

"SOVIET NEWS" BOOKLETS

| | |
|--|---------|
| SOVIET GOVERNMENT ON THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY | 1d. |
| THE U.S.S.R. ON GUARD OVER THE PEACE AND SECURITY OF THE NATIONS, <i>by A. Y. Vyshinsky</i> ... | 1d. |
| NEW U.S.S.R. PROPOSALS ON DISARMAMENT (Malik's Speech at Security Council, February, 1949) | 1d. |
| SOCIAL INSURANCE IN THE U.S.S.R., <i>by Z. Mokhov</i> ... | 1d. |
| STALIN'S POLICY OF PEACE AND DEMOCRACY ... | 2d. |
| FOR A DEMOCRATIC PEACE WITH GERMANY. Speeches at London Session of Council of Foreign Ministers; <i>by V. M. Molotov</i> , 1947 | 2d. |
| MOLOTOV'S SPEECHES AT PARIS CONFERENCE, 1946 ... | 2d. |
| MOLOTOV'S SPEECHES AT NEW YORK SESSION OF U.N.O. GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 1946 | 2d. |
| MOLOTOV'S SPEECHES AT MOSCOW SESSION OF COUNCIL OF FOREIGN MINISTERS, 1947 | 2d. |
| BAN ATOMIC BOMB AND REDUCE ARMAMENTS, <i>by A. Y. Vyshinsky</i> | 2d. |
| LEGAL RIGHTS OF THE SOVIET FAMILY, <i>by G. M. Sverdlov</i> | 2d. |
| SOVIET MUSIC, <i>by Boris Yagolim</i> | 2d. |
| U.S.S.R. AND MARSHALL'S PROPOSALS (Molotov's Statements) | 3d. |
| SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS | 3d. |
| FIVE-YEAR PLAN FOR 1946-1950 | 1s. 0d. |
| PROPERTY RIGHTS OF SOVIET CITIZENS, <i>by M. S. Lipetsker</i> | 1s. 0d. |
| SHAKESPEARE ON THE SOVIET STAGE, <i>by M. M. Morozov</i> | 1s. 0d. |
| SOVIET TRANSPORT (Rail, Air and Water), <i>by V. Obratzov</i> | 1s. 6d. |
| THE TEACHINGS OF LENIN AND STALIN ON THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND THE STATE, <i>by A. Y. Vyshinsky</i> | 2s. 0d. |
| CHESS IN RUSSIA, <i>by P. Romanovsky</i> | 2s. 6d. |

Obtainable from Newsagents and Bookshops or direct from the Publishers,
SOVIET NEWS, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, S.W.7

Printed by Illustrated Publications, Ltd. (Group), London, S.E.1

The Soviet Foreign Policy—

A Policy of Peace

Against Preparations For a New War— For a Five-Power Peace Pact

By A. Y. VYSHINSKY

Speech at United Nations Political
Committee on November 16, 1949

THREEPENCE

"Soviet News" Booklet, London, 1949

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 Condemning the Preparations
of a New War and for the
Conclusion of a Five-Power Pact
to Strengthen Peace**

By A. Y. VYSHINSKY

**Speech at the United Nations Political
Committee on November 16, 1949**

**1. The Five Powers Bear the Main
Responsibility for Peace**

I DEEM it necessary from the very outset to call attention to a specific feature of the recent debates in the Political Committee on the proposals of the Soviet Union, which at once is noticeable. It is the extreme tendentiousness and one-sidedness in the speeches of the delegates who objected to the Soviet proposals—speeches which contained so many distortions and crude attacks against the Soviet Union and Soviet foreign policy.

So many questions with no bearing whatever on the Soviet Government's proposals for condemning the preparation of a new war and concluding a pact of the five Powers for strengthening peace, were piled up in these speeches as to leave no doubt whatever about the real schemes of our opponents. These schemes consist in diverting the attention of public opinion from the main problems now facing us which demand a solution, since, without a solution of these problems, it is impossible to eliminate the danger of a new war which hangs over the world.

A number of speakers objected to the main proposal of the Soviet Government for the conclusion of a five-Power pact referring to the fact that all member States of the United Nations bear responsibility for peace. This, of course, is true, since no single member State of the United

Nations can be relieved of responsibility both for the instigation and the preparation of a new war and for the cause of peace; but, no matter what may be said here on this score, one cannot dispute the fact that the main responsibility for peace is borne by the five permanent members of the Security Council and that this responsibility devolves upon them precisely because of the special role which they play in international relations by virtue of their international position.

For this reason one must resolutely reject attempts to minimise the degree of responsibility for the cause of peace borne by the five great Powers, attempts to relieve the great Powers of this responsibility which in fact rests primarily and above all with them, by talk about the equal responsibility of all member States of the United Nations. This responsibility of the great Powers is a fact which can in no way be evaded. Those who deny such responsibility or try to minimise it in every possible way, hiding behind the backs of all the U.N. member States, merely prove, not only their unwillingness to bear such a responsibility, but also unwillingness to take the effective measures which it is necessary to take in the interests of the strengthening of peace and the security of the nations.

Two Outstanding Facts

This refers first of all to the United States representative whose speech on this question cannot be regarded as other than an attempt to prevent the adoption of the Soviet proposals and, consequently, to prevent the adoption of measures aimed against the preparation of a new war and for the strengthening of peace.

In his speech Mr. Austin stressed that the U.S.S.R. delegation raises the question of propaganda and preparation of a new war not for the first time. This is true. But what is this evidence of? It is evidence of at least two facts:

Firstly, it is evidence that for a number of years the war propaganda conducted in a number of countries, and in the first place in the United States and Britain, has not ceased, and of late the preparation of a new war has developed extensively as well.

Secondly, it is evidence of our persistent striving to draw the General Assembly into the serious elaboration of measures for the consolidation of peace. It is evidence that the U.S.S.R. pursues a truly consistent line, and wages a consistent struggle not only against war propaganda but also against the preparation of a new war.

Here, Mr. Austin, is what is shown by the fact that you, the representative of the United States, are forced every year to listen to our proposals on peace.

2. American Militarists Seek to Cloak Preparations of a New War

MR. AUSTIN denies that the preparation of a new war is being conducted in the United States. To deny is not enough. It is necessary to prove that war preparations are not being carried out. I have cited a number of facts, a number of proofs that war preparations are being carried out. Perhaps the facts presented are insufficient, perhaps Mr. Austin considers that they do not prove anything? In that case Mr. Austin ought to prove it. But he has made no attempt whatever to prove anything, to show in what way the groundlessness of our proof is made manifest. Not a single fact was adduced to refute our assertions, corroborated by numerous data.

Has Mr. Austin refuted the maniacal pronouncements on war made by General Bradley? Has he refuted the maniacal utterances of the United States Secretary of Defence, Mr. Johnson? But these are not insignificant people in the Governmental system of the United States of America, these are the official representatives of the American Government! One could expect that Mr. Austin would produce some kind of explanation for these maniacal speeches, that he would say: "You do not properly interpret what General Bradley said," or "He did not say this. He did not have this in mind. He said something else. You distorted. You misinterpreted. Your proof therefore cannot be believed."

Mr. Austin said nothing of the kind. He kept silent, posing as the Egyptian sphinx whom incidentally, I do not envy—not Mr. Austin, but the sphinx. And Mr. Austin simply let all these facts float past his ears. I also pointed

to such facts as the organisation in the military schools of the United States of a special course which is called the "Course for Special Strategy in War Against the Soviet Union." This course is being given, not in some place, some club of insane or semi-insane people, but in the military school at Maxwell Field. I now ask: Perhaps this is untrue? No, it is true, and Mr. Austin could not deny it and did not deny it.

The entire reactionary American press is screaming and howling, clamouring for Soviet blood. Mr. Austin preserves an imperturbable calm as though nothing of the kind is taking place in reality, as though this press is singing love roudades dedicated to the U.S.S.R. and is not publishing despicable slander, outright calls for war against the U.S.S.R.

You demand facts. We have cited these facts. If this is insufficient for you, we shall cite some more. Mr. Austin expressed obvious displeasure with our proposals. He is dissatisfied in general because we speak the truth, because we call war preparation war preparation, and call warmongers warmongers. Mr. Austin is dissatisfied because we call things and people by their proper names.

Warmongers Accused

He said outright that abuse does not facilitate constructive co-operation, provocation cannot serve as a contribution to friendly co-operation. Of what friendly co-operation is Mr. Austin speaking when American militarists conduct open incitement to war against the U.S.S.R.? Of what provocation is Mr. Austin speaking, unless it is to be applied to the behaviour of Messrs. the American militarists?

Mr. Austin says that the U.S.S.R. proposal is aimed at condemning the United States of America and Great Britain for preparing a new war. Yes, this is so. We have said it in the first sentence of our proposals. We said it at the plenary session on September 23. We repeated it here on November 14, I repeat it today.

We are told: "This is a grave accusation." Yes, it is. But it is an accusation based on facts. You say: "We must thus become a court and must therefore examine these facts." I welcome this, but I cannot agree with such speeches as, for example, that of the Peruvian delegate who did not give any facts whatever, who spoke more

about his diplomatic practice, his splendid experience as a diplomat, who spoke about Bolivar and anything you please, but said nothing concerning the substance of our proposals. This is not an examination of the matter, not a study of facts, and in such a situation you, of course, have no right to regard yourselves as a supreme court in matters of international import.

To be a judge in this matter one must examine the facts, gentlemen, and not evade examination of the facts. This will not help those who think they represent the majority here. The majority beyond the walls of this hall and the majority in different countries—in East and West, in South and North—closely follows what is happening here in these halls, committees and plenary sessions.

We promised to present additional facts. We shall do so. But we are entitled to present our demand, which is that it is necessary to settle with the facts we have already cited. You ignore them. You say: "Give us other facts."

We shall give you other facts but you—I am addressing my critics—bear in mind that we shall remember that you have not settled with those facts, that you are in debt to us, that you prefer to keep silent about these facts. Thereby you have already said what these facts mean, what weight they carry.

American Military, Naval and Air Bases

Let us, then, turn to facts. These facts show that reactionary circles in the United States of America, Great Britain and certain other States—there is no need to enumerate them all—are preparing a new war. The leading role here belongs to the ruling circles in the U.S.A. who openly support preparation for a new war, which is shown not only in propaganda but also in the very rapid growth of the military budgets, in the armaments race, in the organisation of bases which have the specific purpose of preparing war, in organising blocs which have specific purpose of bringing about war.

What facts have we? Be so kind as to listen. In September, 1945, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Hensel, outlining the view of his Department at a public press conference, said that the United States "must secure for itself a gigantic post-war ring of naval bases en-

compassing the Pacific Ocean and including bases which formerly belonged to Britain." And indeed, according to authoritative data which no one has as yet disputed, the U.S.A., in the course of the war, built 256 bases of all dimensions and all types in the Pacific theatre of war and 228 military, naval and air bases in the Atlantic theatre of war, that is 484 bases in all. Since then the number of these bases has increased.

In October, 1948, a communique was issued in London confirming that there are permanent bases for American Super Fortresses in Britain and that stationed at these bases were 90 American B-29 Super Fortresses, subdivided into three groups of the strategic bomber air force. The former Commander of the U.S. Air Forces, General Spaatz, then boasted—counting on intimidating people with weak nerves—that these 90 American bombers, translated into the language of atomic firepower, would be equivalent to 19,800 Super Fortresses!

American Bombers in Britain

On November 4, 1949—only recently—the *New York Times* published a dispatch stating that "after 24 hours of grave consideration the British Government had finally agreed on November 3 to accept the proposal of the United States to hand over to Britain 70 American B-29 bombers. These bombers were soon to be sent to Britain as part of the military aid programme in conformity with the terms of the North Atlantic Pact. The above decision had been taken by the British Government after prolonged discussion in the course of which high-ranking officers of the Royal Air Force, the officials of the Ministry of Aviation and the Defence Committee of the Cabinet who took part in it, had disagreed on the expediency of accepting these American planes."

What do these indisputable facts show? They show, firstly, that Britain has no faith in herself, that she recognises her military weakness, that she is placing the country's destiny in the hands of the American armed forces and, consequently, in the hands of those who direct these armed forces.

Moreover, this is evidence that imposing air and military forces are being mustered precisely in Britain, that Britain

has been turned into an American military base from which country targets for attack could easily be reached. Which? Ponder over this question. Well, who is to be attacked by these 19,800 bombers translated into the language of atomic firepower? Who? France? Belgium? Luxembourg? Western Germany? Sweden? Norway? Who?

You are silent, you have already replied with your silence! All these speeches by Mr. Austin and then by Mr. McNeil and others among their friends—in their overwhelming majority members of the North Atlantic Pact—were needed in order to justify this attack that is being prepared on the U.S.S.R. and the countries of people's democracy.

The United States of America is building its bases on the territories of other countries, including Great Britain, and at the same time accuses the Soviet Union of preparing armed attack.

Acquiring Strategic Bases

It turns out that those who build bases are not preparing to attack, while those who do not build bases are preparing to attack! But, after all, one does not attack with bare hands! Those who are arming are peace-loving people, they are peacemakers; while those who demand disarmament, who demand the signing of a treaty for the strengthening of peace—those are the real aggressors! But do you think that anyone will believe such logic? Do you think that such logic can convince anyone of anything?

Let us proceed. In 1948 the *New York Times* carried a dispatch from Nicosia (Cyprus), saying that Cyprus is being turned by the Americans and British into an important strategic base which must become, as the correspondent put it, a point of support against Soviet expansion. This means that Cyprus has been included in this system of attack on the Soviet Union.

The *New York Times* correspondent reported at the same time that although Cyprus was a British colony, plans for converting Cyprus into a bastion directed against the Soviet Union were being drafted under joint Anglo-American control, or rather, under American control.

In September, 1948—this is known to the entire world—Senator Gurney, Chairman of the Armed Services Com-

mittee of the U.S. Senate, met Franco. The Madrid correspondent of the *Daily Mail* reported that in exchange for granting bases to the United States, Franco had demanded Spain's admission to the United Nations and the extension to her of all the benefits given to the Marshallised countries.

It is now clear, of course, why we have here a delay in the admission of certain new members to the United Nations. The reason is that the United States and Britain are trying in every way first of all to drag Portugal, Spain, etc., into the United Nations. One must frankly say that their entry into the United Nations will bring nothing good to the United Nations. What is important is not this; what is important is the deal taking place behind the back of the entire world. The deal: "Give us bases and we will admit you to the United Nations."

American Bases in Spain and Portugal

The State Department, as the American press now reports, is seeking to obtain from Franco the right to use the ports of Cadiz, Cartagena, Valencia, Barcelona and Huelva; the right to extend existing military aerodromes, the right to build new aerodromes, especially near the coast, on the high plateau in the interior of the country, in Catalonia and Aragon. It is plainly pointed out that the United States is interested in one more Balearic Island being placed at the disposal of the American armed forces.

There is information available that, as early as 1947, a secret agreement was concluded with Spain under which the United States received the right to build 13 bases on Spanish territory. Similar news was published in the monthly bulletin *Report on World Affairs*, which reported that the United States at the same time reached an agreement in Portugal granting it the right to build seven bases in Portugal proper and five bases in the Portuguese colonies.

In July, 1949, Associated Press published a report that the United States was drawing up a plan for setting up advanced air bases deep in the heart of the Arctic and explained why this was necessary for the United States. It turns out that this was necessary because planes could refuel there during operations across the North Pole.

Will you be so kind as to tell us against whom these

operations across the North Pole will be directed? Perhaps against Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Iceland? Across the North Pole—against whom could these operations be carried out? Operations for which such tremendous preparation is necessary: bases, hundreds of planes and the atom bomb, which, as is known, is the last hope of the American militarists.

Was there a denial of a report, also by the Associated Press—a report which said that they—the editors—had happened to get hold of a report of the Air Force Department, the American Air Force Department, about plans and estimates connected with setting up bases for heavy bombers at Limestone, Maine, which said that "a typical Arctic operation might require that planes taking off from air bases in the United States of America should refuel at advanced bases in Northern Canada, Greenland, or even on the Arctic ice?" One could cite a host of other facts which prove the complete justification for the anxiety, the complete justification for the assertions about the preparation of a new war being pursued under cover of all kinds of peaceful or peace-loving phraseology.

What is Purpose of Bases?

It would be important at least to explain to world public opinion for what purposes are being preserved the above military bases set up during the Second World War against Hitlerite Germany and militarist Japan. For what purpose are they not only being preserved but also new bases organised? Precisely against whom are these bases designated? Precisely what does the peaceful mission of these bases consist of?

It must be admitted that until now neither we nor anyone in general could obtain any kind of articulate answer from the United States of America to all these questions, even to one of these questions.

One cannot regard as an answer to these questions the speeches which we hear from time to time from Messrs. American representatives—military and civilian—former and present Senators, speeches about the military vacuum which, don't you see, must be filled because the law of physics says that nature abhors a vacuum . . . or speeches about the need of mutual assistance, defence, when it is known that

no one intends to attack the United States or the other participants of the North Atlantic Pact, and consequently there is no one to defend against.

3. North Atlantic Union — Instrument of Aggression and Not Instrument of Peace

MR. AUSTIN tried here to convince us of the peace-loving policy of the United States. He quoted in his speech the statement of the Foreign Relations Committee of the American Senate as proof, as he said, that the main aim of the North Atlantic Pact is to assist in attaining the prime object of the United Nations, namely, the maintenance of peace and security.

Mr. Austin quoted also the section of this statement which says that the North Atlantic Union is a union only against war itself. In doing so, he asserted also, I am quoting him, that "the policy of the United States of America was directed exclusively at ensuring international peace and security through the medium of the United Nations, so that armed forces should not be used otherwise than in the common interests." Mr. Austin asserted further that "the United States seeks to secure armed forces to the United Nations, as envisaged in the Charter."

This is what Mr. Austin assured us of, boosting the foreign policy of the United States as a peace-loving policy, as a policy directed against war and military gambles, as a policy aimed at consolidating peace.

Does this correspond to reality? No, it does not correspond, and for this reason. I am using the arguments of Mr. Austin himself. We are told that inasmuch as the United Nations Charter already contains the obligation to strengthen peace, there is no need for concluding a pact of the Five Powers for the strengthening of peace. But why have you, though such obligations envisaged in the Charter exist, nevertheless concluded the North Atlantic Pact? Is it not clear that such a line of argument is unconvincing?

If, with the United Nations in existence it is possible to have the North Atlantic Pact, even with the most peace-

loving aims, a pact of 12 States, while the United Nations Organisation consists of 59 States, why is it impossible to have a Pact of five States? Why is this regarded as contrary to the principles of the United Nations?

I must state that everything that is being said about the peaceful aims of the North Atlantic Pact does not withstand any criticism; nor does the reference that the North Atlantic Pact allegedly acts through the United Nations in the common interests withstand criticism. This does not correspond to reality because the United Nations did not give its consent to the establishment of the North Atlantic Union. You organised this Union without us and without many other States, and for a perfectly natural reason. Because this Union is directed against us.

Mr. Austin beats his breast, maintaining that everything is for peace and only for peace and that the North Atlantic Pact does not pursue any military aims whatever, and refers to the fact that the Soviet Union has Pacts with the East European countries, with Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania.

Western Germany and North Atlantic Pact

But these Pacts are directed against possible future German aggression, which remains a real danger and a threat for us also in the future, for German militarism has not been killed, especially owing to the policy of the United States of America and Great Britain in the Western zones of Germany. Moreover, it is being encouraged. Western Germany is being turned into a future participant of this North Atlantic Pact, with all the consequences that follow therefrom, as a bridgehead for possible attack on other countries, on the U.S.S.R. and its friends.

If the North Atlantic Pact deals with peace, why in such a case does the United States thwart the elaboration of measures for setting up armed forces of the United Nations? Why could we not during four years reach an understanding about contingents of armed forces of the United Nations, reach an understanding on the qualitative and quantitative principle of organisation of the armed forces?

If the policy of the United States is really directed at ensuring peace and security through the United Nations, as you assert, how in such a case is it possible to set

up such an organisation as the North Atlantic Union outside of the United Nations and even in an atmosphere of competition with the United Nations? What relation does the United Nations bear to the North Atlantic Union except the fact that 12 of the 59 States present here are participants in this Union?

What right have you, Mr. Austin, to say that the North Atlantic Union is a Union set up through the medium of the United Nations and in a way that the armed forces of the United Nations should not be used otherwise than in the common interests? In whose common interests will be used the armed forces of this North Atlantic Union if they are to be used? Whose will these "common interests" be?

Twelve States participate in this Union, 59 States participate in the United Nations and outside of the Organisation remains a good ten other possible participants in this Organisation. In whose "common interests" will be used the armed forces at the command of these 12 States, or more exactly, the one State which runs all these affairs—the United States of America?

This alone convincingly shows that the policy of the United States of America pursues entirely different aims than those of which Mr Austin spoke here, aims spoken of more imposingly and authoritatively, allow us to say this here, by the Bradleys, Johnsons and others who guide the military affairs of the United States of America and are the makers of its foreign policy.

4. Instead of International Control— an American Super-Trust

MR. Austin is displeased with Paragraph 2 of the Soviet Union's proposals, which speak of practical measures for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and international control over the implementation of this prohibition.

What has Mr. Austin expounded on this score, becoming for the time a real poet? This, it turns out, is "a sweet-sounding paragraph." This, it turns out, is an "artificial branch surrounded by thorns," this, lastly, is "lofty talk

of peace which sounds like war." He is not a Senator, though a former one, but a veritable poet!

But what did he say besides this on the substance of Paragraph 2? I can assert that if one is to cast aside all these verbal trappings, all these belaboured attempts at poetic imagery, what remains is only Mr. Austin's irritation. It is precisely only a state of irritation and loss of self-control that can explain this entire part of Mr. Austin's speech, in which he said that we allegedly ignore the conclusion of the General Assembly that effective prohibition of the atomic weapon can be attained only by turning over all dangerous atomic materials and all means for the manufacture and utilisation into the hands of the international agency which the American delegates call an international co-operative.

But this too does not correspond to reality. Indeed, do we ignore the General Assembly's decision? On the contrary, we have thoroughly analysed it and proved that this demand for placing all atomic raw materials and all enterprises processing these raw materials at the disposal of a so-called international agency, whether on the basis of property rights or ownership rights, is unacceptable. And we have shown why.

American Proposals on Atomic Energy

All our opponents were irritated by the fact that we defend State sovereignty, that we oppose the conversion of the international control agency into an American super-trust. They attempted to reduce this entire matter to some theoretical talk about juridical concepts.

But the point at issue is quite different indeed. I have quoted here the 1946 memorandum of the Commission headed by Mr. Acheson, I have quoted a number of other documents and specifically the statement made by Mr. Barnard, whom Mr. Austin undoubtedly knows, a statement which reveals the ins and outs of this proposal on the transferring of atomic resources as the property of the international control agency and in opposition to our proposals. These questions remained unexplained, although elucidation of these questions would have eliminated many grounds for all sorts of differences of opinion which are tearing us asunder here.

But this has not been done either. We say that the transferring as the property of this international control agency of all atomic resources of every country, all enterprises processing atomic materials, all enterprises of so-called related industries—metallurgical, chemical, etc., as well as entire scientific research—to transfer all this as the property of this agency is impossible because it would mean paralysing the entire economic system, particularly in those countries where energetics play a decisive role while atomic energy plays a particular role in the development of the national economy.

Let us leave the question of sovereignty alone. Let it be a threadbare, old, some sort of feudal mediaeval theory as asserted here. All this is certainly wrong. But let us leave it at that. Let us break away from the captivity of legalistic scholastics and let us approach it from the viewpoint of the life of States and nations.

Aim of American Proposals

From this standpoint, too, it is necessary to reject the American proposal to turn over atomic resources and enterprises as the property of the control agency because we cannot allow by means of the American plan—which, incidentally, is deficient, as is admitted by its authors themselves—that the entire economy of a country be subjected to the control of this agency.

Besides, it can be regarded as established that the turning over of atomic energy resources as the property of the control agency is not called forth by any necessity. This is said by persons of authority, by Americans themselves. There are no grounds whatever for such a plan and such proposals except a striving to lay hands on the entire set up of atomic energy, to grab it all in one fist and become a monopolist which would dictate to any country the lines of development of its economy, the lines of development of this country.

The matter at issue is not theories of State sovereignty, although this to a great extent concerns State sovereignty too. In no way can we agree to the denial of sovereignty of which we are hearing here not for the first year. The matter at issue is the vital interests of a country, and only those who have nothing to lose in this respect, or those

who by the course of historical developments have been placed in such a position where they are incapable of offering such opposition, when they are compelled to drink this cup of bitterness to the last drop, only those have no choice.

But we are not in such a position, we have never been and never shall be in such a position. We have sufficient strength and means in order to keep our economic and political independence. We confidently look to the future because we have a great past behind us, and ours is a great present, created by the genius of our Soviet people, and we shall turn down any plan which seeks to subjugate our country to the control of foreign capitalist organisations.

Here, as it is quite clear, we have two camps. Each of them has its own concepts. If we do not find a way of reaching agreement then, of course, our co-operation is made impossible.

Soviet Proposals on Atomic Energy

But is it possible to find such a way? It is possible. And I shall especially prove this later in connection with a very important question which was raised here about war and about the existence of two systems, about the possibility of co-operation, about the statements of our great teachers Lenin and Stalin, our teachers Marx and Engels. Yes, gentlemen, we are guided and inspired by Marxism and Leninism. We stand on these grounds, since this is the greatest achievement of science in the realm of sociology, economy, about the paths of the social development of humanity, and our activity is built on the basis of science and not utopia. But now I want to speak about Soviet proposals and about the extent of honesty of the criticism of our critics.

The Soviet proposals are very modest. Our proposals on atomic energy are reflected in paragraph 2. The Soviet proposals boil down to the proposal that the General Assembly instruct, direct, recommend the Atomic Energy Commission, that it delay no further but get on with the practical measures for the prohibition of the atomic weapon, for the establishment of strict international control.

Can such a proposal hinder or harm the matter in the eyes of those who are genuinely interested in it? Does

the adoption of such a proposal exclude the duty of the Atomic Energy Commission or any other appropriately authorised body to begin drawing up practical measures for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and for control? I shall not err if I say that the decision on atomic energy adopted yesterday in the Special Political Committee, and which will, of course, be approved by the General Assembly, will have the same practical importance as had all previous decisions of the General Assembly on this issue, that is, no importance whatever.

Here we do not need words, but we do need practical deeds, and we have only one request to Political Committee No. 1 and through it to the General Assembly—to adopt such a decision that would make it obligatory to tackle the practical task. If you want to prohibit the atomic weapon, then order that practical measures be drawn up.

U.S.A. Opposes Abolition of Atomic Weapon

But you do not want to do it by way of issuing instructions to draw up practical measures. This gives us the right to assert for the whole world to hear that you do not want the prohibition of the atomic weapon. This is attested to by the already quoted report of Mr. Acheson's Commission, a report which you defenders of this plan are attempting to gloss over.

But you will not succeed in glossing it over since Mr. Acheson's letter states directly: "Here you have the control plan which we have worked out. But do not think, Messrs. Senators, that by adopting this plan the United States will be obliged to discontinue the production of atomic bombs. No, the United States will not at all be obliged to do so. This will still be decided by Congress in the light of higher politics, we shall settle this by our constitutional procedure irrespective of the plan for international control. In other words, we shall vote in the Senate as we like if we desire to preserve these bombs and to increase their stocks."

More than that, from the afore-mentioned report it is clear, as was said by Mr. Lilienthal, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, that the main attention of this Commission is not directed towards inventing methods for suspending the production of the

atomic weapon but to accumulate as many atom bombs as possible.

As far back as 1946 the Lilienthal Commission realised that the hour would come, and that it would be struck by the clock of history, when other States also would be in a position to compete with the United States as regards the production of atom bombs! And this hour has struck, and several years earlier than estimated by the American stargazers.

Now we are striving for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of strict international control over the implementation of this prohibition. We are offered a plan which cannot satisfy anyone but those who want neither prohibition nor control.

But we are being assured of the contrary assertion that they—our critics—are also for prohibition and control. We say: "Good, but let us begin work together on practical measures." But to this we get the reply: "This is useless! Accept our plan." We, however, say: "Your plan is no good." And this is said not only by us but is also said by your own representatives, as, for instance, Mr. Osborn. Your refusal to accept our proposals exposes you completely.

Mr. Austin suggested that Political Committee No. 1 reject Paragraph 2 of our proposals. In so doing he referred to the fact that the *ad hoc* committee had already examined the question of atomic energy. But this cannot prevent the Political Committee from accepting our proposals on drawing up practical proposals on prohibition and control, all the less so as the *ad hoc* committee had not considered or adopted such a proposal. Rejection of this proposal laid down in Paragraph 2 of our draft resolution can be demanded only by those who are not interested in speeding up this work, not interested in prohibition of the atomic weapon.

5. Anglo-American Critics Try to Deceive Public Opinion

NOW a few words about other questions touched upon by Mr. Austin—about the elections in Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Poland. All these questions were dragged in here by the hair in order to divert public

attention from the Soviet Government's proposals on strengthening peace, in order to deceive public opinion. My Polish colleague has replied to questions regarding Poland. I shall say a few words in connection with what was said here by Mr. Austin about other countries.

First of all I shall recall what we said on this subject while discussing the question of alleged violation by the Governments of Hungary, Bulgaria and Rumania of so-called human rights and basic liberties. We spoke about all this rather in detail. We cited the facts, and you voted. We cited the facts, and you were silent. But the head of the Polish delegation, Mr. Werblowski, opportunely recalled the Greek elections which were accompanied by swindles and falsifications. Indeed, it is a fact that a member of the International Control Commission, a professor of California University, who exposed these falsifications, was driven out of this Commission.

Insinuations Regarding People's Democracies

All this Mr. Austin and Mr. McNeil passed over in silence, preferring to indulge in insinuations with regard to the elections in the people's democracies. Mr. Austin thought it somehow appropriate to repeat gossip to the effect that in 1945 I allegedly had presented the Rumanian King with an ultimatum, demanding a reply within two hours and five seconds. Where did Mr. Austin get such accurate information? Was it from the ex-King himself? Maybe we ought to invite the ex-King to come here and question him?

Actually, of course, there was no ultimatum of any kind. There was General Radescu's conspiracy, the treason of a handful of Generals—Hitler's agents. That was in February, 1945. That was the time when the Red Army was fiercely fighting its way towards Berlin and when Radescu and other traitors planned to undermine the Red Army's rear. In those conditions it was necessary to draw the ex-King's attention to the situation that had arisen and to propose that General Radescu's Government be replaced by a Government enjoying the confidence of the Rumanian people. And this was done. General Radescu resigned and his resignation was accepted. General Radescu immediately took refuge in the British Embassy in Bucharest and subsequently, as is known, went to the

United States, where he is now in the company of other traitors and adventurers who are conspiring against the Rumanian People's Democratic Republic.

If this question is to be referred to, then it should be recalled that in the same year of 1945, on the strength of a decision taken at a conference of three Ministers of the United States, Great Britain and the U.S.S.R., a commission—composed of your humble servant, the British Ambassador in Moscow, Sir Archibald Clark Kerr, and the American Ambassador in Moscow, Mr. Harriman—visited Bucharest and conducted negotiations with the same ex-King Michael and the Rumanian Government on adding to Dr. Groza's Government two members of the Zaranist and Liberal Parties, which was also done.

Thus, the United States and Great Britain, far from objecting to Dr. Groza's new Government, helped it, as we see, and took measures for its consolidation. Why, then, all this gossip disseminated here by Mr. Austin about an ultimatum and about General Radescu's "lawful" Government being replaced by a new Government of Dr. Groza on the instructions of the Soviet Government?

It is clear that this gossip can pursue only one aim—to make an attempt somehow to whitewash Radescu and to pass him off as a victim of interference on the part of the Soviet authorities.

Mr. Austin's tall stories were apparently needed in order to divert, by idle talk, attention from the discussion of such a serious matter as the Soviet Government's proposals "On Condemning the Preparations of a New War and for the Conclusion of a Five-Power Pact to Strengthen Peace."

6. Provocative Raving of the Titoite Clique

FOLLOWING Mr. Austin, the floor was taken by a representative of the titoite clique, who protested against my calling him so, but I have no intention to change my formulation. He tried to make insinuations against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies.

Of course, the Soviet proposals to strengthen peace and the security of the nations evoked the unconcealed

irritation of this gentleman. He joined his voice to the chorus of slander on and enmity against the land of Socialism. Mr. Djilas, who spoke on behalf of this group, was displeased by the fact that the Soviet proposals give, as he said, an incomplete and one-sided definition of war propaganda. He would like this definition to be extended in a direction for which there is no need whatever, because there are no grounds at all for those dark suspicions about which this speaker babbled here, having evidently lost all vestiges of shame.

He tried to accuse us of having exerted pressure on Yugoslavia, and even of having broken the Treaty of Friendship. But did not Tito break the agreement on the joint stock Yugoslav-Soviet Danube Shipping Company? Did not Tito break the agreement on the joint stock Soviet-Yugoslav Transport Aviation Company? On whose initiative were these agreements on mixed companies broken?

Arrest of Soviet Citizens in Yugoslavia

And did not the Tito Government permit itself to arrest Soviet people *en masse*, people whom it did not accuse, as is shown in its Notes, of espionage, as Mr. Djilas falsely asserted here yesterday, but arrested them allegedly because they had been Whiteguards in the past but, in reality, because they favoured friendly relations with the Soviet Union?

Criticising the Soviet proposals, Mr. Djilas almost word for word said what Mr. Bevin said on September 26 at the plenary meeting of the General Assembly, Mr. Bevin stated then that our proposals were a "serious blow at co-operation, at hopes for the strengthening of peace."

Mr. Djilas repeats Mr. Bevin. "This," he said, "is a serious blow at the strengthening of peace." One cannot say that Messieurs the representatives of the Titoite clique are poor students. They perfect themselves from month to month, increasingly grow into the camp of the imperialists to which they have deserted. It is no surprise to hear such slander and insinuations from these gentlemen!

Mr. Djilas devoted no little time to Rajk's trial, seeking to prove that this trial allegedly was a badly bungled affair. This is not new. It is known that the Titoites have specialised in spreading all sorts of vile gossip. They have for

this purpose such an expert as Mosha Pijade who, in his exercises in slander, does not disdain any abomination on any question pertaining to the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. He excels also in slander regarding Rajk's trial. Mr. Djilas wants to outdo Pijade, inventing all sorts of fables.

Mr. Djilas spared no words in an attempt to discredit Rajk's testimony and the trial as a whole. But it should be admitted that nothing came of it.

He kept silent about a number of important facts disclosed at the trial of Rajk, facts fatal to the Titoite clique. Mr. Djilas, for example, kept silent about the testimony of Brankov. Yet Brankov was not the smallest pawn in the company of Tito-Djilas-Rankovic.

An inveterate spy, chief secret agent of the Yugoslav intelligence service in Hungary, such was Laza Brankov. He was the agent directly subordinated to General Milic and the Yugoslav Minister of the Interior Rankovic. His testimony is widely known. Has Mr. Djilas forgotten about it? I can remind him of it.

Exposure of Yugoslav Espionage Network

Brankov testified in court specifically that during the war Misha Lompar was sent to Switzerland with an assignment to establish contact with the leader of the American espionage organisation in Europe, Allen Dulles. This Misha Lompar contacted the chief of the American espionage organisation in Europe, Allen Dulles. On arriving in Switzerland, Lompar also established contact with the Trotskyite groups which were there. Latinovic, who was in Marseilles, and Vasa Jovanovic, who was in Bari, established close relations with the Anglo-American intelligence service.

General Velebit, generally known as an old British spy, was in London. He furnished the British intelligence service with all the materials at his disposal, including information about the Soviet Army. According to Brankov's testimony, he learned about this from the secret archives of the U.D.B. (Yugoslav State Security Administration).

This is what Brankov testified. But Djilas has "forgotten" to refute it. He did not deem it necessary to do so, he preferred to speak at length here about some sort of inaccuracies in Rajk's testimony!

Rajk's trial disclosed a great deal that had not been known before and covered with eternal shame the titoite clique which claims that it represents the Yugoslav people and that it also, don't you see, is a builder of Socialism. It was precisely in this connection that the Soviet Government was confronted with the problem of its attitude to the Treaty of Friendship signed with Yugoslavia in 1945.

Mr. Djilas of course knows that the Note of the Soviet Government of September 28 pointed out that in the course of the trial of the State criminal and spy Rajk and his accomplices, who at the same time were agents of the Yugoslav Government, it was disclosed that the Yugoslav Government had been waging for a long time gravely inimical, subversive activity against the Soviet Union, hypocritically taking cover behind the Treaty of Friendship and that, thus, this Treaty had already been then trampled under foot by the Yugoslav Government. Such are the facts.

7. Slanderers in the Role of "Theoreticians"

THE next to speak was the Canadian delegate, Mr. Martin, Senator Martin it seems. His speech consisted of a cascade of abuse and hysterical outbursts, which had to do duty for criticism of the Soviet proposals. He piled up here a whole heap of all sorts of slanderous nonsense and fables.

I will begin with the main thing although, naturally, I will have to speak also about the rest that merits attention. If one is to listen to Mr. Martin, the problem now facing the United Nations is not that of condemning preparation of a new war, and by no means consists in concentrating efforts on the strengthening of peace. He said that the United Nations faces the problem of fear and worry caused, as he said, "by areas under the domination of the Soviet Union."

Cannot one advise the Canadian Senator not to worry about these areas, let this be a matter for these districts themselves, and that he rather be worried about the sad fate of Canada . . . (Mr. Martin interrupted the speech by the remark that he is not a Senator.)

Here you see that when some fact does not correspond to reality there is a possibility of replying to it at once. This encourages me, because during the almost one and a half hours I have been speaking here this is the first denial of what I have said.

And so Mr. Martin, it turns out, is worried about Poland. But Poland herself is not worried. He is worried about Rumania and Hungary. But they too do not ask the Canadian delegate to "worry" about them, especially since the Canadian Government hinders the admission of these countries to the United Nations.

Mr. Martin is also worried by the fact that, according to the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, war is inevitable in the history of mankind, while he, Mr. Martin, does not want, as he asserts, that there should be war. But why then does Mr. Martin not agree to record this in an international document, in an appropriate international treaty? Why does not he want to support our proposal that the five Powers conclude a pact for the strengthening of peace? Why then does this supporter of peace run away from our proposals on peace like the devil from holy water?

What Lenin Really Said

"The Soviet Government, the countries of people's democracy and the Communists in general," Mr. Martin said, "hold the view that war is inevitable. They recognise that the proletariat on becoming the ruling class needs a military organisation of its own." As proof Mr. Martin referred to volume 24, page 122 of Lenin's collected works. It is pleasant to hear the representatives of Canada quoting our great teachers. It is a pity only that they find their way so poorly in quotations, and that they distort what they have read.

What did our teacher V. I. Lenin really say in this cited section about the military organisation of the proletarian State? When did he say it? Under what circumstances? What is the real meaning of V. I. Lenin's words? I deem it necessary to reply to these questions because without replying to them one cannot claim to understand properly what had been said by the great Lenin.

This was in 1919. This was at a time when the young Soviet Republic was encompassed by a ring of enemy States. Already then the well-known defender of the capit-

alist classes, the former Marxist Kautsky (I hope this name is familiar to Mr. Martin, I am not certain of it but I hope so) tried to accuse the Bolsheviks of having "not Socialism but militarism." Thus Mr. Martin has not discovered any America but has merely repeated the elementary utterances of well-known slanderers against the Soviet Union.

On this score Vladimir Ilyich Lenin said at the Eighth Congress of the Party in 1919: "I smiled and shrugged my shoulders. As though indeed there has been a single big revolution in history which was not connected with war." This is a remarkable statement by V. I. Lenin. It was precisely war which pressed from all sides on the young Socialist Republic and brought to the fore the question that the proletariat on becoming the ruling class should build its own military organisation capable of defending its frontiers—the frontiers of the young Socialist State.

Intervention against Young Soviet State

Could one act otherwise under conditions when the enemy attacked on all sides, when the fate of the young Socialist State of the workers and peasants literally hung in the balance? It is clear that under those circumstances one could not act otherwise, that it was necessary and imperative not only to speak of military organisations but also to build this military organisation for repulsing the crusade of 14 States organised in 1918-1919 under the guidance of Winston Churchill.

One must say that in raising this question Mr. Martin is at least one year late, because already at the third session of the General Assembly in Paris similar claims to interpret Marxism-Leninism were made by none other than—I was about to say Senator—ex-Senator Austin. He at that time cited a section from the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), Short Course*, which reads that war is the inevitable concomitant of capitalism and that there are just wars which are waged to liberate people from capitalist slavery and unjust wars.

Mr. Austin wanted to prove that the Soviet Union seeks to destroy the capitalist States, considering war inevitable, and that the Soviet Union thus by no means strives for peaceful aims. From this Mr. Austin also drew the conclusion that, consequently, all proposals of the Soviet Union directed at the strengthening of peace are hypocri-

tical and insincere, because how can one propose to strengthen peace, advocating at the same time the inevitability of war?

It must be admitted that the ill-starred commentators of Marxism-Leninism who undertook to interpret Marxism-Leninism poorly understood the matter. They display an utter lack of understanding of the significance and rôle of the laws of development of society in the life of society. They manifest in this respect an utter ignorance which, as is known, has never and in no way helped anyone!

Marxism-Leninism teaches that human society develops in conformity with the imminent laws of this society and is subject to their influence. Capitalist society has its laws of development. The concomitants of capitalism are war crisis, unemployment, crimes, prostitution. These phenomena follow from the laws of capitalist society. These are all scourges, concomitants, of the capitalist system, which is based on the exploitation of human labour, of some classes of society by others.

Greatest Service of Marxism-Leninism

These social phenomena are engendered by the very system of capitalist society and by no means by the individual psychology of certain traits of people, the violation of their rights and freedom, and so on and so forth. The violation of rights is itself the result of this system.

The greatest service of Marxism-Leninism (I beg to be excused for having to speak about it here since, perhaps, it would be more suitable to speak about it from some university rostrum, but my opponents force me to delve into this field. I know whom I am addressing, for this reason I do not want to convince or "propagandise" anyone of anything. I am speaking about it to eliminate distortions in the interpretation of our great teaching), I repeat: The greatest service of Marxism-Leninism lies precisely in that it has found the key to the study of the laws of development of human society and thereby to understanding the laws of the history of this society.

It has found this key, not in the minds of men, not in the views and ideas of society, but in the means of production, in the organisation of social relations and first of all of production relations in each historical period. But the subordination of the development of human society to

certain laws does not signify that man is reduced to the rôle of blind subjugation to the action of these laws. Man is man.

The Canadian delegate said that man is the image of God. Looking at my opponent, I would not say that this maxim always holds good.

But in any case, man is man, society is a society which is capable of organising social relations. By his organisational activity, man can contribute to the development of the historical path. If this path accords with the laws of social development then it is of a progressive nature. If this path does not conform to the laws of development then it retards the development of society, it plays a reactionary rôle.

People, classes of society, therefore, play a tremendous rôle, and this means that the activity of people who are capable of regulating social relations plays a tremendous rôle. This task is effected by the internal and foreign policy of one or another State.

8. Soviet Foreign Policy—a Policy of Peace

THE task of the foreign policy of the Socialist State consists in restricting or completely eliminating such social vices as war by undertaking measures capable of coping with this task. One of these measures is the organisation of the peace-loving forces of society in all countries, the establishment of mutual trust, the elimination of everything that creates the possibility of the conflicts which breed war.

Here is what the leader of the Soviet people, V. I. Lenin, said 27 years ago in an interview granted to a correspondent of the British newspapers *Observer* and *Manchester Guardian*: "Our experience has developed in us the unyielding conviction that only great attention to the interests of different nations eliminates the ground for conflicts, eliminates mutual mistrust, eliminates fear of some kind of intrigues, creates that confidence, especially of the workers and peasants speaking different languages, without which either peaceful relations among nations or any kind

of successful development of everything that is valuable in modern civilisation are absolutely impossible."

From the above it is consequently clear that we stand—and Leninism teaches us this—for peaceful relations among peoples, without which, as Lenin pointed out, any kind of successful development of everything that is valuable in modern civilisation is impossible.

This is why, as far back as in 1919, V. I. Lenin said literally the following at the Seventh All-Russian Congress of Soviets: "That is why we are in a position to say with absolute certitude, on the basis of the experience of the last two years (two years of the Civil War of 1918-1919), that every new military success will considerably hasten the time—it is already close at hand—when *we shall devote our forces entirely to peaceful constructive work*. We are able to pledge ourselves, on the basis of the experience we have gained, that *within the next few years we shall perform incomparably greater miracles in the work of peaceful construction* than we performed in these two years of successful war against the all-powerful Entente." (My emphasis—A.V.)

Lenin's Proposal to Seventh All-Russian Congress

Is it not remarkable that this was said in 1919, when our Motherland was surrounded by States hostile to us who plotted military intrigues against us? And at that time, under those conditions, notwithstanding our victories over our enemies, V. I. Lenin proposed at the Seventh All-Russian Congress to adopt a resolution which read:

"The Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic desires to live in peace with all nations and to devote all its energies to the work of internal construction in order to set going its production, transport and public administration on the basis of the Soviet system, in which it has hitherto been prevented, firstly by the oppression of German imperialism, and then by the intervention of the Entente and by the hunger blockade."

You, Mr. Canadian, have not understood the elementary questions of Marxism-Leninism on the correlations between the laws determining the development of society and the measures which a conscious society undertakes in order to lessen the pernicious effect of negative laws and in order to create conditions—notwithstanding these laws—favour-

ing the utmost alleviation of the crisis which periodically leads to the catastrophes that capitalist society is fraught with.

That is why we state also now that there is no contradiction whatever between the precept that war is an inevitable phenomenon in capitalist, imperialist society, which is taught by our teachers, which is taught by the entire history of humanity, and the striving to restrict, to curb the operation of this law. On the contrary, notwithstanding the fact that wars are inherent in capitalism, democratic forces are able to frustrate war, to prevent war by their solidarity, strength and the resolve to prevent war.

The stronger the unity of the masses in the struggle against war, the stronger the voice of protest of the nations resounds against war, the sooner will the danger of war be reduced to naught. The might of the solidarity of the peace-loving nations can paralyse the activity of such phenomena as war preparation and save the world from this horrible calamity.

Responsibility for Second World War

This is the reason why, gentlemen, when certain quotations from the works of our teachers, remarkable quotations scientifically substantiated with great profundity, are made here in an attempt to prove that if we recognise, for example, that crisis is inherent in capitalist society, this consequently, means that we seek to foster the development of this crisis—we must say that this is absurd.

"If you consider that war is inherent in capitalist society then, consequently, you are for war," our opponents tell us. This is likewise absurd, because the task consists in overcoming this feature, law, if you wish, of capitalist society, in order by the conscious efforts of the nations to paralyse the effect of such features, the laws of capitalist society.

So it was before the Second World War. Recall the history of the Second World War. Was not the soil on which Hitlerite militarism flourished fertilised by the golden shower of American dollars in the '20's? Was not Hitlerite militarism nurtured by the shameful Munich policy of France and Britain, Daladier and Chamberlain, behind whom stood the United States—the great Trans-Atlantic Power?

One could cite many documents on this subject. They were presented in the past. I recommend them to your attention. These documents leave no doubt whatever as to how and why the Second World War occurred and who bears responsibility for it.

Did not the Soviet Union throughout the period when Hitler already laid his paw on Czechoslovakia, which he had occupied, raise its voice in defence of the independence of the Czechoslovak Republic? And did not the Soviet Union expose the Munich policy which had to lead and did lead to the Second World War?

Soviet Peace Policy

Such is the Soviet foreign policy—a policy of peace. Mr. McNeil tried to distort the matter and slander our foreign policy, to prove that the U.S.S.R. does not want peace. Wild nonsense! He, of course, could not prove this for the very same reason which is fatal for all our opponents—lack of proof. This explains also why, in place of businesslike consideration of the Soviet proposals—let him excuse me: frankness for frankness—he substituted empty talk about everything you please but not about our proposals.

Mr. McNeil exerted no little effort to assure us that all nations want to live in peace. Normal people, he said, normally desire peace. This is perfectly true. If Mr. McNeil is right that all normal people want peace, then it means that those who do not want peace are abnormal people. In that case—if Mr. McNeil is right—in the light of facts which appear to me absolutely indisputable, it should be admitted that there are too many of these abnormal people in certain countries. Is it not possible in that case to put these abnormal people in appropriate surroundings? Say, for example, at least to put them in strait-jackets—perhaps this will alleviate the situation.

We perfectly understand, and it is a pity that Mr. McNeil does not want to understand it, that what is meant are not nations, what is meant are the reactionary circles of certain countries which really want war. At first the "cold war," of which Professor Slyter of Harvard University spoke frankly, and the real "hot" war, of

which leading American personages who determine the policy of the United States shout almost to a man.

Mr. McNeil argued that no war threatens the world, but the same was said by the heroes of Munich on the very eve of the Second World War. They likewise tried to prove that Hitler did not prepare war. And we warned—the Soviet Union warned—that Hitler was preparing war and that this preparation should not be encouraged.

Why, in reality, did the Second World War become possible? This has long been known to all. Naturally, the fact that it became possible and that it occurred proves that there was also preparation for it. And we know this on the basis of historical data.

But we also know that not a single move was made by the Governments of Great Britain and France, as well as the United States, to prevent the organisation of that war—that, on the contrary, they lulled public opinion with statements that there would be no war of any kind, that it was only necessary to appease Hitler, and they helped Hitler. They began to appease Hitler with loans and encouragement of his predatory policy.

Against Appeasement of Warmongers

We are against this policy of appeasement, against this policy of soothing, especially when we are soothed by those who, simultaneously with saying: "There will be no war," conduct the wildest propaganda of the preparation of this war, and not only propaganda but the very preparation of this war.

Mr. McNeil tried to dispute, to shake, the assertion about the 600 million peace supporters: he even cited a number of countries where Communists received an insignificant number of votes to prove the weakness of Communist influence. But the point at issue is by no means one of elections. And it is by no means typical for determining the sentiment of the people towards peace to show what were the results of an election campaign scored by one or another political party in one or another capitalist country.

It is known that a big role in this respect is played by the system of the elections. It is known that the "Jules Moch" system in France was specially invented in order

that those who poll a bigger vote should get fewer seats.

It is known that this is a historical tradition of all such parliamentary systems; it is not fortuitous that the system known as the system of "rotten boroughs" flourished in Britain and until now has been making itself felt. Therefore, there is nothing to boast of in the fact that in some place Communists received a small number of votes. Six hundred million fighters for peace are 600 million!

We are told by Mr. McNeil: "Look around, the number of your friends is becoming smaller and smaller!" This is a grave delusion: the number of our friends is becoming bigger and bigger.

I would advise Mr. McNeil to remove the blinkers from his eyes, to open his eyes, to look around himself and see what is happening. Does not he see how millions of people have set themselves into motion in all countries? These, Mr. McNeil, are not your friends, because you are not their friend. These are our friends, the friends of peace, the friends of democracy in the finest, most noble meaning of this word.

Who Really Represents China?

If you do not notice this, if you imagine that the man who sits in the place where a sign carries the inscription "China" is the real representative of the Chinese people, this is the bitterest delusion. And you are due for a disappointment very soon, because this Kuomintang man is by no means the representative of China, for China is now new China, democratic China, with 500 millions . . . (the Chairman calls to the speaker "to order").

I am very sorry that Mr. Chairman could not muster courage and call to order those who spoke before me and said absolutely irrelevant things. But I am a disciplined person. I will not object to your order. This does not mean, of course, that I will not follow my order.

Mr. McNeil told us: "Show us your budgets." He wanted to prove that we are a militaristic Power, that we do not want peace and that we are preparing for war and are setting up monstrous armies. "Show your budgets"—by all means. I am ready to show our budgets. But Mr. McNeil ought to know this even without my help because on March 11, 1949, all Moscow newspapers published our 1949 budget in full.

It says here—I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman, may I

say this? (The Chairman replies in the affirmative. General laughter.): "The Soviet State together with tremendous economic construction effects a big plan of social and cultural measures which are important means for raising the cultural standard and material well-being of the people. For these measures the 1949 budget envisages 119,200 million rubles, that is an increase of 13,600 million rubles as compared with 1948 . . ."

Out of a total sum of expenditure so much goes for this, so much for that, etc. And now we come to military expenditure.

"In 1949 it is intended to spend for the maintenance of our armed forces 79,100 million rubles, or 19 per cent. of the budget expenditure. A certain increase in military expenditure as compared with last year (when this sum comprised 17 per cent.) is due to the rise in wholesale prices and railway rates. The appropriations for the armed forces envisaged in the budget for 1949 ensure funds for all expenditure of the Soviet Army which reliably safeguards the freedom and independence of our homeland."

Two Systems—Two Budgets

This is how matters stand with regard to our budget. Appropriations for military needs for 1949 planned in our budget amount to 19 per cent., or 79,100 million rubles.

And how do matters stand on this score, say, in other countries? What about Britain, for example? The share of military expenditure in Britain's budget in the fiscal year 1949-50 is greater than before the war and comprises this year 30 per cent. of all expenditure.

And what about the budget of the United States of America for the fiscal year of 1949-50? Of the total sum of 42,000 million dollars, direct expenditure for armaments and armed forces in the United States amounts to 14,268 million dollars, that is to 34 per cent. of the entire budget. According to calculations, about 30,000 million dollars, or 69 per cent. of the entire budget of the United States in the fiscal year of 1949-50 go directly or indirectly for military purposes.

And in France? Twenty per cent. of the State expenditure of France is assigned for military needs. But, after all, it is known that in France the bulk of military measures is being effected for the French Army, not at the expense of

the French budget, but of the American budget. Incidentally, this is not a bad illustration to the problem of State sovereignty! It is not accidental, therefore, that the British, French and American press carried on this score views that this military budget exceeds all permissible budget standards which had been applied in normal conditions.

Here, Mr. McNeil, is the answer to your questions about our budget.

9. Allied Duty and the U.S.S.R.

THE Polish delegate, Mr. Werblowski, spoke here splendidly today about the part that the Soviet Union played in this war. I am grateful to him for it, but I would like to add a few more words to what he said.

He recalled one episode of tremendous historic importance. This is a highly significant episode. Perhaps, gentlemen, it will help some people in future to regard with a greater sense of responsibility their words when it is a matter of the role of the U.S.S.R. in the Second World War. That was the time when the front in the West headed by General Eisenhower, which included also the British Air Force subordinated to Air Marshal Tedder, was in an extremely difficult position.

Churchill's Appeal to Generalissimo Stalin

Here is the telegram which Churchill sent on January 6, 1945, to the head of the Soviet Government and Commander-in-Chief of our forces, Generalissimo Stalin: "The battle in the West is very heavy and at any time large decisions may be called for from the Supreme Command. You yourself know from your own experience how very anxious the position is when a very broad front has to be defended after temporary loss of the initiative."

He who understands military language knows what this "loss of the initiative" by General Eisenhower means.

"It is General Eisenhower's great desire and need to know in outline what you plan to do, as this obviously affects all his and our major decisions. Our envoy, Air Chief Marshal Tedder, was last night reported weather-bound in Cairo. His journey has been much delayed through no fault of yours. In case he has not reached you yet, I shall be grateful if you can tell me whether we

can count on a major Russian offensive on the Vistula front, or elsewhere, during January, with any other points you may care to mention. I shall not pass this most secret information to anyone except Field Marshal Brooke and General Eisenhower, and only under conditions of utmost secrecy. I regard the matter as urgent."

You must understand what the sending of such a telegram on January 6, 1945, by Mr. Winston Churchill to Generalissimo Stalin meant. It meant a call for heroic efforts to save the Western Front.

We forgot how the very same Messrs. Churchills and others treated us when they did not carry out their obligations on opening a Second Front. Our allies were in danger, and it was our obligation to discharge our allied duty. And Generalissimo Stalin the very next morning telegraphed:

Generalissimo Stalin's Reply to Churchill

"I received your message of January 6, 1945, on the evening of January 7. Unfortunately, Air Chief Marshal Tedder has not yet reached Moscow. It is very important to make use of our superiority over the Germans in artillery and air force. For this we need clear weather for the air force and absence of low mists, which prevent the artillery from conducting aimed fire. We are preparing an offensive, but at present the weather does not favour our offensive. However, in view of the position of our allies on the Western Front the H.Q. of the Supreme Command has decided to complete the preparations at a forced pace and, disregarding the weather, to launch wide-scale offensive operations against the Germans all along the central front not later than the second half of January. You need not doubt but that we shall do everything that can possibly be done to render help to the glorious troops of our allies."

Churchill Thanks Generalissimo Stalin

What then happened further? On January 17, 1945, Mr. W. Churchill telegraphed to J. V. Stalin:

"On behalf of His Majesty's Government and from the bottom of my heart I offer you our thanks and congratulations on the immense assault you have launched upon

the Eastern Front. You will now no doubt know the plans of General Eisenhower and to what extent they have been delayed by Rundstedt's spoiling attack. I am sure that fighting along our whole front will be continuous. The British 21st Army Group, under Field Marshal Montgomery, have today begun an attack in the area south of Roermond."

Generalissimo Stalin's Order of the Day

An Order of the Day issued by Generalissimo Stalin to the Soviet troops in February, 1945, said:

"In January of this year the Red Army brought down on the enemy a blow of unparalleled force along the entire front from the Baltic to the Carpathians. On a stretch of 1,200 kilometres it broke up the powerful defences which the Germans had been building for a number of years. In the course of the offensive the Red Army, by its swift and skilful actions, has hurled the enemy far back to the West. The first consequence of the successes of our winter offensive was that they thwarted the Germans' winter offensive in the West, which aimed at the seizure of Belgium and Alsace and enabled the armies of our allies in their turn to launch an offensive against the Germans and thus link up their offensive operation in the West with the offensive operations of the Red Army in the East."

And yet, when such facts from the recent past are before us, fresh in our memories, we hear speeches by the Belgian representative, and the New Zealand representative to the effect that we repeat Goebbels and Hitler. Mr. McNeil today stooped to say that our policy is a Goebbelsian policy.

I cited this not in order to enlarge on this theme but only to remind Messieurs the critics that an elementary sense of gratitude should prompt them to be careful not only in using the words which they use but also in thinking the way that they think in regard to the Soviet Union.

10. On So-called "Cultural" Affairs of the United States and Great Britain

MR. McNEIL, saying that we interfere with broadcasts of the B.B.C., simultaneously touched on the question of the "Voice of America" and said that we, so to say, do not permit them to penetrate this "Iron Curtain." All windows and doors, they say, have been shut!

But I must tell Mr. McNeil, in addition to what has already been said here by Mr. Werblowski, that in reality all British and American radio broadcasts constitute a most vicious hostile propaganda. This is a call for an uprising, essentially speaking for a war against the Soviet Union. It is most insulting demagoguery, it is most insulting, slanderous lies.

I am deeply convinced that were we to take measures ensuring the unhindered printing and unhindered radio broadcasting of all this collection of calumny, all these abominations against our country, this would arouse such an outburst of general indignation and wrath of our people that this probably would not be very pleasant for Mr. McNeil and all those who seek that we should not hinder these broadcasts.

"Conspiracy Against Peace"

To this it is necessary to add the following, and here I reply also to Mr. Austin, who complained that we are not interested in maintaining cultural relations with the United States. Mr. McNeil said: "Open the windows, open the doors, give fresh air access into Soviet Russia."

I must say that the doors and windows for fresh air are always open in our country, but what kind of air is wafted to us from that side, from the West and from beyond the ocean?

A booklet has now been published in Moscow which I would recommend to our critics. This book was penned by the well-known British journalist Ralph Parker. You, gentlemen, British representatives, probably know Mr.

Ralph Parker, a British journalist who has lived in Moscow eight years and now refuses to return to Britain because, as he said, he cannot return to a country which prepares war against the Soviet Union.

In his book *Conspiracy Against Peace*, he relates with what aims Messrs. the British "cultural" leaders come to our country through these "open doors." Allow me to quote several passages from Mr. Parker's book. Is this permissible, Mr. Chairman? (The Chairman replies: "Permissible." General laughter in the hall.)

Thank you, I am quoting: "On coming from London, the correspondents worked closely with responsible officials," Mr. Parker writes. "Every morning guidance talks were held for them at the British Embassy. The British correspondents resident in Moscow were pointedly excluded."

Diplomatic Correspondents in Moscow

Mr. McNeil, open the doors to your own correspondents in your own Embassy! Mr. Parker writes that presumably it was feared that their presence would disturb the harmonious relations between the Foreign Office and the diplomatic correspondents who came from London, the so-called "tame seals." The latter nickname hinted at their closeness to the head of the Foreign Office Press Department, Mr. Ridsdale, who was always available day and night. And Mr. Parker further says that he could not help admiring the skill with which the British Foreign Office spokesman handled his "tame seals" and that their accounts of the work of the conference was limited to an enumeration of facts which were wholly copied from previously prepared accounts and reports of the Embassy sent to the Foreign Office.

Mr. Parker cites a host of facts showing how this very same B.B.C., as in general the Foreign Office, tried to send as many as possible of their secret agents to the U.S.S.R. under the guise of these journalists. And this precisely reveals, *inter alia*, the secret of the special insistence which the British Minister and one of the leaders of the Foreign Office, Mr. McNeil, displayed today demanding that we, no matter what happens, "open the windows and doors" to these British intelligence agents camouflaged under different pseudonyms. I must warn Mr. McNeil that for

such people neither doors nor windows, nor even the small window panes used for ventilation, will be open in our country.

Hostility to Soviet Delegates in U.S.A.

Mr. Austin also complained here that we are against cultural relations, that we break all these cultural ties, do not want any intercourse. Mr. Austin, why do you ignore certain facts? Why, for example, do you not speak about the fact which occurred in 1946, when six delegates of the Soviet Union and five delegates of the Ukrainian Republic who arrived for the Third American Slav Congress in New York were ordered to register as agents of a foreign State or leave the United States at once. In this delegation were the writer Alexander Korneichuk, Professor Gorbunov, several generals, well known Ukrainian artists, poets and journalists, a Professor of Lvov University, and so on.

And all of them, in view of the special hospitality of the State Department and Department of Justice of the United States, had to "pack in a hurry," as the saying goes, and go home.

And in March, 1949, did not a Soviet delegation, consisting of the composer Shostakovich, the writers Fadeyev and Pavlenko, Academician Oparin, the film producers Gerassimov and Chiaureli, and Professor Rozhansky, arrive in New York for the Congress of Intellectuals for Peace? And were not these delegates prevented from making an artistic tour of the United States by the American authorities, who let it be known that, in view of the end of the Congress, there was no need for them to remain in the United States any longer?

What Kind of Cultural Relations?

You complain that we do not want cultural relations, but do you not maintain so-called cultural relations with all kinds of traitors and turncoats, such as Kravchenko, Kasyenkina and so on and so forth, whom you boost notwithstanding the fact that they are traitors and turncoats, and whom you utilise in every way so as to oppose these scoundrels to the Soviet Union!

And under these conditions you desire that we should maintain cultural relations with you? Mr. Austin, learn to maintain really cultural relations with the Soviet Union, then we shall reciprocate.

If you desire that we should entertain you with our ballet, that we should entertain you with our musicians, artists, actors and orchestras, then the appropriate conditions, the appropriate atmosphere, are needed for this. However, they are lacking and they will be lacking as long as you take to your bosom traitors and turncoats, enemies of the Soviet Union.

We maintain extensive cultural relations with all peoples, which fully refutes your lying talk about some sort of "iron curtain." If you were really interested in this question you could learn that no day passes without some delegation leaving the U.S.S.R. for other countries or some delegation arriving in the U.S.S.R.

These quite lively relations are conducted in science and art, including all forms—from music and dances to football and other sports events. The Soviet Union maintains such relations with a whole number of countries. I will name them. These are Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Albania, Bulgaria, Finland, the People's Republic of China, Italy, Sweden, Eastern Germany, Belgium, the Korean People's Republic, and Pakistan, where a delegation of Soviet writers is now taking part in the work of the Congress of the Association of Progressive Writers of Pakistan.

This is a fact! If we send our delegations, our lawyers, our scientists, our artists, our musicians, to Belgium, to Italy, notwithstanding the resistance which the Governments of these countries offer to these measures of ours, what right have you to speak of some kind of "iron curtain," repeating foul Goebbelsian calumny?

Soviet Delegations to Friendly Countries

But we send delegations to countries where we are met as friends, where we are not counterposed by Messrs. Kravchenko and others of your friends, where no attempts are made to vilify us by all kinds of fables and slanderous inventions drawn from unclean sources. Mr. Austin, think about it, before hurling such accusations!

Mr. Austin's statement that the Soviet Union does not want to follow the usual paths of international intercourse and thus does not display any striving for international co-operation is, therefore, false and devoid of all grounds.

I am concluding Mr. Chairman. I must say that one cannot take in earnest, perhaps this is simply the play of the excited mind of Mr. McNeil, when he permitted himself today to say: "Here is Lenin's teaching, here is Stalin's teaching. Perhaps Lenin's teaching is out of date? Then you repudiate it."

I must say that I consider it beneath my dignity to react to such an insolent statement. I do not want to say any more harsh words.

"The Slanderer and the Snake."

Mr. McNeil amazed us today by his remarkable knowledge of Krylov's fables. He told me in a private conversation a long time ago: "I am seriously studying your fables of Krylov. I shall reply to you." I impatiently awaited when at last he would reply. And so today he replied to me. He cited Krylov's fable, available in English translation. The translation seems to be decent. It is entitled "The Snake," which—not Krylov but Mr. McNeil—dedicated to yours truly.

It turns out, according to Mr. McNeil, that I resemble a snake. I have a similar poisonous sting, and moreover I resemble the nightingale because I have a very melodious voice. It is good to be, if only for a minute, in the position of a nightingale, even as presented by Mr. McNeil. So before you is a snake.

A fable is a fable, but I would like to advise Mr. McNeil—it would be better, perhaps, if he turned to British fables, then he might be on more familiar ground. He made a mistake by turning to Krylov's fables without studying these fables. For if Mr. McNeil thought it necessary to look for an analogy, for the sake of objectivity he ought to have recollected or read some more fables.

In your collection, Mr. McNeil, I perused it today, there are some other fables and also about the snake. I, in turn, want to cite one fable in order not to be in debt to Mr. McNeil.

This fable is called "The Slanderer and the Snake." I will not permit myself to make any comparisons. Mr. McNeil spoke here about me as a snake with the trill of a nightingale. But I will not say whom I have in mind

when I outline this fable to you. You yourselves, of course, will easily see it. Permit me to recall this fable.

So we have Krylov's fable, "The Slanderer and the Snake."

He who claims, so says the fable, that devils know nothing about justice speak in vain.

"I'll give an instance which occurred of late.

When all the Powers of Hell marched out in state
Disputed which came first, and, each one feeling slighted
Got most excited."

The snake said that he should have first place; to this the slanderer said, "Nay!" So they went to Beelzebub to settle their dispute. Beelzebub consigned the snake to second place, and addressed him thus in no uncertain terms:

"Though your deserts I fully bear in mind,
His claim to precedence more just than yours I find.
You're vicious and your sting will kill;
Who comes too near, you seldom miss;
You bite—and no mean title this—
When no one means you ill.
But say, who from afar by you was ever stung,
As by this slanderer's vicious tongue.
From which, though men may flee across the hills, the waves,
No distance saves?
Agree that he can do
More ill than you:
Then, just you go behind, and be more humble, pray!
To slanderers, from that day,
The snakes in hell give way."

Allow me, gentlemen, to end with this. I am very grateful that Mr. Chairman has only once interrupted me during my speech, and then not to the point. I have finished.