

**THE WORLD COUNCIL
OF PEACE
AND THE
UNITED NATIONS
(DOCUMENTS)**

Title: The World Council of Peace and United Nations (Documents)
Author: The World Council of Peace
Description: 1951
Type: Paperback

Digital Scanning & Transcription
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus
www.st-cyprus.co.uk



&

Doğrudan Demokrasi (Komünist Partisi)
Direct Democracy (Communist Party)
<http://www.directdemocracy4u.uk/>



January 2017

Contents

TEXT OF THE ADDRESS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADOPTED BY THE SECOND WORLD CONGRESS OF THE DEFENDERS OF PEACE (WARSAW 16-22 NOVEMBER 1950).....	7
TEXT OF THE RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE ADDRESS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADOPTED BY THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE AT ITS MEETING IN BERLIN (21-26 FEBRUARY 1951)	13
LETTER SENT MARCH 8th, 1951 TO Mr. TRYGVE LIE BY Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE	15
TELEGRAM SENT MARCH 16th, 1951 TO Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE BY THE GENERAL SECRETARIAT OF THE UNITED NATIONS	17
LETTER SENT APRIL 10th, 1951 TO Mr. TRYGVE LIE BY Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE	18
LETTER SENT APRIL 24th, 1951 TO EVERY MEMBER OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS BY Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE.....	19
LETTER SENT MARCH 8th, 1951 TO MR. JOLIOT-CURIE BY Mr. AUSTIN.....	22
LETTER SENT JUNE 19th, 1951 TO Mr. AUSTIN BY Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE	29
LETTER SENT JUNE 5th, 1951 TO Mr. MALIK BY Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE	37
TELEGRAM SENT JUNE 16th, 1951 TO Mr. MALIK BY Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE	39
TELEGRAM SENT JUNE 19th, 1951 TO Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE BY Mr. MALIK, PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL	40
TELEGRAM SENT JUNE 21th, 1951 TO Mr. ACHESON BY Mr. LAFFITTE	41
TELEGRAM SENT JUNE 28th, 1951 TO Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE BY Mr. MALIK.....	43
LETTER SENT JUNE 30th, 1951 TO Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE BY Mr. MALIK.....	46

LETTER SENT JULY 13th, 1951 TO MRS JESSIE STREET BY THE VICE-CONSUL OF THE UNITED STATES IN LONDON48

INTERVIEW OF Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE.....49

PROTEST AGAINST THE REFUSAL, BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES, OF THE VISAS NECESSARY FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE, TO PROCEED TO THE CONVOCATION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL51

The World Council of Peace, in which is expressed the will of hundreds of millions of men and women of all countries and of all opinions, considered that it was its duty to make known to the United Nations Organisation the will of its Constituents.

Indeed, after the world war, the United Nations Organisation contained the hope of the peoples who had endured the most terrible suffering and who unanimously desired that the repetition of a similar catastrophe be made impossible. It symbolized the unity of the great allied powers which alone had made possible the victory and which alone can make possible the establishment of a lasting peace.

But the Charter of the United Nations was not respected and the people's confidence in the United Nations Organisation became severely shaken.

It is in no way true, as some have claimed, that the World Council of Peace is opposed to the United Nations Organisation and in contradiction to its Charter. Indeed to the contrary: its aim is that the Charter once more be respected and that the United Nations Organisation again become faithful to the principles which guided its creation.

This is why the World Council of Peace considered that it was its duty to express regret to the United Nations Organisation that it disregarded the mission which it took upon itself to seek agreement between the nations, and to make it take account of its proposals for the re-establishment of peace. This act was expressed in the adoption by the II World Peace Congress of a solemn Address to the United Nations Organisation.

It would have been normal for the great organisation of the United Nations to examine these important proposals. But it did nothing, and that is why the World Council of Peace, at its meeting in Berlin, decided to send a delegation to the United Nations Organisation to present this document and to submit its nine points, all of which are entirely conceived in the spirit

of the Charter.

Would it not have been normal that this delegation be received?

Yet, even though the acting President of the Security Council of the U.N.O. agreed to receive the delegation and himself set the date to meet them, the members of the delegation found themselves refused by the government of the United States the visas necessary to go to the U.S.A. By this act, the headquarters of the United Nations Organisation has been made inaccessible to those who have been mandated to make known there the will of hundreds of millions of persons.

The refusal of visas by the American authorities adds a new difficulty to that created by the silence of the United Nations Organisation on the Address which had been sent to it. Nevertheless, the World Council of Peace will ceaselessly pursue its effort to make the United Nations Organisation hear the will of the peoples.

The very complete documentation contained in this brochure includes notably the texts of the Address to the United Nations Organisation, the resolution of the World Council of Peace, the correspondence exchanged between Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE, President of the World Council of Peace, and the Secretary General of the United Nations Organisation, the letter sent by Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE to the members of the Security Council, the reply of Mr. Warren AUSTIN, United States delegate, and Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE's reply to Mr. AUSTIN. Finally, there is the letter and telegram of Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE to Mr. MALIK, acting President of the Security Council of the U.N.O., and Mr. MALIK's reply.

We submit these documents to the judgment of the people. Each, on studying them objectively, will be able to form a just opinion on this question.

TEXT OF THE ADDRESS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADOPTED BY THE SECOND WORLD CONGRESS OF THE DEFENDERS OF PEACE (WARSAW 16-22 NOVEMBER 1950)

When the peoples of the world created the United Nations, they endowed it with their hopes. The greatest of these was the hope for peace.

Today, however, war upsets the peaceful life of many peoples and threatens tomorrow to upset the peace of all mankind.

If the United Nations is not fulfilling that great hope reposed in it by all the peoples of the world, both those whose governments are represented in it and those not yet represented therein—if the United Nations is not guaranteeing mankind security and peace, this is because it is being influenced by forces which have disregarded the only path to universal peace: the search for general agreement.

If the United Nations is to realise the hopes that the peoples have reposed in it, it must return to the path marked out for it by the peoples since the days of its foundation, and, as a first step in this direction, must secure as soon as possible the calling together of a meeting of the five great powers: the Chinese People's Republic, France, Great Britain, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, for the examination and peaceful settlement of current differences.

The Second World Congress of the Defenders of Peace, comprising delegates of eighty countries and expressing the true voice of a humanity longing for peace, demands that immediate consideration be given by the United Nations, and by the parliaments to which the governments of the various countries are responsible, to the following proposals designed

to restore confidence among all countries, regardless of their respective systems, and to maintain and re-establish peace:

1.—In view of the fact that the war now raging in Korea is not only bringing incalculable disaster upon the people of Korea, but also threatens to become a general war, we demand the cessation of hostilities, the withdrawal from Korea of foreign armies, and the peaceful settlement of the internal conflict between the two parts of Korea, with the participation of the representatives of the Korean people. We demand that the problem be dealt with by the Security Council in its full composition—that is, including the lawful representatives of the Chinese People's Republic.

We call for the termination of the intervention by American armed forces on the Chinese island of Formosa (Taiwan) and the cessation of hostilities against the Republic of Viet Nam, military operations which also carry the threat of world war.

2.—We categorically condemn every move made and measure taken, violating the international agreements which forbid the rearmament of Germany and Japan. These moves and measures constitute a grave threat to peace. We urgently demand the conclusion of a peace treaty with a united and demilitarized Germany, as well as with Japan, and the withdrawal from both these countries of the forces of occupation.

3.—We consider the violence employed to hold peoples in a state of dependence and colonial subjection as a powerful menace to the cause of peace and we proclaim the right of those peoples to freedom and independence. At the same time we raise our voices against every form of racial discrimination, for it promotes hatred between peoples and endangers peace.

4.—We consider it necessary to expose the attempts made by the supporters of aggression to confuse the very meaning of what constitutes aggression and to intervene, under one pretext

or another, in the internal affairs of other nations.

We declare that no political, strategic or economic considerations, no ground deriving from the internal situation or any internal conflict in one or another state, can justify armed intervention by any other state. That state commits the crime of aggression which first employs armed force under any pretext whatever, against another state.

5.—We hold that propaganda for a new war constitutes a grave threat to the peaceful co-operation of the peoples, and we therefore hold it to be a crime of the deepest gravity against humanity.

We appeal to the parliaments of all countries to enact a «Law for the Protection of Peace,» which shall render all propaganda for a new war, in any form whatsoever, liable to criminal prosecution.

6—In view of the fact that all decent persons, regardless of their political views, regard the ruthless mass destruction of civilian populations in Korea as a crime against humanity, we demand that a competent International Court be appointed to examine the crimes committed during the war in Korea, and in particular the question of the responsibility of General MacArthur.

7.—Voicing the demands of peoples who bear upon their shoulders the heavy burdens of military budgets, and firmly resolved to guarantee humanity a firm and stable peace, we present for the consideration of the United Nations, of all parliaments and of all peoples the following proposals:

—Unconditional prohibition of all manner of atomic weapons, and of bacteriological, chemical, poisonous, radioactive and all other devices of mass destruction:

—Denunciation as a war criminal of that government which-henceforth is the first to use these weapons.

The Second World Peace Congress, mindful of its responsibility to the people, appeals, with equal earnestness, to

the great powers and calls upon them to launch, during the years 1951 and 1952, a gradual, simultaneous and similarly proportioned reduction of all their land, sea and air armed forces of from one third to one half of their present size. Such a step, by putting a definite end to the armaments race will diminish the risks of aggression. It will allow the lightening of the costs which burden the budgets of States and weigh heavily on all sections of the people. It will allow also the re-establishment of international confidence and the necessary co-operation between all nations, regardless of their social system.

The Congress declares that the controls for prohibiting atomic weapons and all weapons of mass destruction, as well as all conventional arms, are technically possible. An international body, staffed by qualified inspectors, should be set up within the framework of the Security Council and should be made responsible for the control of the reduction of conventional arms as well as the prohibition of atomic, bacteriological, chemical and other weapons. These controls, to be effective, must apply not only to military forces, existing armaments and arms production as declared by each nation, but also, on the demand of the international control commission, must be extended to include the inspection of military forces, existing armaments and arms production which is suspected beyond what has been declared. These proposals for the reduction of armed forces constitute a first step on the road to general and complete disarmament, the final goal of all defenders of peace.

The Second World Congress, convinced that peace cannot be secured through an armaments race seeking a balance of forces, holds that these proposals give no military advantage to any country, but that they would result in halting the drive to war and in advancing the well-being and security of all the peoples of the world.

8.—We emphasise that, in certain countries, the passage

from a peace economy to a war economy is increasingly disturbing normal economic relations and the interchange between countries both of raw materials and industrial goods. It is our view that this exerts a harmful influence on the standards of living of many peoples, that it raises obstacles to economic progress and business relations, and that this situation is a source of conflicts endangering the peace of the world.

Taking into consideration the vital interests of the populations of all countries, and with the desire to improve conditions throughout the world, we urge the restoration of normal trading relations between the countries on the basis of mutual advantage, satisfying requirements of the peoples concerned, excluding economic discrimination in any form and safeguarding the development of each national economy and the economic independence of states, both, large and small.

9.—We hold that obstructions of cultural relations among the peoples tends to quarrelling and loss of mutual understanding and creates a climate of distrust, favourable to propaganda for war.

We consider that on the other hand, the strengthening of cultural relations between the peoples creates conditions favourable to mutual understanding and strengthens their trust in the general struggle for peace.

Accordingly, we appeal to all governments, urging them to contribute towards bettering cultural relations among the peoples, in order to enable them to become better acquainted with each other's treasures in the field of culture. We appeal to them to facilitate the organisation of international conferences of persons active in the field of culture, the mutual exchange of visits and the publication and wide diffusion of the literature and art of other countries.

We draw the attention of the United Nations to the fact that, while calling upon it to justify the hopes reposed in it by the peoples of the world, we are at the same time undertaking the

establishment of a World Council of Peace.

The World Council of Peace shall be a body embracing representatives of all the peoples of the world, those within the United Nations and those not yet represented therein, and also countries still dependent and colonial.

It shall call upon the United Nations to fulfil its duty to strengthen and develop peaceful co-operation between all countries.

It shall assume the lofty task of securing a firm and lasting peace that shall respond to the vital interests of all nations.

The World Council of Peace will, in short, prove before mankind that, despite all present difficulties, which must in no wise be minimised, we shall accomplish the great mission of peace upon which we have embarked.

THIS TEXT WAS COMMUNICATED BY TELEGRAM ON
DECEMBER 1st, 1950, TO THE SECRETARY GENERAL
OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND TO THE MEMBERS OF
THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATION BY
THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE ADDRESS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADOPTED BY THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE AT ITS MEETING IN BERLIN (21-26 FEBRUARY 1951)

The World Council of Peace has taken note that the United Nations has failed to reply to the Address of the 2nd World Congress, as though proposals for the maintenance of peace advocated by the representatives of hundreds of millions of human beings did not concern it.

Since the adoption of that Address, the United Nations has still further disappointed the hopes the peoples had placed in it and has raised this disappointment to a climax by the resolution condemning China as an «aggressor.»

It has sanctioned, and covered by its authority, the systematic destruction in Korea, by the American armed forces, of almost a million human beings, including old people, women and children, crushed or burnt in the debris of their towns and villages.

The World Council of Peace resolves to dispatch to the United Nations a delegation comprising:

Signor NENNI (Italy), Mrs. Isabelle BLUME (Belgium), Mrs. S. O. DAVIES (Great Britain), Mrs. J. STREET (Australia), Mr. d'ASTIER de la VIGERIE (France), Mr. TIKHONOV (U.S.S.R.), Mr. Y. T. WU (China), Mr. HROMADKA (Czechoslovakia), Mr. G. d'ARBOUSSIER (Africa), Senor P. NERUDA (Chile), General JARA (Mexico), Mr. Paul ROBESON, Rev. UPHAUS (U. S. A.), Dr. ATAL (India).

This delegation shall be charged to demand of the United Nations:

1. that it considers the various points of the Address of the World Congress and the various resolutions of the World

Council of Peace and express an opinion on each;

2. that it returns to the role assigned it by the Charter, namely that it should serve as an area of agreement between the Governments and not as the instrument of any dominant group.

This decision of the World Council will have the support of hundreds of millions of men and women who have a right to maintain a vigilant watch to ensure that high international organs do not betray their mission of safeguarding peace.

LETTER SENT MARCH 8th, 1951 TO Mr. TRYGVE LIE BY Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE

to Mr. TRYGVE LIE
Secretary general of the
United Nations Organisation
LAKE SUCCESS (United States)

Mr. Secretary General:

The Second Congress of Peace approved an Address to the United Nations Organisation containing concrete proposals for maintaining peace in the world.

The text of this Address has been sent you by telegram and your secretariat kindly acknowledged its receipt on December 5th, 1950.

The World Council of Peace, elected by this Congress, has just held its first session at Berlin, from the 21st-to 26th February.

It has resolved to dispatch a delegation to the United Nations Organization to discuss the different points of this Address and the decisions of the Council relating to it.

This delegation will comprise the following personalities:

Mr. Pietro NENNI (Italy). Member of Parliament, former Minister, former vice-President of the Council of Ministers.

Mrs. Isabelle BLUME (Belgium). Teacher of history and literature, Member of the Belgium Parliament.

Mrs. S. O. DAVIES (Great Britain) Teacher.

Mrs. Jessie STREET (Australia) Member of the Australian Delegation to the Conference of San-Francisco for the drafting of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Emmanuel d'ASTIER DE LA VIGERIE (France) Deputy to the National Assembly, former Minister.

Mr. Nikolai TIKHONOV (USSR) Writer, deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Mr. Y. T. WU (China) Professor.

The Reverend Dr. HROMADKA (Czechoslovakia) clergyman, member of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches.

Mr. Gabriel D'ARBOUSSIER (Black Africa), Councillor of the French Union.

Mr. Pablo NERUDA (Chile) Poet, Senator of the Chilean Parliament.

Mr. Heriberto JARA (Mexico) Brigadier General, former Minister, Senator.

Mr. Paul Robeson (USA) Singer

The Reverend Mr. UPHAUS (USA) Professor.

Dr. Madan ATAL (India) Doctor of Medicine.

The gravity of the international situation and the supreme necessity of joining all efforts to avoid a new conflict compel me to ask you to receive this delegation in as short a time as possible and I beg you to make known to me the date on which this interview will take place.

Awaiting your reply, I beg you, Mr. Secretary-General, to accept my respects.

Frédéric JOLIOT-CURIE,
President of the World Council of Peace

(Translation)

**TELEGRAM SENT MARCH 16th, 1951 TO Mr.
JOLIOT-CURIE BY THE GENERAL SECRETARIAT
OF THE UNITED NATIONS**

TO PROFESSOR JOLIOT-CURIE,
President of the World Council of Peace

SECRETARY GENERAL HAS ASKED ME TO STATE THAT IN RESPONSE YOUR LETTER MARCH EIGHTH HE HOPES TO MEET YOUR DELEGATION AT SOME POINT IN EUROPE PERHAPS PARIS GENEVA ROME IN THE COURSE OF THE TRIP HE PLANS TO TAKE IN VERY NEAR FUTURE STOP I WILL COMMUNICATE WITH YOU AGAIN SOON WITH REGARD TO EXACT TIME AND PLACE ANDREW CORDIER EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO SECRETARY GENERAL UNITED NATIONS.

**LETTER SENT APRIL 10th, 1951 TO Mr. TRYGVE
LIE BY Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE**

Paris, April 10th, 1951.

Mr. TRYGVE LIE

Secretary-General of the United Nations
Organisation.

Mr. Secretary-General;

Last March 8th, I wrote you to inform you of the decision of the World Council of Peace to send a delegation to the United Nations Organisation.

I also informed you of the object of this delegation.

You kindly let me know, through Mr. CORDIER, that you were willing to receive this delegation, for which I thank you, and you informed us subsequently that you would receive it on April 9th at the time of your sojourn in Paris.

This last information however, reached me only 10 days before the proposed date.

The delegation being composed of personalities from thirteen countries, including India and China, it has not been materially, possible to assemble the delegation in due time.

On the other hand, the members of this delegation were mandated by the World Council of Peace to go to the United Nations.

I would be very grateful, therefore, if you would kindly let me know as soon as possible the date on which you will be able to receive the delegation of the World Council of Peace at the headquarters of the United Nations Organisation.

I beg you to accept, Mr. Secretary-General, my respects.

Frédéric JOLIOT-CURIE

President of the World Council of Peace

(Translation)

**LETTER SENT APRIL 24th, 1951 TO EVERY
MEMBER OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE
UNITED NATIONS BY Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE**

Your Excellency,

In view of the gravity of the international situation, I feel it my duty to address you, speaking on behalf of millions of men and women all the world over who see with anxiety a new war threatening their lives and their possessions.

The 2nd World Congress of Peace which took place in November 1950 expressed the desire for peace of these millions of men and women in an Address to the United Nations Organisation which I have already had the honour of sending to you and which you will find enclosed.

Moreover, the World Council of Peace of which I am president and which was elected at the 2nd Congress adopted the text of an Appeal for the conclusion of a Pact of Peace. This appeal seeks to answer the aspirations of millions of people in the world, whatever their opinion as to the causes which give rise to the danger of a world war.

Finally, this same World Council of Peace decided to charge a delegation to the United Nations Organisation with the mission of discussing with this high international body the various points of the Address to the U.N.O. and the decisions of the Council relating to it.

The delegation is composed of the following personalities:

Mr. Pietro NENNI (Italy) member of Parliament, former vice-President of the Council of Ministers,

Mrs. Isabelle BLUME (Belgium) professor of history and literature, member of the Belgium Parliament,

Mrs. S. O. DAVIES (Great-Britain), teacher,

Mrs. Jessie STREET (Australia) member of the Australian delegation to the Conference of San Francisco, for the drafting

of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Emmanuel d'ASTIER DE LA VIGERIE (France)
deputy to the National Assembly,

Mr. Nicolai TIKHONOV (USSR), Writer, deputy to the
Supreme Soviet of USSR,

Mr. Y. T. WU (China) professor,

The Reverend Dr. HROMADKA (Czechoslovakia)
clergyman, member of the Central Committee of the World
Council of Churches,

Mr. Gabriel d'ARBOUSSIER (Black Africa) Councillor of
the French Union,

Mr. Pablo NERUDA (Chile) Poet, Senator of the Chilean
Parliament,

Mr. Heriberto JARA (Mexico) Brigadier General, former
Minister, senator,

Mr. Paul ROBESON (U.S.A.) singer,

The Reverend Mr. UPHAUS (U.S.A.) professor, Dr.
Madan ATAL (India) Doctor of Medicine.

Permit me to ask you, Excellency, to give the support of
your high authority to the demarche of this delegation.

The men and women, who compose it are inspired by the
only concern of saving peace. They are elected by the
representatives of all currents of peace-loving opinion.

They want the triumph of reason and humany dignity over
the barbarity of war. I am convinced you will help them to
fulfill a miss on which embodies the hopes of millions of
human beings.

I am convinced that it is possible to avoid a world war and
that we can silence the guns if the representatives of the
peoples negotiate.

Please accept, Your Excellency, the expression of my
respects.

Frédéric JOLIOT-CURIE
President of the World Council, of Peace

(Translation)

THIS LETTER HAS BEEN SENT TO:

Mr. Joao Carlos MUNIZ

Ambassador, Permanent delegation of Brazil to U. N. O.

Dr. TINGFU F. TSIANG

Ambassador, Permanent delegation of China to U. N. O.

Mr. Jean CHAUVEL

Ambassador, Permanent delegation of France to U. N. O.

Mr. D. J. Von BALLUSECK

Ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary Permanent delegation of Holland to U.N.O.

Sir Benegal Narsing RAU

Ambassador, Permanent delegation of India to U.N.O.

Mr. Selim SARPER

Ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary Permanent delegation of Turkey to U.N.O.

Sir Gladwyn JEBB

Ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary. Permanent delegation of the United Kingdom to U.N.O.

Mr. Jacob MALIK

Ambassador. Permanent delegation of the U.S.S.R. to U. N. O.

Mr. Warren R. AUSTIN

Ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary Permanent delegation of the United States to the Security Council

Dr. Ales BEBLER

Ambassador, Permanent delegation of Yugoslavia to U.N.O.

Dr. Antonio QUEVEDA

Ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of Ecuador to U.N.O.

**LETTER SENT MARCH 8th, 1951 TO MR.
JOLIOT-CURIE BY Mr. AUSTIN**

Two Park Avenue
New York 16 N. Y.
May 25, 1951

Dear Professor JOLIOT-CURIE,

Your letter asking me to lend my support to a delegation appointed by your World Peace Council to explain its view at the United Nations deserves a frank reply.

You say in your letter: «... millions of men and women all over the world... see with anxiety that a new war is threatening their lives and property.» I would add: Free people, with access to the facts, know who started the aggression in Korea, who supports it in the United Nations against all the rest of the membership, and who would be responsible for spreading war. They know that most of the members of the United Nations are faithful to their commitments under the Charter and are cooperating to prevent general war, to resist aggression collectively, and to restore peace where it has been broken.

On September 6. 1950, the Security Council voted on the following resolution: .

«*The Security Council,*

«*Condemns the North Korean authorities for their continued defiance of the United Nations;*

«*Calls upon all States to use their influence to prevail upon the authorities of North Korea to cease this defiance;*

«*Calls upon all States to refrain from assisting or encouraging the North Korean authorities and to refrain from action which might lead to the spread of the Korean conflict to other areas and thereby further endanger international peace and security.»*

The Soviet Union cast the only negative vote which was a veto.

If your delegation honestly desires to make a contribution to peace, I suggest that it visit Moscow and urge the Soviet ruling circle to abide by the Charter and the other International agreements to which it is pledged.

Your delegation could then proceed to Peiping, and urge the ruling circle there to end the aggression in Korea, withdraw its forces, and let the Korean people organize the independent, unified and democratic nation the United Nations seeks for them.

This would certainly reduce the present anxiety.

In Moscow you could urge the leaders of world communism to abandon their declared aims of taking over other people's countries by the well-known totalitarian tactics which led Hitler to disaster. You could assure them that the governments and peoples of the free world are determined to resist these tactics by collective measures wherever they are tried. Tell them there will not be a war unless they decide to precipitate it; that the peoples of the world want real peace with freedom as defined in the United Nations Charter; but that they will not pay blackmail to aggressors.

In Peiping you could tell the leaders that they cannot shoot their way into the United Nations. Remind them that it was only the Soviet Union that blocked a Security Council resolution giving formal guarantees on the security of China's borders. Assure them that the propaganda campaign advocating withdrawal of United Nations support from the Republic of Korea and thus give the aggressor his way is doomed to failure; that with every new onslaught they are strengthening the determination of the United Nations to repulse aggression in Korea and elsewhere.

You indicate that your Council consider it necessary to have a delegation come here to explain various points of its,

Address to the UNO». Being familiar with the proposals adopted by the World Peace Council which met in the Soviet zone of Berlin last February, I can assure you that all the UN delegations have already debated them at length with the Soviet spokesmen who originally put them forward in the General Assembly.

After exhaustive debate the United Nations rejected these proposals. Are you suggesting that Mr. VISHINSKY and Mr. MALIK have not adequately argued the cases for the proposals you have borrowed from them?

Your Number One proposal, for which you announce a new signature-collection campaign, was put forward in the General Assembly by the Soviet Union twice, in 1949 and in 1950. This vague demand for «*the conclusion of a pact of peace among the five Great Powers*» including Communist China now engaged in aggression against UN forces, was rejected by the General Assembly on both occasions by overwhelming vote.

In opposing this Soviet proposal, most delegates agreed on these points during the exhaustive debates in the General Assembly:

1. The Charter of the United Nations itself is «the most solemn pact of peace in history».

2. The Charter lays down the basic principles essential to peace.

3. The causes of the present international tension are traceable to the Soviet Union's disregard of these principles.

4. The remedy lies not in negotiating new pacts, but in the performance by the Soviet Union of the obligation already undertaken.

5. Peace would be strengthened if the Soviet Union and the states under its control abandoned policies of obstruction and honestly cooperated with the rest of the members of the UN to solve common problems.

6. If the Soviet Union is prepared to take such action, the proposed new pact is unnecessary; if it is not prepared to do so, then the pact is a fraud.

Both in 1949 and 1950, the great majority of members of the United Nations supported plans of action for a real peace. The first positive program in 1949, supported by 53 Members, called for adherence, to the principles of the Charter which were specifically enumerated as the «*Essentials of Peace*».

The Soviet bloc stood alone against the «*Essentials of Peace*» Resolution. After it was adopted they refused to abide by it.

Last fall, the Soviet Union introduced a proposal for a «peace pact», adding one new element, namely, the formula of the so called Stockholm Peace Appeal, designed to confuse public opinion concerning the control of atomic energy. (You are, of course, familiar with this, since you and your colleagues of the World Peace Council, functioning at that time as the «*Partisans of Peace*», launched and circulated this deceptive appeal).

The 1950 version of the Soviet pact was again exhaustively, discussed and overwhelmingly rejected by the United Nations.

This time, the vast majority of members advocated and supported a resolution entitled «*Peace through Deeds*». By the terms of this resolution they condemned the intervention of a state in the internal affairs of another state for the purpose of changing its legally established government by the threat or use of force. They declared aggression itself, not the weapons used, «*the gravest of all crimes against peace and security*». They urged every nation to accept «*effective international control of atomic energy under the United Nations, on the basis already approved by the General Assembly, in order to make effective the prohibition of atomic weapons*». They urged «*prompt united action to be taken to meet aggression wherever it arises*».

The Soviet bloc stood alone against the «*Peace through Deeds*» Resolution. After it was adopted, they refused to abide by it.

You indicate that your delegation wishes to argue that the United Nations should rescind its Resolution naming the Chinese People's Republic as an aggressor in Korea. The United Nations voted for this Resolution overwhelmingly after they had heard all the arguments and distortions of facts the Soviet spokesmen could muster. They have since repeated these arguments on every possible occasion. But the whole world knows that the Chinese Communist forces are in fact continuing their aggression in Korea. The obvious way for a regime to take itself out of the category of an aggressor is to stop being one.

Another demand your group is instructed to make of the United Nations, namely, «*that it returns to the role assigned to it by the Charter*», is a familiar Soviet propaganda refrain. The Members of the United Nations have not only supported resolutions calling upon all members to carry out their obligations under the Charter, but have acted collectively against aggression.

Under the «*Uniting for Peace*» Resolution of 1950, they are now engaged in organizing for collective measures to resist and repel aggression more effectively. Most delegates, I believe would feel that this demand for member states to return to the Charter, if advocated here, was being delivered to the wrong address. In Moscow, you would be able to deliver the message to the right party.

I have no doubt that many people you claim as your followers are sincerely searching for a just peace—as we are—and do not yet realize that they are being used to advance the interests of the Soviet imperialist power. To them I commend a paragraph from the letter sent to you in April by the Secretary General of the United Nations, which has been published

widely in most of the world, but so far concealed from the people under Soviet domination:

«It is the first duty... of every peace-loving man and woman in the world to give their support to the United Nations, to seek to persuade all governments to give respect and compliance to all its decisions and recommendations, and to use every opportunity to spread and to strengthen its influence for peace. Conversely, those whose actions tend to weaken the United Nations, to undermine its authority, to sharpen the discords that are inevitably present in a world organisation—they are no true friends of peace no matter what they profess to be.»

«We are ready, at any time, to negotiate for a restoration of peace in the area. But we will not engage in appeasement. We are only interested in real peace.

«Real peace can be achieved through a settlement based on the following factors;

«One: the fighting must stop.

«Two: concrete steps must be taken to insure that the fighting will not break out again.

«Three: there must be an end to the aggression.

«A settlement founded upon these elements would open the way for the unification of Korea and the withdrawal of all foreign forces.

«The free nations have united their strength in an effort to prevent a third world war.

«That war can come if the communist rulers want it to come. But this nation and its allies will not be responsible for its coming.»

The sense of the American people was further expressed by the United States Senate recently when it adopted, without a

dissenting vote, a resolution declaring:

«That the American people deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them, from the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of America's desire to live in friendship with art other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

«That the American people desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war; and

«That, although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom, and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to compose the differences standing between them and the Soviet Government.»

Very truly yours

Warren R. AUSTIN.

**LETTER SENT JUNE 19th, 1951 TO Mr. AUSTIN
BY Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE**

Paris, June 19th 1951
Hon. Warren R. AUSTIN
Ambassador Extraordinary and
Envoy Plenipotentiary
U. S. Mission to the U. N.

Dear Mr. AUSTIN,

I am in receipt of your letter of May 25th 1951 in answer to my letter in which I requested you to be so kind as to facilitate the hearing before the United Nations Organisation of the delegation of the World Council of Peace.

We are convinced that we are able to make a valuable contribution to the search for means of maintaining peace. We believe that we have already given evidence of this notably in adopting, during our Warsaw Congress, the proposals which were addressed to all the members of the United Nations Organisation.

You advise us to make ourselves heard in Moscow and Peking. May I remind you that in 1950, after the meeting of our Committee in Rome, we sought audiences with the Parliaments of different countries: our delegations were received in Paris and Moscow, in Stockholm and Prague, in Rome and Warsaw, etc... but not in Washington.

*

In refusing our request, you base your reasons on two affirmations which you consider fundamental:

1. *«The free peoples», who have access to the true facts, know who is the aggressor in Korea, and who upholds him in*

the United Nations Organisation against the other members, and who will be responsible for the extension of the war.

2. A «Five Power Peace Pact» is absolutely superfluous since there is the Charter of the United Nations. It would be sufficient, according to you, if Moscow and Peking would really respect it.

I can assure you at once, and it is difficult for me to believe that you ignore it, that scores and scores of millions of persons, having access to knowledge of the facts in the countries which you call free, as in all countries of the world, have quite different ideas as to the origin of the war in Korea from those which you consider to be indisputable.

I do not want to go into a detailed analysis here of the facts but I should like to mention that:

- a) On June 18th 1950, Mr. JOHNSON, Secretary of Defense of the U. S. A., declared in Tokio that American defenses depended on a semi-circle extending from the Aleutian Islands to the Philippines and passing through Japan and Okinawa (this semi-circle passes through Korea and Formosa).
- b) With a simple dispatch, the Security Council was convoked in all haste.
- c) Even before the decision of the Security Council, President TRUMAN gave the order to the air and naval forces of the United States to give aid and support to the government of Syngman Rhee who, by the way, had just been placed in the minority in the recently renewed parliament, and to the 7th Pacific fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa, situated 1,300 kilometres from the 38th parallel.
- d) The Security Council, in the absence of the U.S.S.R. delegate and in the presence of the

Chinese delegate of «Formosa» denounced North Korea and requested the military intervention of the member nations of the United Nations Organization.

Of the events that followed, I shall mention also the offer of mediation made on July 13th 1950 by Pandit NEHRU, an offer rejected by the U. S. A. but accepted by the U.S.S.R., and, after the participation of the Chinese volunteers, the vote of the U. N. O. on January 31st 1951 designating the People's Republic of China as an aggressor. This vote took place a few days after the Congress of the United States had called on the U. N. O. to take this step. Except for Turkey and Siam, no Asiatic nation associated itself with this resolution. The resolution was adopted by the representatives of 546 million people: those of 775 million either voted against it or abstained and 475 million Chinese were not represented.

The denouncement of North Korea, as well as the designation of the government of China as an aggressor, was a defiance of justice and right. It is not customary to condemn an accused person without making an enquiry and without asking him to make explanations. Yet North Korea was condemned without being given the possibility of presenting defence. Under these conditions it must be admitted that, in the eyes of a very great number of people, nothing as yet proves that North Korea was the aggressor.

Finally, an even greater number of people, knowing that Korea has been turned into a scorched earth, fear that they in their turn will become the victims of the horrors of modern warfare.

You cannot ignore that all these facts arouse in a large number of citizens, whom you regard as adherents to your point of view, legitimate suspicions as to the purity of the motives behind your acts in Korea.

Should it seem unnecessary to you to listen to those who

are not always of your opinion and should those who believe that your intervention in Korea, for example, is but an operation destined to provide you with military bases refuse to enter into discussions with you, then a third world war would be inevitable.

It is because we shall never accept the idea of the fatality of this catastrophe that I again address you in the absolute conviction that to-morrow, even more than yesterday, it will be indispensable that there be heard in the United Nations Organisation the voice of millions of men and women who reject solutions of force and who put all their hope in peaceful negotiations.

*

Does the United Nations Charter make the conclusion of a Five Powers Peace Pact unnecessary?

The United Nations Charter, in which all the peoples of the world placed so much hope, fully justifies the estimation of your great President F. D. ROOSEVELT:

«The choice is not between the Charter and something else it is between the Charter and nothing.»

However, we are forced to admit that this Charter has been violated and diverted from its object.

The composition of the United Nations Organisation, containing a majority of small states, was accepted at San Francisco only on the condition that the Charter would be observed in *its spirit and letter*. The rule of unanimity was introduced into the Charter, at the request of the government of the United States, not to block arbitrarily the decisions of the majority but to avoid the unleashing of a war which would result from the will of a majority to trample on a minority.

The creation of the «Little Assembly» and, above all, the adoption of the American proposal known under the name of

«Plan against Aggression» have, in fact, abolished the basic principle of the rule of unanimity and have substituted the seeking of a majority for the seeking of solutions capable of uniting the principal powers which, having together defeated fascism, should together preserve peace.

Without the rule of unanimity, the very principle of the United Nations becomes doubtful, if simply by the fact that no allowance is made for demographic data in determining the majority. Of what value for the democratic expression of the will of the inhabitants of our planet can be a rule which gives as much importance to Bolivia as to the U.S.A., as much to Belgium as to India, and which, moreover, refuses to take into account more than 450 million Chinese ?

The, People's Republic of China does not endeavour, as you claim to *«shoot its way into the United Nations Organisation»*. The demand for its admission was formulated and supported quite sometime before the beginning of the war in Korea and one cannot help, regretting that it was not present at the Security Council in June 1950.

The Charter, as it resulted from the San Francisco Conference, is the very expression of the principle of the co-existence of different political and economic regimes.

«We are on the only road that we can follow if peace is to be maintained» President ROOSEVELT declared at that time.

In order to appreciate. the road that has been traversed since then under the pressure of the U.S.A., it is sufficient to compare this statement with that of the delegate of India in the Political Commission of the United Nations Organisation at the time of the vote on the «Plan Against Aggression»:

«The Plan Against Aggression gives the impression that the United Nations are busy perfecting their machinery for war.»

This confirms what I said in Warsaw on November 16th 1950 at the Second World Congress of the Partisans of Peace:

«To win unanimity for decisions that concern the maintenance of peace is to recognize that one desires cooperation and collaboration among different regimes and not that one desires to see established a trend towards direct and indirect pressures for the creation of an obedient majority.»

In your letter you often invoke this majority to convince yourself and to try to convince others of the accuracy of your opinions. The confirmation, however, that you seek in the support which many countries give to your theses is very often the result of economic and political pressure exercised precisely to obtain this agreement. Thus, getting into a vicious circle, you risk the danger of deluding yourself as to the value of your affirmations.

It is because we wish keep hope in a United Nations Organisation restored to its principles that we have sought to be heard there.

I am firmly convinced that it is of great benefit for the expression of the will for peace of all peoples, including those who do not form part of the United Nations Organisation, to be presented to the Security Council for their arguments to be heard and for their solutions to be studied.

But it is necessary, of course, that the proposals be examined on their own merits and the mere fact that one of them might be supported by one of the members of the United Nations Organisation should not make the others consider this support as a sufficient reason for rejecting it *a priori*.

Contrary to what you say, I do not believe that all our proposals have been submitted to and debated by the General Assembly.

We should like problems to be posed not with the intention of causing embarrassment to a partner, but with the desire of finding a solution.

For example, that Stockholm Appeal on which you exercise your irony, was it not the cry of the universal

conscience which revolts against one of the most horrible aspects of war? And is not the logic of law restored in the order of the proposals formulated in this Appeal? First, the law is enacted, then its control is assured and finally sanctions against offenders of the law are applied.

For our part, we are convinced that one cannot sincerely wish general disarmament, and consequently atomic disarmament, without being ready to seek agreement on a principle, without becoming involved in the drawing up of paragraphs of an international convention for the observance of which all controls will be defined and put into application.

Since the proposals formulated in Warsaw in our Address to the United Nations Organisation include the control of declared arms and the possibility of investigation in case of suspicion you certainly should recognize there a will to stop the armaments race and to achieve progressively a general disarmament with the necessary controls.

In place of that, we see the world hurled into a frightful armaments race. The countries that experienced the last war see the possibility of reconstruction disappearing: raw materials are 'becoming scarce; education and the raising of the standard of living have to retreat before the manufacture of arms.

We feel that the more the level of armaments is raised, the more difficult will be discussion, all the more so as the campaign of hate and panic will be intensified in those countries which have refused to pass laws forbidding war propaganda. Such a development will inevitably lead to war. And it is in order to avoid this atrocious result that we call for the conclusion of a Peace Pact.

It is because the Five Powers, on the unanimity of which the Charter of the United Nations was based, *can to-day no longer* discuss their differences in the United Nations Organisation due to the alteration of the Charter and the non-admission of the People's Republic of China, that we call on all

people to demand of their governments that negotiations be engaged in order to conclude such a Pact.

I have sought, dear Mr. AUSTIN, to answer you frankly and in detail, having appreciated the frankness of your letter and without wanting to take into account what might have been expressed either intentionally or unintentionally in irony. You are Mr. Warren AUSTIN, a diplomat who represents a great country, a great people who, like the other peoples, also desires peace; your post implies heavy responsibilities.

We, too, measure the weight of our responsibilities, and every person on this earth who, through the Stockholm Appeal, has learned that he can make his voice heard and can play his proper and useful part in this dramatic international debate knows that he holds a part of this responsibility.

That is why we strive to interpret as faithfully as possible his thoughts in speaking the language of common sense which all men speak who have the opportunity to be able to express themselves and to explain their ideas — irrespective of their philosophy, religion or race — in the bosom of the World Peace Council, the doors of which are wide open to every good purpose and to all good ideas.

We feel that after having weighed these arguments, you will understand that it is difficult, seeing how serious events are becoming, to oppose the meeting which we seek with the United Nations Organisation.

We repeat, to you, therefore, as well as to all your foreign colleagues, this request for a hearing which the worsening of the international situation justifies.

I beg you, dear Mr. AUSTIN, to accept the assurance of my respects.

Frédéric JOLIOT-CURIE,
President of the World Council of Peace.

(Translation)

LETTER SENT JUNE 5th, 1951 TO Mr. MALIK BY Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE

Mr. MALIK
President of the Security
Council of the United Nations.

Dear Sir,

The Second Peace Congress held at Warsaw from the 16th to the 22nd November 1950 approved an Address to the United Nations Organisation containing concrete proposals for maintaining peace in the world.

The text of this Address has been transmitted by telegram. on December 1st 1950 to the Secretary General of the United Nations Organisation, to the President of the Security Council, and the Presidents of the delegations of the five great powers, to the United Nations Organisation.

The Secretariat of the United Nations acknowledged receipt. of the Address, by a telegram dated December 5th.

The World Council of Peace, in the course of its first session in Berlin from 21st to 26th February, 1951, decided that a delegation would be sent to the United Nations Organisation to discuss the different points of this Address and the decisions of the Council relating to it.

The following personalities have been elected as members of this delegation;

Mr. Pietro NENNI (Italy) Member of Parliament, former Minister, former vice-President of the Council of Ministers.

Mrs. Isabelle BLUME (Belgium), Teacher of history and literature, Member of the Belgium Parliament.

Mrs. S. O. DA VIES (Great Britain), Teacher.

Mrs. Jessie STREET (Australia), Member of the Australian Delegation to the Conference of San-Francisco for the

drafting of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Emmanuel d'ASTIER DE LA VIGERIE (France), Deputy to the National Assembly, former minister.

Mr. Nikolai TIKHONOV (USSR), Writer, deputy to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

Mr. Y. T. Wu (China), Professor.

The Reverend Dr. HROMADKA (Czechoslovakia), Clergyman, member of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches.

Mr. Gabriel d'ARBOUSSIER (Black Africa), Councillor of the French Union.

Mr. Pablo NERUDA (Chile), Poet, Senator of the Chilean Parliament.

Mr. Heriberto JARA (Mexico), Brigadier General, former Minister, Senator.

Mr. Paul ROBESON (USA), Singer.

The Reverend Mr. UPHAUS (USA), Professor.

Dr. Madan ATAL (India), Doctor of Medicine.

By a letter dated March 8th, 1951, we made known to the Secretary General of the United Nations Organisation these decisions, asking him kindly to let us know, in as soon as possible, the date that such an interview could take place. To this date, this request has not received satisfaction. That is why, by reason of the gravity of the international situation, we have the honor to appeal to your high authority so that the delegation of the world Council be received at the headquarters of the Organisation of the United Nations.

In asking you to be so kind as to inform us of any action you may be able to take in this matter, I beg you, Mr. President, to accept my high respect.

Frédérie JOLIOT-CURIE,
President of the World Council of Peace.

(Translation)

**TELEGRAM SENT JUNE 16th, 1951 TO Mr.
MALIK BY Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE**

TO PRESIDENT MALIK
SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE U. N. O.

FOLLOWING REQUEST APRIL 24th TO MEMBERS
SECURITY COUNCIL WE BEG YOU KINDLY TO
RECEIVE DELEGATION DESIGNATED BY WORLD
COUNCIL OF PEACE TO GO TO UNITED NATIONS
ORGANISATION STOP RESPECTFULLY YOURS.

JOLIOT-CURIE.

(Translation)

**TELEGRAM SENT JUNE 19th, 1951 TO Mr.
JOLIOT-CURIE BY Mr. MALIK, PRESIDENT OF
THE SECURITY COUNCIL**

TO PRESIDENT F. JOLIOT-CURIE
WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE.

I HAVE RECEIVED THE TELEGRAM OF JUNE 16th WHICH YOU SENT TO ME AS PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE U.N.O. AND CONCERNING THE RECEPTION OF THE DELEGATION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE. I CAN RECEIVE THE DELEGATION OF THE W. C. P. IN NEW YORK FROM THE 25th TO THE 27th OF JUNE.

PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL
I. A. MALIK

(Translation)

**TELEGRAM SENT JUNE 21th, 1951 TO Mr.
ACHESON BY Mr. LAFFITTE**

JUNE 21th 1951

MR. DEAN ACHESON
SECRETARY OF STATE
WASHINGTON D. C. — UNITED STATES

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANISATION MR. MALIK HAS INFORMED US BY A TELEGRAM SENT ON JUNE 19TH 1951 THAT HE COULD RECEIVE THE DELEGATION CHARGED BY THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE TO GO TO THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANISATION. STOP. IN ORDER TO ENSURE THE PROMPT DELIVERY OF THE VISAS NECESSARY FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE DELEGATION TO FULFILL THEIR MISSION AT THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANISATION WE ASK YOU TO INTERVENE SO THAT IMMEDIATE INSTRUCTIONS BE GIVEN TO YOUR REPRESENTATIVES IN THE COUNTRIES WHERE MEMBERS OF THE DELEGATION WILL MAKE THEIR APPLICATIONS FOR VISAS STOP. THE MEMBERS OF THE DELEGATION ARE APPLYING FOR VISAS IN THE FOLLOWING PLACES:

MR. PIETRO NENNI AT THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY IN ROME, ITALY

MRS. ISABELLE BLUME AT THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY IN BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

MRS. DA VIES AT THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY IN LONDON, GREAT BRITAIN

MRS. JESSIE STREET FROM AUSTRALIA AT PRESENT VISITING GREAT BRITAIN AT THE UNITED STATES

EMBASSY IN LONDON, GREAT BRITAIN
PROFESSOR HROMADKA AT THE UNITED STATES
EMBASSY IN PRAGUE, CZECHOSLOVAKIA
MR. D'ASTIER DE LA VIGERIE AT THE UNITED
STATES EMBASSY IN PARIS, FRANCE
MR. TIKHONOV AT THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY IN
MOSCOW, U.S.S.R.
MR. Y. T. WU FROM CHINA AT THE UNITED STATES
EMBASSY IN PRAGUE, CZECHOSLOVAKIA
MR. GABRIEL D'ARBOUSSIER AT THE UNITED
STATES EMBASSY IN PARIS, FRANCE
MR. PABLO NERUDA FROM CHILE AT PRESENT
VISITING CZECHOSLOVAKIA AT THE UNITED STATES
EMBASSY IN PRAGUE, CZECHOSLOVAKIA
GENERAL JARA FROM MEXICO AT PRESENT VISITING
THE SOVIET UNION AT THE UNITED STATES
EMBASSY IN MOSCOW, U.S.S.R.
DR. ATAL AT THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY IN NEW
DELHI, INDIA
WE BEG YOU TO INFORM US OF THE ACTION TAKEN
BY YOU IN THIS MATTER.

JEAN LAFFITTE,
GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE WORLD COUNCIL
OF PEACE

(Translation.)

**TELEGRAM SENT JUNE 28th, 1951 TO Mr.
JOLIOT-CURIE BY Mr. MALIK**

NEW YORK JUNE 28th 1951

Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE
PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD COUNCIL
OF PEACE

I AM SENDING YOU THE TEXT OF THE TELEGRAM WHICH I SENT ON JUNE 27TH to MR. ACHESON, SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES, REGARDING THE VISAS OF MEMBERS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE, MRS. DA VIES AND MRS. STREET:

«MR. ACHESON, SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON.»

«ON JUNE 16th, MR. JOLIOT-CURIE, PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE, ADDRESSED HIMSELF TO ME IN MY CAPACITY AS PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNO, ASKING ME TO RECEIVE THE DELEGATION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE.»

«I GAVE MY AGREEMENT TO MR. JOLIOT-CURIE TO RECEIVE THE DELEGATION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE IN NEW YORK ON JUNE 25-27th, AND I INFORMED MEMBERS OF THE DELEGATION TO THAT EFFECT BY CABLE.»

«NOW I HAVE RECEIVED A COMMUNICATION FROM THE NATIONAL PEACE COMMITTEE OF GREAT BRITAIN, INFORMING ME THAT THE DELEGATION MEMBERS, MRS. DA VIES AND JESSIE STREET; HAVE NOT TO DATE RECEIVED THEIR AMERICAN VISAS DESPITE FREQUENT DEMANDS MADE AT THE

UNITED STATES EMBASSY IN LONDON.»

«THE SITUATION IS SUCH THAT SHOULD VISAS NOT BE GIVEN TO MEMBERS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE, THE MEETING OF THE DELEGATION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE WITH THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNO MIGHT BE PREVENTED UNLESS IMMEDIATE MEASURES ARE TAKEN TO GRANT VISAS TO DELEGATES OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE, WHO HAVE ADDRESSED THEMSELVES TO THE U.S. EMBASSIES AND CONSULATES, OFFICIALLY DEMANDING THE GRANTING OF THE VISAS.»

«IN CONNECTION WITH THE DELAY IN GRANTING VISAS TO MEMBERS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE, I SENT AN URGENT TELEGRAM ON JUNE 23TH TO THE CHIEF OF THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS, MR. AUSTIN, ASKING HIM TO TAKE, ALL POSSIBLE MEASURES TO SPEED THE GRANTING OF THESE VISAS, HOWEVER, UP UNTIL TODAY, I HAVE RECEIVED NO REPLY TO THIS TELEGRAM FROM MR. AUSTIN AND, JUDGING FROM THE COMMUNICATION OF JUNE 26TH FROM THE NATIONAL PEACE COMMITTEE OF GREAT BRITAIN, THE SITUATION TO DATE REMAINS UNCHANGED AND DELEGATION MEMBERS, MRS. DAVIES AND MRS. STREET, STILL HAVE NOT RECEIVED VISAS. I ASK YOU, MR. SECRETARY, TO TAKE MEASURES THAT VISAS BE PROMPTLY GRANTED TO THESE MEMBERS OF THE DELEGATION OF THE WORLD PEACE COUNCIL SO THAT THEY MAY COME TO NEW YORK, TOGETHER WITH THE REST OF THE DELEGATION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE, FOR THE MEETING WITH THE

PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNO.
THE SOLUTION OF THIS PROBLEM CANNOT,
UNDERSTANDABLY, BE ALLOWED DELAY, PLEASE
KEEP ME INFORMED, MR. SECRETARY, OF THE
MEASURES WHICH YOU TAKE. WITH ALL MY
RESPECTS,

J. MALIK,
PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL
OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

(Translation)

LETTER SENT JUNE 30th, 1951 TO Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE BY Mr. MALIK

New York, June 30, 1951
To Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE
President of the World Council of Peace

Honorable Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE, I bring to your attention the following letter sent on June 29th to members of the Security Council of the U.N.O.:

*«To the members of the Security Council of the U.N.O.:
Despite the many representations made by members of the delegation of the World Council of Peace to United States diplomatic and consular representatives in a series of countries for the granting of visas for a trip to the United States for the purpose of submitting in New York on June 25-27, 1951, to the President of the Security Council of the U.N.O. an address of the World Council of Peace to the United Nations Organisation, the United States Government has not granted visas to the appointed delegates of the World Council of Peace.*

«Telegrams sent by the President of the Security Council on June 23th to the chief of the United States Mission to the U.N.O. Mr. AUSTIN, and later to the United States Secretary of State, Mr. ACHESON, asking them to take measures to speed the granting of visas to members of the delegation of the World Council of Peace, similarly had no positive result and, in fact, have remained unanswered.

«As a result of not receiving American visas, the delegation of the World Council of Peace, composed, of 12 persons, was not able to go to New York to meet with the President of the Security Council of the U.N.O. Such an attitude on the part of the authorities of the country in which the United Nations Organisation has its headquarters, towards

the demands for the granting of visas to members of the delegation of an international organisation for a visit to New York in order to meet with the President of the Security Council, can absolutely not be justified. It grossly violates the rights of the President of the Security Council and prevents the normal execution of the functions of the President; as a result of the non-delivery by American authorities of visas to the delegates of the World Council of Peace, the President of the Security Council has been deprived of all possibility to receive the above-named delegation, in consequence of which, the President of the Security Council considers it indispensable to bring to the attention of the members of the Security Council and, on his part, to protest against all similar acts by the United States State Department which prevent the normal execution by the President of the Security Council of the U.N.O. of his functions for the reception of those persons who address themselves to him to request an interview on the problems of strengthening world peace and. security.

The correspondence concerning the problem presented in this letter is contained in the documents relating to the Security Council.

With my respects,

Jacob MALIK

President of the Security Council

June 29, 1951.»

This letter will be circulated as an official document of the Security Council. I warmly wish you success in your great and selfless activity for the strengthening of peace and for the prevention of war.

With my respects,

Jacob MALIK

(Translation)

**LETTER SENT JULY 13th, 1951 TO MRS JESSIE
STREET BY THE VICE-CONSUL OF THE UNITED
STATES IN LONDON**

To Mrs. JESSIE STREET

Madam,

With reference to your application for a visa to proceed to the United States as a delegate of the World Peace Council, you are informed that after careful consideration it has been determined that, the applications of delegates of the World Peace Council do not fall within the scope of the «*Headquarters Site Agreement*» between the United States and the United Nations.

It is regretted, therefore that the Embassy will be unable to take further action on your application.

Very Truly yours,
Clarence J. Mc INTOSH
American Vice-Consul

SIMILAR LETTERS WERE SENT TO MEMBERS OF THE
WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE DELEGATION BY THE
CONSULATES OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE
COUNTRIES WHERE THE DELEGATES MADE
APPLICATIONS FOR VISAS

INTERVIEW OF Mr. JOLIOT-CURIE PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE

QUESTION

«In view of the fact that a delegation of the World Council of Peace was summoned to New York by the President of the Security Council, can you explain to us the reasons why this delegation has been unable to fulfil its mission?»

ANSWER

«Mr. MALIK, President of the Security Council, advised me that he was prepared to receive the delegation appointed by the World Council between June 25th and June 27th last.

»As soon as I received notice of this invitation, I immediately informed each member of the delegation, requesting him urgently to make the necessary visa applications; At the same time, the Secretariat of the World Council of Peace got in touch with Mr. ACHESON and asked him to speed up the usual formalities. Despite the fact that every member of the delegation made immediate application to the U. S. Embassies concerned, not one visa had been granted by June 27th. Accordingly; and notwithstanding the fact that all the necessary arrangements had been made for their journey, it has not been possible for the members of the delegation to comply with the invitation of the President of the Security Council.»

«Advised of this obstacle. I have communicated with the Rev. Willard UPHAUS and Mr. Paul ROBESON, members of the delegation resident in the United States, requesting them to explain to Mr. MALIK the reasons why the delegation has been unable to carry out its task.»

QUESTION

«Should it be assumed that the World Council of Peace will pursue its endeavours to secure that its appointed delegation shall be received at the United Nations?»

ANSWER

«Absolutely. Already in many countries the national peace movements are protesting against the obstacles so far raised to prevent this delegation from reaching the United Nations. I am, indeed, convinced that, thanks to the support furnished to it by millions of men and women, the delegation of the World Council of Peace will in the end be enabled to fulfil its mission.»

Interview given to the Polish Press on June 29, 1951 by Mr. Frederic JOLIOT-CURIE, President of the World Council of Peace.

(Translation)

**PROTEST AGAINST THE REFUSAL, BY THE
GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES, OF THE
VISAS NECESSARY FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE
DELEGATION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF
PEACE, TO PROCEED TO THE CONVOCATION OF
THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL**

adopted unanimously by the Bureau of the World Council of Peace at Helsinki. (July 20—23th, 1951.)

In February 1951, the World Council of Peace decided to send a delegation to the United Nations.

After various steps had been taken, the World Council was informed that the acting President of the Security Council, Mr. Malik, would receive this delegation at the headquarters of the United Nations. The members of the delegation then applied to the competent American consulates for the visas necessary to enable them to proceed to the convocation of the President of the Security Council. They were informed, however, that these visas could not be granted to them.

The reason invoked by the American authorities was that the requests for visas could not receive satisfaction «*within the scope of the Headquarters Site Agreement between the United States and the United Nations*». The examination of this question having necessitated «careful consideration» (sic), the American authorities added that they did not have enough time to submit, through the normal procedure, the requests presented by the members of the delegation, and that in view of these circumstances, no further action would be taken on these requests.

The Bureau of the World Council of Peace strongly protests against this decision.

It does not intend to enter into judicial controversy on the scope of «*the Headquarters Site Agreements* and confines itself to noting that, because of the American authorities, the delegates of the World Council have been ‘prevented from proceeding to the convocation of the President of the Security Council. The Bureau of the World Council presents, in regard to this matter, the following observations:

1.— In deciding to send a delegation to the United Nations, the World Council of Peace had shown its will to establish relations with this high international organisation and to make known to it the point of view of several hundreds of millions of men and women on the questions concerning the maintenance of peace.

It is for the duly-addressed organs of the United Nations, and for them alone, to determine the response to the request of the World Council of Peace. Their decision on such a matter could not be subordinated to a previous ruling of the American Government without compromising their authority and independence.

2.—The violation of the principle stated above is particularly grave when it relates to a delegation convoked to the headquarters of the United Nations by the President of the Security Council or by any other organ of the United Nations. If it were maintained, the decision of the American Government would singularly restrict the liberty of action and of information of the highest organs of the United Nations, which should be able to discuss current international problems with any person or any delegation which they judge proper to receive.

Therefore, the Bureau of the World Council of Peace protests against the decision of the government of the United States. It calls the attention of international public opinion to the dangers resulting from this decision. It points out to the government of the United States that the United Nations is on

its territory, but not under its control. It requests the United Nations to take the measures necessary so that its functioning and independence be fully assured in all domains, including that of information, without any interference and without any hindrance on the part of any power whatsoever.

PUBLISHED BY THE WORLD COUNCIL OF PEACE