

ON THE SITUATION IN BEPLIN	2d.
THE DECLARATION OF WARSAW CONFERENCE	2d.
CONSTITUTION OF THE U.S.S.R. (<i>Authorised Text</i>)	3d.
MOLOTOV ON THE RESULTS OF THE LONDON CONFERENCE OF FOREIGN MINISTERS	3d.
30th ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT OCTOBER SOCIALIST REVOLUTION. Speech of V. M. Molotov	3d.
DEMILITARISATION AND DEMOCRATISATION OF GERMANY, by Marshal V. D. Sokolovsky	3d.
VYSHINSKY'S SPEECH ON PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP OF PEOPLES AGAINST THE INCENDIARIES OF A NEW WAR (UNO, 1947)	3d.
U.S.S.R. AND MARSHALL'S PROPOSALS—MOLOTOV'S STATEMENTS	3d.
SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS	3d.
J. V. STALIN ON POST-WAR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	6d.
THE GREEK QUESTION. Speeches by Soviet Delegates at U.N. Assembly, 1947	1s. od.
FIVE-YEAR PLAN FOR 1946-50	1s. od.
EDUCATION IN THE U.S.S.R.	1s. od.
LEGAL RIGHTS OF THE SOVIET FAMILY, by G. M. Sverdlov	1s. od.
PUBLIC HEALTH IN THE U.S.S.R., by N. Semashko	1s. od.
PROPERTY RIGHTS OF SOVIET CITIZENS, by M. S. Lipetsker	1s. od.
SOVIET MUSIC (<i>Musical Education and Music-making</i>), by Boris Yagolim	1s. od.
CO-OPERATIVES IN THE SOVIET UNION, by V. Batov	1s. od.
HOW THE SOVIET CITIZEN PAYS HIS TAXES, by Prof. M. I. Bogolepov	1s. od.
SPORT IN THE SOVIET UNION, by E. Petrovsky and others	1s. od.
SOVIET LAND AND PEOPLE (<i>A Pocket Geography</i>), by N. N. Mikhailov	1s. 6d.
SOVIET SCIENCE IN THE SERVICE OF THE PEOPLE, by S. Vavilov, <i>President of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences</i>	1s. 6d.
SOVIET TRANSPORT (<i>Rail, Air and Water</i>), by Prof. V. Obratsov and others	1s. 6d.
V. M. MOLOTOV: FOR A DEMOCRATIC PEACE WITH GERMANY (Speeches at the London Session of Council of Foreign Ministers, 1947)	2s. od.
MOLOTOV'S SPEECHES AT THE PARIS CONFERENCE	2s. od.
MOLOTOV'S SPEECHES AT NEW YORK SESSION OF UNO GENERAL ASSEMBLY	2s. od.
CHESS IN RUSSIA, by P. Romanovsky	2s. 6d.
SHAKESPEARE ON THE SOVIET STAGE, by M. M. Morozov	5s. od.

Obtainable from Newsagents and Bookshops or direct from the Publishers,
SOVIET NEWS, 602 Grand Buildings, Trafalgar Square, London, W.C.2.

a.t. 2'22

THE U.S.S.R. ON GUARD OVER THE PEACE AND SECURITY OF THE NATIONS

A. Y. VYSHINSKY

1948

ONE PENNY

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>



ON THE SITUATION IN BEPLIN	2d.
THE DECLARATION OF WARSAW CONFERENCE ...	2d.
CONSTITUTION OF THE U.S.S.R. (<i>Authorised Text</i>) ...	3d.
MOLOTOV ON THE RESULTS OF THE LONDON CONFERENCE OF FOREIGN MINISTERS	3d.
30th ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREAT OCTOBER SOCIALIST REVOLUTION. Speech of V. M. Molotov ...	3d.
DEMILITARISATION AND DEMOCRATISATION OF GERMANY, by <i>Marshal V. D. Sokolovsky</i> ...	3d.
VYSHINSKY'S SPEECH ON PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP OF PEOPLES AGAINST THE INCENDIARIES OF A NEW WAR (UNO, 1947)	3d.
U.S.S.R. AND MARSHALL'S PROPOSALS—MOLOTOV'S STATEMENTS	3d.
SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS	3d.
J. V. STALIN ON POST-WAR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THE GREEK QUESTION. Speeches by Soviet Delegates at U.N. Assembly, 1947	6d.
FIVE-YEAR PLAN FOR 1946-50	1s. od.
EDUCATION IN THE U.S.S.R.	1s. od.
LEGAL RIGHTS OF THE SOVIET FAMILY, by <i>G. M. Sverdlov</i> ...	1s. od.
PUBLIC HEALTH IN THE U.S.S.R., by <i>N. Semashko</i> ...	1s. od.
PROPERTY RIGHTS OF SOVIET CITIZENS, by <i>M. S. Lipetsker</i> ...	1s. od.
SOVIET MUSIC (<i>Musical Education and Music-making</i>), by <i>Boris Yagolim</i>	1s. od.
CO-OPERATIVES IN THE SOVIET UNION, by <i>V. Batov</i> ...	1s. od.
HOW THE SOVIET CITIZEN PAYS HIS TAXES, by <i>Prof. M. I. Bogolepov</i>	1s. od.
SPORT IN THE SOVIET UNION, by <i>E. Petrovsky and others</i> ...	1s. od.
SOVIET LAND AND PEOPLE (<i>A Pocket Geography</i>), by <i>N. N. Mikhailov</i>	1s. 6d.
SOVIET SCIENCE IN THE SERVICE OF THE PEOPLE, by <i>S. Vavilov, President of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences</i> ...	1s. 6d.
SOVIET TRANSPORT (Rail, Air and Water), by <i>Prof. V. Obratsov and others</i>	1s. 6d.
V. M. MOLOTOV: FOR A DEMOCRATIC PEACE WITH GERMANY (Speeches at the London Session of Council of Foreign Ministers, 1947)	2s. od.
MOLOTOV'S SPEECHES AT THE PARIS CONFERENCE ...	2s. od.
MOLOTOV'S SPEECHES AT NEW YORK SESSION OF UNO GENERAL ASSEMBLY	2s. od.
CHESS IN RUSSIA, by <i>P. Romanovsky</i>	2s. 6d.
SHAKESPEARE ON THE SOVIET STAGE, by <i>M. M. Morozov</i> ...	5s. od.

Obtainable from Newsagents and Bookshops or direct from the Publishers,
SOVIET NEWS, 602 Grand Buildings, Trafalgar Square, London, W.C.2.

a.T. D'Eg

THE U.S.S.R. ON GUARD OVER THE PEACE AND SECURITY OF THE NATIONS

A. Y. VYSHINSKY

1948

ONE PENNY

**The U.S.S.R.
on Guard over the Peace
and Security of the
Nations**

*A. Y. Vyshinsky's Speech
to the UNO General Assembly
on September 25, 1948*



Published by "Soviet News"

London 1948

The speech made by A. Y. Vyshinsky, head of the U.S.S.R. delegation, at the plenary session of the General Assembly in Paris on September 25, 1948:

IT has already become an established tradition at the General Assembly of the United Nations to open each session with a general discussion, in order to look over mentally the road that we have covered, to sum up the results of the past year, to give an analysis of the activities of the United Nations and, quite naturally, also of the foreign policies of various States, especially those playing a leading part in our organisation. We intend to do this at the present session as well, certainly most briefly, in regard to that period of the work of the United Nations which separates us from the second session of the General Assembly, held in September-November, 1947.

1. VIOLATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF UNO

At the last session we pointed out the main shortcoming in the activity of the United Nations, which consists in failure to carry out a whole series of very important recommendations of the General Assembly. Thus the recommendations concerning a general reduction of armaments, on the utilisation of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only, on accelerating elaboration of measures for the prohibition of atomic weapons, have not been carried out, nor have the recommendations on a number of other important issues.

Alongside this, we must point out the utterly abnormal situation when influential members of the United Nations make use of their influence, not in order to carry into effect the recommendations of the General Assembly and the steps connected with them, but, on the contrary, to carry out measures fundamentally contradicting these recommendations. This happened, for instance, in the case of Palestine, in the case of Indonesia, in the case of national discrimination in the Union of South Africa and in a number of other important cases.

There is no need to emphasise what damage is caused to the prestige of the General Assembly and United Nations as a whole by violations of the Charter of the Organisation, and especially by the adoption of such unlawful decisions as the one concerning the establishment of the Interim Committee, the Commission for Korea and the so-called Balkans Commission. Everyone remembers under what circumstances the Interim Committee was established last year on the proposal of the United States delegation. Even at that time there was no doubt that those upon whose initiative this Committee was established aimed

at setting up a body competing with the Security Council, in order to undermine the importance of the latter and its position as a body shouldering the main responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security. Already at that time it was clear that this Interim Committee was conceived by the American delegation as a body endowed with broader functions than the Security Council.

The establishment of the Interim Committee was another step to undermine the United Nations and the whole cause of international co-operation. Since the purpose of the American proposal was to transfer the settlement of the most important problems of peace and security to the Interim Committee, thus ignoring the Security Council and violating the Charter of the United Nations, and to deal with these problems, not on the basis of the principle of unanimity among the five great Powers, but on a different basis, there can be no doubt that the adoption of this proposal undermines international co-operation based on mutual understanding, confidence and respect for the interests of all States great and small which are striving to strengthen peace and the security of nations. The Interim Committee, however, failed to justify the hopes of its organisers. It is no accident that the initiators of the establishment of the Interim Committee do not venture at present to raise the question of transforming this Committee from a provisional into a permanent institution.

The appointment of the Commission for Korea, according to the designs of the authors of that proposal, was to cover up foreign intervention in Korea's domestic affairs, to facilitate the formation of a government in Korea composed of people on whom the American military authorities had already previously relied for support, and on whom they planned to rely in the future as well, in disregard of the interests of the Korean people. We are aware of numerous facts of arbitrary actions and violence and even terrorism, which progressive people have suffered and continue to suffer in Southern Korea at present—in the first place people active in the democratic movement who refused to reconcile themselves to the suppression of the rights of their people.

As a result of this, by means of lawless acts and by splitting Korea, the American authorities set up a South Korean puppet government, which they advertise as the alleged government of the whole of Korea. This kind of falsification cannot, however, mislead anyone. This falsification becomes especially manifest when we compare conditions in Southern Korea with those in Northern Korea, where a broad popular movement for Korea's unity and independence has resulted in the formation of the Supreme National Assembly of Korea elected by the population of both Northern and Southern Korea, and in the establishment of the Government of the Korean People's Democratic Republic. Beyond any doubt Korea's future belongs to the Korean people,

who defend the unity and independence of their country against all attempts at converting Korea into a colony and exploiting her as a bridgehead for purposes of aggression.

Similarly abortive proved the efforts of the Balkans Commission, established unlawfully at a past session of the General Assembly and intended to facilitate suppression of the people's struggle for liberation in Greece, on the one hand, and to back up the artificial accusation advanced by the Greek Royalist-Fascists against the northern neighbours of Greece, on the other hand. A Commission of this kind, charged with tasks of this nature, proved unable to gain laurels either for itself or for the United Nations as a whole. Already last year at the General Assembly and in Committee No. 1 abundant proofs were cited to show that this Commission was not objective in its work and it was proved that the materials of this Commission do not give ground for any conclusions that would deserve attention and confidence. The same situation persists to-day, with which however we shall yet have to deal during discussion of the so-called Greek problem.

In respect of economic problems, the activities of the United Nations during the past period were focussed on issues which, although not devoid of significance, by no means affect the most vital interests of the nations, and, in the first place, of those countries which sustained greatest privations and sufferings as a result of the war imposed by the Hitlerites. Such U.N. agencies as the Economic and Social Council, and such commissions as the European Economic Commission and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, evaded carrying out important tasks in the elaboration of measures, for assistance in the economic rehabilitation of European countries which had suffered from the war, as also for assistance in the development of key branches of their national industries.

Despite the fact that, as is well-known, the Marshall plan ignores the United Nations, economic agencies of the United Nations regard as their most important task that of facilitating in every possible way the implementation of this plan. It is no accident that even the report of the Secretary-General, Mr. Trygve Lie, quite groundlessly describes the Marshall plan as a "promising plan for re-establishing economic and political stability in Western Europe". Meanwhile, it is now still clearer than it was one year ago that, far from contributing to the re-establishment of economic and political stability in Europe, the Marshall plan further aggravates the economic position of the European countries which have joined this plan, by undermining their economic and political independence.

2. SECURITY COUNCIL FAILED TO DISCHARGE ITS DUTY

In 1947 and 1948 the Security Council was confronted with a series of highly important problems connected, on the one hand,

with the implementation of the General Assembly's resolutions and recommendations, among which one should name in the first place the General Assembly's decision of January 24, 1946, on atomic energy, and the General Assembly's resolution of December 14, 1946, on the general regulation and reduction of armaments, and connected on the other hand, with the violations of the principles and provisions of the United Nations Charter and the decisions of the General Assembly committed by certain States in the period just passed. In spite of the fact that, on many occasions, these violations directly endangered the peace and security of the nations, the majority on the Security Council not only failed to take appropriate steps to eliminate this danger, but took up quite the opposite stand by rendering support to the offenders.

This is what happened in the case of Indonesia, when the majority in the Security Council did not take any action to put an end to the armed aggression launched by Holland against the Indonesian people. By the decision of the majority on the Security Council this case was turned over to the so-called Good Offices Committee, composed of representatives of the United States, Belgium and Australia. This Committee took the side of the Dutch colonisers and imposed upon the Indonesian Republic the enslaving Renville Agreement, as the result of which Indonesia lost a number of rich areas seized by the Dutch in 1947. At the same time the majority on the Security Council rejected a proposal on the cessation of hostilities and on the evacuation by the Dutch troops of the territory they seized after the beginning of hostilities, and thus in fact encouraged the aggressor's actions.

The Security Council also failed to discharge its duty in the case of Palestine. The General Assembly's decision of November 29 last year regarding the establishment of independent Arab and Jewish States in Palestine was frustrated. In fact, the policy pursued by the majority on the Security Council on the issue of Palestine was not directed towards taking steps to eliminate the national contradictions in Palestine and secure good-neighbourly relations between the Jewish and Arab peoples, but only helped to aggravate these contradictions and pushed both Arabs and Jews on to the road of strife and armed clashes, which led to the outbreak of war in Palestine. It was not only outright proposals presented by certain States to revise the General Assembly's decision of November 29 that led to the frustration of this decision, but also such actions as the American delegations's proposal to establish a trusteeship of Palestine or the proposal to institute the office of Mediator which, however, has failed to yield positive results to this day.

3. SOVIET UNION DEMANDS PROHIBITION OF THE ATOMIC WEAPON, THE ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERNATIONAL CONTROL

The Atomic Commission, which has been working for 30 months, and the Commission for Reduction of Armaments, which has been at work for nearly the same period, have not only failed to cope with any of the tasks set them by the General Assembly but, in fact, have made no progress whatever in this regard. Mountains of paper have been used up, but things have remained where they were before. The work of the Atomic Commission has proved futile because the United States government refuses to settle the fundamental problem upon which must depend the direction and nature of all the actions connected with the removal of the atomic weapon from national armaments and with ensuring the utilisation of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only.

It is well known that the Soviet Union insists on immediate prohibition of the atomic weapon and on the establishment of strict effective international control over the observance of this prohibition. The need for the prohibition of the atomic weapon arises from the very nature of this weapon as one of aggression, a weapon intended for attack, for the destruction of towns and mass extermination of peaceful populations.

Objections to the prohibition of the atomic weapon can come only from those circles which are interested in preserving their hold upon this weapon of aggression, which cherish plans for attack on other countries. It is these circles that place their last hope in the atomic bomb, building their aggressive plans under the illusion that they will be implemented, even under circumstances where the entire people, or the overwhelming majority of the people of the attacking country are against war, against military aggression projected by the reactionary clique at the top.

These circles resolutely oppose the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the atomic weapon and propose the establishment of international control of atomic energy, instead of a convention for the prohibition of the atomic weapon. And yet it is easy to see that, unless the utilisation of atomic energy for purposes of war is prohibited, it would be absurd to speak of any control of atomic energy whatever, since the very object of control would be lacking.

Without the prohibition of the production and application of the atomic weapon, proposals for the institution of an international body for controlling the utilisation of atomic energy are devoid of practical sense. Under such conditions, even the formulation of all kinds of regulations concerning the competence, functions, rights and duties of the control body becomes an utterly useless and empty occupation. Unless the atomic weapon is prohibited, all talk about control of the utilisation

of atomic energy is merely a means to deceive the nations, a smokescreen to conceal from the eyes of the people the atomic armaments race. (Applause.)

By insisting that an international control body should be set up first and an understanding on the prohibition of the atomic weapon achieved afterwards, the United States Government is putting the cart before the horse. Clearly this Government is not interested in progress in the work of the Atomic Commission, which was charged as far back as two and a half years ago with working out proposals concerning the elimination from national armaments of the atomic weapon and all other principal armaments suitable for mass extermination.

The demand that a convention on international control should be concluded first, and a convention on prohibition of the atomic weapon afterwards, is aimed at thwarting the conclusion of a convention on prohibition of the utilisation of atomic energy for war needs. The stand taken up by the American representatives on this issue means nothing else than the intention to cover up, by talk of control, their refusal to have any control whatever.

In addition, serious attention should be given to the proposal contained in the American plan to the effect that enterprises engaged in the production of atomic energy should be transferred to the ownership of the international control body and that in this way this international body should be made the owner of enterprises of this kind in any country, and would be able, on decision of the majority, to effect unrestricted and uncontrolled intervention in the economic life of this country. Bearing in mind that the American plan provides for transfer to the international control body, not only of individual enterprises, but of whole industrial branches which to some extent or another co-operate with plants and installations producing atomic materials, it is not difficult to see what consequences may result from the adoption of the American plan.

The Soviet Union holds that the international control body certainly must have the right to pass decisions by a majority vote on appropriate occasions. One cannot, however, agree that this international control body should in fact become an American body, and that such a body should be given the right to intervene in the economic life of various countries, even though on decisions of the majority of the control body.

The Soviet Union cannot permit such a situation to arise. The Soviet Union knows that the control bodies will have a majority which may pass one-sided decisions, a majority on whose favourable attitude the Soviet people cannot count. Therefore, the Soviet Union—and probably not the Soviet Union alone—cannot permit that the fate of its national economy should be placed in the hands of this body. Besides, the American proposal

on control does not afford the possibility of controlling atomic production in itself.

The second report of the Atomic Energy Commission of the Security Council of September 11, 1947, stating the American position on this issue, says that "effective international control of atomic energy to prevent its utilisation for purposes of destruction should be started with the strictest control over the two above-mentioned basic substances (uranium and thorium)" and that "the initial stage of any system of control should affect the raw materials constituting the source of these two basic substances." It would be vain, however, to look for any statements in this report concerning the need for simultaneous establishment of control of industrial production of atomic energy.

Thus, there remains no doubt but that the United States Government desires to lay hands on sources of raw materials in other countries with the help of a so-called international body, in which it hopes to have a majority, and refuses to place its atomic plants under international control along with all other enterprises and sources of raw materials. This attitude is clearly aimed at securing for the United States the unlimited possibility of further uncontrolled production of atomic bombs.

The Soviet Union maintains that a properly-organised international control body should exercise control over the production of atomic energy in all its stages—from the output of raw materials down to the ready product. The Soviet Union is unable to agree with the stand in regard to this issue adopted by the Government of the United States and by the Governments of Great Britain, France and certain other States supporting it. And in this the Soviet Union does not stand alone.

Recently, the newspaper *Manchester Guardian* published a letter by Mr. R. Innes, General Secretary of the British Association of Scientific Workers, who quite rightly raised the following question: "What harm would have been done by our agreeing to a declaration that we would not use atomic energy for military purposes in any future war?" Pointing out that a similar declaration was made in the convention prohibiting the use of gas in war, the Association of Scientific Workers is wondering why the use of atomic energy in war cannot be condemned.

The above-mentioned letter by Mr. Innes gives a reply to this question. It says that: "In the two years that have elapsed since the first Soviet suggestion for a convention was made, it has become clear that the real reason for the attitude of the Western Powers on this issue was that the United States Government deemed it necessary to retain the use of the threat of atomic weapons as a key factor in the cold war against Russia."

We must recall again that the atomic weapon is a weapon of attack, a weapon of aggression. All peace-loving nations, millions

upon millions of the common people, to whom aggressive aspirations and intentions are alien, should raise their voices for immediate prohibition of the utilisation of the atomic bomb, which is intended for the mass extermination of civilian populations and for the destruction of peaceful towns. (Applause.)

4. FOREIGN POLICY OF THE U.S.S.R. AND FOREIGN POLICY OF THE U.S.A.

This situation doubtless arose in connection with the course of policy which is being pursued in the work of the United Nations as a whole by such influential members of it as the United States of America, the foreign policy of which underwent a drastic change in recent years.

Formerly the United States, jointly with the U.S.S.R., fought against the aggressive forces—fascist Germany and militarist Japan. The United States, together with the Soviet Union, shed its blood on the battlefields against the common enemy and crowned this struggle with victory and the establishment of peace. The Soviet Union is pursuing its former policy of struggle against Fascism for democratic principles, for the welfare and consolidation of economic and political conditions in the democratic countries.

Having done away with German fascism and Japanese militarism, the Soviet Union continues its policy of peace, concentrating all its efforts on the solution of internal problems and, in the first place, of problems connected with rehabilitation and the further development of the war-damaged national economy. The Soviet people is fully absorbed in peaceful labour, in the consolidation and further development of Socialist construction in the country, firmly protecting the peace and security of the nations. (Loud applause.)

The Soviet Union's policy is an invariable and consistent policy of extending and strengthening international co-operation. This arises from the very nature of the Soviet State as a Socialist State of workers and peasants, highly interested in the creation of the most favourable conditions for peaceful constructive work, in building a Socialist society.

In its foreign policy the Soviet Union follows the course of co-operation among all countries willing to co-operate peacefully. It consistently opposes all plans and actions aimed at creating disunity among the nations and champions the democratic principles of post-war peace.

Things are different as regards the foreign policy of the United States of America. Following the termination of the Second World War, the United States Government changed its foreign policy. From a policy of struggle against the forces of aggression it passed to a policy of expansion and realisation of plans for world supremacy.

The characteristic of the foreign policy of the United States at present is the support openly rendered in various countries

to the most reactionary fascist-monarchist regimes and groups and the regular aid in money and arms rendered them for suppressing the democratic liberation movements of the peoples in those countries; the organisation of military alliances or blocs; the construction of new air and naval bases, as well as the expansion and reconstruction, in accordance with the latest military technical requirements, of old bases organised for the duration of the war with Germany, Japan and Italy; the frenzied propaganda for a new war against the Soviet Union and the new democracies in Eastern Europe; the feverish armaments race; the veritable worshipping of the atomic bomb as the alleged means of salvation from all dangers and troubles menacing the capitalist world. This policy fans the war psychosis, causes uneasiness and alarm among the broad masses of the people, who thirst for peace and calm creative labour. This policy has nothing in common with the policy of peace.

It is known that the Government of the United States, together with the Governments of Great Britain and France, has organised a military and political bloc of five States which does not set itself the aim of averting German aggression or rendering mutual assistance against such aggression. It cannot even set itself such an aim, as it is not directed against the danger of the recurrence of German aggression, but even envisages the inclusion of the Western part of Germany, which was for a long time the mainstay of German militarism and but recently served as the bulwark of Hitlerite aggression. It is perfectly clear that the organisation of such alliances plainly contradicts the interests of the consolidation of peace and the security of nations.

We are familiar with other alliances—alliances between peace-loving European States concluded for the purpose of averting the possibility of a new German aggression. The Soviet Union has concluded treaties of this kind with the countries of Eastern Europe and also with Finland. Treaties such as the Anglo-Soviet Treaty and the Franco-Soviet Mutual Assistance Treaty, signed for a term of 20 years, are built on the same basis. Treaties of this kind, and alliances based on them and intended to avert the possibility of a new German aggression, fully meet the interests of all the peace-loving nations and cannot result in some peace-loving States being opposed to other States or in the division of Europe.

On the other hand, treaties such as the Treaty of Military Alliance of the Western Countries, including Britain, France, Belgium, Holland and Luxemburg, do not envisage Germany alone, but may equally be directed against those States which were their allies in the Second World War. The entire British, French and American press frankly says that the Military Alliance of the five Western Countries is directed against the U.S.S.R. and the new democracies. Such a Treaty can by no

means be regarded as a defensive one. Whoever concludes such treaties and organises such alliances is pursuing a policy which has nothing in common with the consolidation of peace and is helping those who instigate and organise a new war.

5. ACTIVITIES OF WAR INSTIGATORS UNABATED

The decision passed last year by the second session of the General Assembly, condemning propaganda for a new war and demanding that means of information and propaganda should be used for assisting in the consolidation of friendly relations among States, failed to curb the instigators of a new war, who have grown still more insolent during the past year and engage in their criminal doings with still greater cynicism, endeavouring to drug as many of the common people as possible with the fumes of war propaganda.

This propaganda is accompanied by the dissemination of slanderous fabrications about the "aggressive" policy of the Soviet Union and the new democracies for the purpose of depicting the Soviet Union as an undemocratic country, and the United States, Great Britain and the other countries of the Anglo-American bloc as democratic States. All this is accompanied by a frenzied armaments race and by the elaboration of plans for attack on the U.S.S.R. and the new democracies and the preparation of other war actions.

In this connection I cannot fail to recall that, although three years have passed since the Second World War came to an end, the Anglo-American Combined Staff set up in 1942 for the duration of the war waged by the United Nations against fascist Germany and for the purpose of ensuring the direction of allied military operations, this Combined Staff exists to this day and engages in its secret activities directed against the interests of peace.

Among the representatives of the United States on this Staff we see Admiral Leahy, Admiral Denfeld Lewis, General Bradley, General Vandenberg, and the British representatives Admiral Henry Moore, General William Morgan, Air Chief Marshal Midhurst. In September 1947, under the direction of the Anglo-American Combined Staff, manoeuvres were held in the North Atlantic with the participation of naval forces of Britain, the United States and Canada, and in September 1948, manoeuvres for the so-called defence of Great Britain, with the participation of air forces of Britain and the United States.

At the same time steps are being taken to expand and strengthen bases, mostly air bases, for various future military adventures. In the pages of the newspapers, chiefly in the above-mentioned countries, frenzied instigators of war against the U.S.S.R. and the new democracies freely discuss various plans for an attack against the Soviet Union from these bases, manifestly planned to dazzle fainthearted people by enlarging upon

the military might of the United States and especially the might of the "special offensive forces", which means bomber aviation supplied with atomic bombs, as the American weekly *Saturday Evening Post* explained in its issue of September 11.

The editorial article in the April 9 issue of the influential American magazine *United States News and World Report* openly confirms that the United States Air Force is being reformed for the eventuality of possible hostilities in Europe. The magazine stresses the fact that these combat air forces, based in Great Britain, are being gathered by the United States in a circle around the U.S.S.R.

The magazine reproduces a detailed plan of attacks on the U.S.S.R. being prepared by the American Air Force, chiefly with the help of the above-mentioned bombers, jet fighter-planes and planes carrying atomic bombs.

The magazine published a map indicating the directions of blows by the United States Air Force in accordance with the above-mentioned plan. One of the explanatory notes to this map says: "The United States is attacking Russia chiefly from the air. The Mediterranean area, together with Britain and the Middle East, will be of primary importance. The Arctic will be of lesser significance in this operation. Southern Italy, Sicily and Turkey will serve as important bases. The atomic bomb will be used for attack on Russia proper."

On May 30 another American publication, the *New York Times Magazine*, carried an article expressing regret at the fact that the United States virtually does not possess satisfactory maps of most of the regions in Russian territory. "This fact," the article said, "is perhaps the greatest shortcoming of our attacking bomber force in the case of a raid on Russia. In blind bombing one must dispose of most precise maps."

This article specifies with cynical frankness air bases from which Soviet cities will be attacked, and indicates distances: "The distance from London to Moscow and back amounts to 3,100 miles, from Tripoli to Rostov 1,750 miles one way, from Fairbanks in Alaska to Vladivostok 3,400 miles one way, from Greenland base to Sverdlovsk 3,500 miles. . . ."

Of the same insolently brazen nature, in the nature of instigation to war, is the map published by the American firm Esso in New York. This map, with challenging bellicose appeals, bears the title: "Map of the Third World War. Pacific Theatre". This map is an instance of the vile propaganda for war against the U.S.S.R. and the democratic countries of Eastern Europe.

The mobilisation of reactionary forces, which have lost their confidence in the morrow, goes on incessantly. Public opinion is being worked on in the most frenzied manner with the help of unrestricted slander of the U.S.S.R. and the new democracies, malicious fabrications, misrepresentation of facts aimed at

deceiving millions of common people and diverting their attention from the real instigators of war.

Publishing scores of millions of copies of newspapers, magazines and books imbued with bestial hatred of democracy and Socialism and openly instigating an attack on the peace-loving democratic countries, the reactionary circles in the United States and Great Britain, as well as in France, Belgium and other countries, no longer confine themselves to slander and abuse.

At present this campaign is directed not only by amateurs from among retired politicians and statesmen, Senators, Members of Parliament, but also by persons holding high official positions in the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, France and certain other countries, such as United States Secretary of Defence Forrestal, Commander of the United States Strategical Air Force Kenny, United States Secretary of War Royall, Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee Bridges, British Members of Parliament Brown, Air Commodore Harvey, Sir Thomas Moore, Deputy Chief of Staff of the British Air Force Sir Hugh Walmsley, MacMillan, and others.

Now these gentlemen no longer come out with general phrases and slogans calling for war against the U.S.S.R. and the new democracies. They, and in particular the above-named representatives of the Higher Command of the United States come out with brightly painted plans for the utilisation of the Army, Air Force and the atomic bomb for the destruction of Soviet cities such as Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Kharkov, Odessa.

Thus the United States Secretary for Defence Forrestal, speaking in the Senate Armed Forces Committee, exceeded all bounds and, while insisting on the expansion of the Army and on the supplementary appropriation of 3,000 million dollars for military needs, instigated war against the U.S.S.R., urging the formation of a powerful air force capable of dealing incessant blows far from the periphery bases available at present. Speeches in the same vein were delivered by Royall, Bridges, Brown and other adventurers who bluntly called for an attack on the oil fields in Batumi and Baku, to the Donetz Basin and the industrial area beyond the Urals ridge.

6. ARMAMENTS RACE IN THE UNITED STATES

Contrary to repeated statements by representatives of the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and a number of other Western European States that their Governments entertain no aggressive aims, a frenzied armaments race is in progress in these countries. First in this race is the United States of America.

It is known that in 1947, that is two years after the end of the war, the United States Army was 3.5 times as great as it was before the war. Still greater expansion is observed in the United States Air Force which in 1947 grew in strength to 17 times that

of 1937. During the same period the tonnage of United States naval ships on active service increased 3.5 times while Navy personnel grew even as much as five times.

The United States approved Budget for 1948-1949 shows a growth in military expenditure of almost 4,000 million dollars compared with the preceding year. To this should be added that according to official data the following yearly increases have been planned in the military budget intended for the re-equipment of the Army, Air Force and Navy of the United States: in 1949-1950—17,500 million dollars, in 1950-51—20,000 million dollars, in 1951-52—21,500 million dollars, 1952-53—22,500 million dollars.

Enormous funds continue to be expended on military experiments and military research work, on the manufacture of all kinds of new perfected weapons which puts thousands of millions of dollars in profits into the pockets of the American monopoly capitalists.

The United States is not only intensively preparing for aggressive actions against the U.S.S.R. and the new democracies, but is helping a number of West European countries to prepare for this by supplying their armies with American arms. And all this is being masked by a need for the strengthening of defence and preparations for the protection of the country in the event of foreign aggression. The press has already carried a report on the possibility of a resumption of deliveries of arms from the United States to certain West European countries in the guise of lend-lease.

Such are conditions in the sphere of international relations at the present time. Such are the international conditions in which the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations is beginning its work.

It is easy to foresee that at the present session, as was the case at the previous session, as is the case in various committees and commissions of the United Nations, pompous and high-sounding speeches will again be delivered on subjects of international co-operation, of the peace and security of the nations, of human rights, of democracy. We know, however, that at the same time behind the scenes of the United Nations, in various H.Q.s and military bureaux of the United States, Great Britain and a number of other countries revolving in the orbit of Anglo-American influence, feverish work having nothing in common with the interests of peace or the defence of these countries is under way.

One cannot reconcile oneself to this situation. Millions of common people who paid with their blood for the crimes of the Fascist sponsors and organisers of the recent Second World War cannot permit a repetition of war, which carries with it terrific calamities and suffering for all humanity.

On the instructions of the Soviet Government, the Soviet delegation is proposing to the General Assembly to adopt the following decision for the sake of strengthening the cause of peace and eliminating the threat of a new war being kindled by expansionists and other reactionary elements:

7. PROPOSALS OF THE SOVIET UNION

"Noting that practically nothing has been done to this day to carry into effect the Assembly's decision of January 24, 1946, on atomic energy or the decision of December 14, 1946 on the principles governing the general regulation and reduction of armaments; acknowledging that prohibition of the production and utilisation of atomic energy for war needs is a primary task; acknowledging that a general substantial reduction of armaments meets the purposes of the establishment of firm peace and the consolidation of international security and corresponds to the interests of the peoples in reducing the heavy economic burden they shoulder as a result of the excessive and ever-growing expenditure on armaments in various countries; considering that the great Powers—permanent members of the Security Council—possess the bulk of the armed forces and armaments and bear the main responsibility for the maintenance of peace and general security; with a view to strengthening the cause of peace and eliminating the threat of a new war being kindled by expansionists and other reactionary elements:

"The General Assembly recommends the permanent members of the Security Council—the United States, Great Britain, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, France and China—as the first step in the reduction of armaments and armed forces, to reduce by one-third within one year all existing land, naval and air forces.

"The General Assembly recommends the prohibition of the atomic weapon as a weapon intended for aggressive aims and not for defence.

"The General Assembly recommends the establishment of an international control body within the framework of the Security Council to watch and control the carrying out of measures for the reduction of armaments and armed forces and for the prohibition of the atomic weapon."

Presenting these proposals on the instructions of the Soviet Government, the delegation of the U.S.S.R. expresses confidence that by adopting the aforesaid proposals the General Assembly will make a real and important contribution to the cause of the peace and security of the nations. (Prolonged applause.)

SOVIET WEEKLY

*The Only Soviet Illustrated Journal
Published in Great Britain*

Every Thursday

3d.

SPEECHES

and STATEMENTS
of international importance.

ARTICLES

by leading Soviet writers
and journalists.

SELECTIONS

from modern Russian Literature.

PICTURES

taken by our photographers
in all parts of the U.S.S.R.

SPORT

*From all newsagents, booksellers, or direct from
602 GRAND BUILDINGS, Trafalgar Sq., London, W.C.2*

Subscriptions: 4/4 per quarter; 8/8 half year; 17/4 year