyang and other cities.

All this goes to show that the United States Government is drawing the United States more and more into war, but, compelled to reckon with the unwillingness of the American people to be involved in a new military adventure, it is gradually impelling the country step by step towards open war.

The United States Government tries to justify armed intervention against Korea by alleging that it was undertaken on the authorisation of the Security Council. The falsity of such an allegation strikes the eye.

What really happened?

It is known that the United States Government had started armed intervention in Korea before the Security Council was summoned to meet on June 27, without taking into consideration what decision the Security Council might take. Thus the United States Government confronted the United Nations Organisation with a *fait accompli*, with a violation of peace.

The Security Council merely rubber-stamped and back-dated the resolution proposed by the United States Government, approving the aggressive actions which this Government had undertaken. Furthermore, the American resolution was adopted by the Security Council with a gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations Organisation.

In accordance with Article 27 of the United Nations Charter all Security Council decisions on major issues must be adopted by an affirmative vote of not less than seven members, including the votes of all the five permanent members of the Security Council, i.e., of the Soviet Union, China, the United States, Great Britain and France.

However, the American resolution approving the United States armed intervention in Korea was adopted by only six votes — those of the United States, Britain, France, Norway, Cuba and Ecuador. The vote of the kuomintangite Tsiang Ting-fu, who unlawfully occupies China's seat on the Security Council, was counted as the seventh vote for this resolution.

Furthermore, of the five permanent members of the Council only three — the United States, Britain and France — were present at the Security Council's meeting on June 27. Two other permanent members of the Security Council — the U.S.S.R. and China — were not present at the Council meeting, since the hostile attitude of the United States Government towards the Chinese people deprives China of the opportunity of having her legitimate representative on the Security Council, and this made impossible the Soviet Union's participation in the meetings of the Security Council.

Thus neither of these two requirements of the United Nations Charter with regard to the Security Council's procedure for taking decisions were fulfilled at the Council's session on June 27, which deprives the resolution adopted at that session of any legal force.

It is also known that the United Nations Charter envisages the intervention of the Security Council only in those cases where the matter concerns events of an international order and not of an internal character. Moreover, the Charter directly forbids the intervention of the United Nations Organisation in the internal affairs of any state when it is a matter of an internal conflict between two groups of one state. Thus the Security Council by its decision of June 27 violated also this most important principle of the United Nations Organisation.

It follows from the aforesaid that this resolution, which the U.S. Government is using as a cover for its armed intervention in Korea, was illegally put through the Security Council with a gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations Organisation. This only became possible because the gross pressure of the United States Government on the members of the Security Council converted the United Nations Organisation into a kind of branch of the U.S. State Department, into an obedient tool of the policy of American ruling circles who acted as violators of peace.

The illegal resolution of June 27, adopted by the Security Council under pressure from the United States Government, shows that the Security Council is acting, not as a body which is charged with the main responsibility for the maintenance of peace, but as a tool utilised by the ruling circles of the United States for unleashing war.

This resolution of the Security Council constitutes a hostile act against peace.

If the Security Council valued the cause of peace, it should have attempted to reconcile the fighting sides in Korea before it adopted such a scandalous resolution. Only the Security Council and the United Nations Secretary-General could have done this. However, they did not make such an attempt, evidently knowing that such peaceful action contradicts the aggressor's plans.

It is impossible not to note the unseemly role played in that whole affair by the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Trygve Lie. Being under the obligation, by virtue of his position, to observe the exact fulfilment of the United Nations Charter, the Secretary-General, during discussion of the Korean problem in the Security Council, far from fulfilling his direct duties, on the contrary obsequiously helped a gross violation of the Charter to be committed by the Government of the United States and other Security Council members. Thereby the Secretary-General showed that he is concerned not so much with strengthening the United Nations Organisation and with promoting peace, as with how to help the United States' ruling circles to carry out their aggressive plans with regard to Korea.

At a press conference on June 29, President Truman denied that the United States, having launched hostilities in Korea, was in a state of war. He announced that this was only "police action" in support of the United Nations Organisation and alleged that this action was aimed against a "group of bandits" from North Korea.

It is not difficult to understand the untenability of such an allegation.

It has long been known that, in undertaking aggressive actions, an aggressor usually resorts to this or that method of camouflaging his actions.

Everyone remembers that when, in the summer of 1937, militarist Japan started armed intervention in North China with the campaign on Peking, it announced that this was solely a local "incident" for the sake of maintaining peace in the East, although no one believed this. The military operations which General MacArthur has now undertaken in Korea upon the instructions of the United States Government can be regarded as "police action" in support of the United Nations Organisation to just the same extent as the war started by the Japanese militarists against China in 1937 could be regarded as a local "incident" for maintaining peace in the East.

As is known, the operations of the United States armed forces in Korea are commanded, not by some police officer, but by General MacArthur. However, it would be absurd to admit that the Commander-in-Chief of the United States Armed Forces in Japan, General MacArthur, is directing, not military operations, but some sort of "police action" in Korea. Who will believe that MacArthur's armed forces, including military aviation, down to "Flying Fortresses" and jet planes, which attack the civilian population and the peaceful cities of Korea, the navy, including cruisers and aircraft carriers, as well as ground forces, were needed for a "police action" against a "group of bandits."

This is something that even quite naïve persons will hardly believe.

It will not be superfluous to recall in this connection that when the People's Liberation Army of China was fighting against Chiang Kai-shek's armies, which were equipped with American military technique, certain people also called it "groups of bandits". What the reality turned out to be, however, is something well-known to all. It turned out that those who were called "groups of bandits" not only expressed the fundamental national interests of China, but also constituted the Chinese people. Those whom the ruling circles of the United States thrust upon China as a Government turned out to be in reality a handful of bankrupt adventurers and bandits who traded the national honour and independence of China right and left.

What are the real aims of American armed intervention in Korea?

Evidently, the point is that the aggressive circles of the United States violated peace in order to lay hands, not only on the South, but also on North Korea. The invasion of Korea by American armed forces constitutes open war against the Korean people. Its goal is to deprive Korea of her national independence, to prevent the formation of a united democratic Korean State and forcibly to establish in Korea an anti-popular regime which would allow the ruling circles of the United States to convert the country into their colony and use Korean territory as a military and strategic springboard in the Far East.

In ordering the United States armed forces to attack Korea, President Truman at the same time stated that he had ordered the American Navy "to prevent any attack on Formosa", which means the occupation by American armed forces of this part of China's territory.

This move of the United States Government constitutes outright aggression against China.

This move of the United States Government furthermore constitutes a gross violation of the Cairo and Potsdam International Agreements concerning Formosa being Chinese territory, agreements which bear the signature of the United States Government too, and is also a violation of the statement made by President Truman on January 5 of this year to the effect that the Americans would not intervene in the affairs of Formosa.

President Truman also stated that he had instructed American armed forces to be increased in the Philippines, which aims at intervention in the domestic affairs of the Philippine state and at kindling an internal struggle. This act of the American Government shows that it continues to regard the Philippines as its colony and not as an independent state, which, furthermore, is a member of the United Nations Organisation.

President Truman stated in addition that he had issued an instruction that so-called "military assistance" to France in Indo-China be accelerated. This statement of President Truman shows that the United States Government has embarked on a course of kindling war against the people of Viet Nam for the sake of supporting the colonial regime in Indo-China, thereby demonstrating that it is assuming the role of gendarme of the peoples of Asia.

Thus President Truman's statement of June 27 means that the United States Government has violated peace and has gone over from a policy of preparing aggression to direct acts of aggression simultaneously in a whole number of countries in Asia. Thereby the United States Government has trampled underfoot its obligations to the United Nations in promoting peace the world over and has acted as a violator of peace.

There is a small number of historical examples of cases where, by means of intervention from without, the attempt was made to throttle the struggle waged by the peoples for national unity and for democratic rights.

In this connection one could recall the war between the Northern and Southern States of North America in the sixties of the last century. At that time the Northern States, headed by Abraham Lincoln, waged an armed struggle against the slave-owners of the South for the abolition of slavery and for the preservation of the national unity of the country. When attacked by the South, the armed forces of the Northern States did not, as is known, limit themselves to defence of their own territory, but transferred military operations to the

territory of the Southern States, routed the troops of the planters and slave-owners, who did not enjoy the support of the people, smashed the slave-owning system existing in the South and created the conditions for establishing national unity.

It is known that at that time certain governments, as for instance the British Government, also intervened in the internal affairs of North America in favour of the South against the North and against national unity. Despite this, victory was won by the American people as personified by those progressive forces which headed the struggle of the North against the South.

It will not be amiss to recall also another lesson of history.

In the period after the October Revolution in Russia, when the reactionary tsarist generals, having dug themselves in on the outskirts of Russia, rent Russia asunder, the Government of the United States, together with the Governments of Britain, France and certain other States, intervened in the domestic affairs of the Soviet country and came out on the side of the reactionary tsarist generals in order to prevent the unification of our Motherland under the aegis of the Soviet Government. The United States Government also did not shrink from armed intervention, sending its troops to the Soviet Far East and to the Archangel area. Together with the troops of certain other countries, the American troops actively helped the Russian tsarist generals — Kolchak, Denikin, Yudenich and others — in their struggle against the Soviet power, shot Russian workers and peasants and plundered the population.

As we see, in this case too, the ruling circles of certain foreign states, violating peace, tried by armed intervention to turn back the wheel of history, tried forcibly to impose on the people the much-hated regime they had overthrown and tried to prevent the unification of our country into a single state.

It is universally known how this interventionist adventure ended.

It is useful to recall these historical examples because the events now taking place in Korea and certain other countries of Asia, and the aggressive policy of the United States as regards these countries, are in many respects reminiscent of the above-mentioned events from the history of the United States and Russia.

The Soviet Government has already expressed its attitude towards the policy which is being pursued by the United States Government, a policy of gross intervention in the domestic affairs of Korea, in its reply of June 29 to the statement of the United States Government, dated June 27.

The Soviet Government invariably adheres to a policy of strengthening peace the world over and to its traditional principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of other states.

The Soviet Government holds that the Koreans have the same right to arrange at their own discretion their internal national affairs in the sphere of uniting South and North Korea into a single national state as the North Americans had in the sixties of the last century when they united the South and the North of America into a single national state.

From the aforesaid it follows that the Government of the United States of America has committed a hostile act against peace and that it bears the responsibility for the consequences of the armed aggressions it has undertaken.

The United Nations Organisation will fulfil its duties of maintaining peace only in the event that the Security Council demands the unconditional cessation of American military intervention and the immediate withdrawal of American armed forces from Korea.