

**On Reduction of Armaments
On Prohibition of the Atomic Weapon
and on International Control**

**Vyshinsky
at UNO**

**Speeches in the United Nations
Political Committee,
December 18, 19 and 21, 1951**

**On Aggressive Actions and
Interference in the Internal Affairs of
Other Countries by the
United States of America**

A "SOVIET NEWS" BOOKLET

**Printed in Great Britain by
FARLEIGH PRESS LTD.
BEECHWOOD RISE WATFORD**

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>



June 2011

**Speeches
by**

A. Y. VYSHINSKY

**in the
Political Committee
of the
U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

Paris, December 18, 19 and 21, 1951



SOVIET NEWS, LONDON, 1952

Contents

On the Reduction of Armaments, on Prohibition of the Atomic Weapon and on International Control. Speech by A. Y. VYSHINSKY December 18, 1951.....	5
Speech by A. Y. VYSHINSKY December 19, 1951.....	45
On Aggressive Actions and Interference in the Internal Affairs of other Countries by the United States of America. Speech by A. Y. VYSHINSKY. December 19, 1951.....	51
On Aggressive Actions and Interference in the Internal Affairs of other Countries by the United States of America. Speech by A. Y. VYSHINSKY December 21, 1951.....	88

**On the Reduction of Armaments, on
Prohibition of the Atomic Weapon and on
International Control. Speech by A. Y.
VYSHINSKY December 18, 1951**

DURING the last few days, the attention of the First Committee* has been concentrated on the so-called revised draft resolution of the “three”—the United States, Britain and France—and the amendments submitted by the U.S.S.R. delegation thereto.

The representatives of certain delegations, and first and foremost the authors of the altered draft resolution, have spent no little effort trying to convince us that such changes have been introduced in this draft as actually give grounds for regarding it as an altered, as a revised draft in comparison with the original draft of the same three Powers—the United States, Britain and France—submitted by them as early as November 19.

Careful examination of the revised draft resolution, however, does not reveal any more or less serious changes in it. True, individual minor corrections have been introduced in this draft, but in substance this so-called revised draft does not differ from the previous one. This draft, like the original one, too, constitutes an attempt to substitute the question of reduction of armaments and armed forces, prohibition of the atomic weapon, establishment of international control, by the proposal to collect information on armaments and armed forces, and essentially it does not go further than that. As hitherto, this draft retains the object of frustrating the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of the atomic weapon.

* The Political Committee.

Therefore it is necessary to be very careful in accepting the statements made here by the authors of this draft, and first of all by Mr. Jessup, to the effect that the United States strives to find a practical solution which would lead to certain, so he said, agreed results in order to ease the international tension, and to the effect that the proposals put forward by the United States constitute the key to a future decision, opening up a broad road along which it is possible to advance, striving for the solution of the problems which have not been settled, and the lessening of the friction and disagreements. If, in the given question the Government of the United States had really been guided by such aspirations, there would be no necessity to resort to such hazy and indefinite formulations as run through the revised draft resolution of the “three”, which in this respect does not differ in the least from the original draft of this resolution. This is seen with particular clarity, for instance, from an analysis of Paragraph 3 of the revised draft resolution of the “three” whose only difference from the original text of this paragraph of the draft resolution consists in the paraphrasing of some provisions and in a more subtle formulation of others, which to a no lesser degree mask the real purpose of this paragraph, actually boiling down to the defence at all costs of that selfsame “Baruch plan”.

In this so-called revised draft resolution of the “three”, everything finally boils down to a few changes of secondary importance which have the aim of diverting attention from the basic line of the United States, Britain and France aiming to hold on firmly to the fundamental conceptions of which Messrs. Jessup, Lloyd and Moch have spoken here, having in mind that selfsame “Baruch plan”.

All the latest statements of Mr. Jessup, echoed by Messrs. Lloyd, Moch and several other delegates, such as the representatives of Bolivia and Peru, to the effect that the

United States is trying to achieve such an international system as would secure the reduction of all armed forces and all types of armaments, are completely contradicted by numerous facts that permeate the entire practice and policy of the United States of America and certain other States limping along in its train.

Despite the fact that for the second month now the United Nations is extensively discussing the questions of the prohibition of the atomic weapon, the establishment of international control and the reduction of armaments and armed forces, and the United States, Britain and France declare their willingness to take the necessary measures in this sphere, these States are confining themselves to mere declarations which, in addition, are accompanied by serious resistance to any attempt to put these declarations in any sort of definite form, even remotely resembling a decision of the General Assembly. And at the same time, in their countries, under the leadership of their Governments, ceaseless work is under way, assuming ever great proportions, further to increase the armaments and armed forces of these countries, to produce and perfect ever new types of such a weapon of aggression and mass extermination of people as the atomic weapon.

The last half-yearly 1951 report of the United States Secretary of Defence to the United States President insists on the further expansion of the American military programme and calls upon the American people to make further sacrifices for the purpose of successfully fulfilling this military programme.

In his report, the United States Defence Secretary speaks of the most gratifying, as he puts it, successes attained in the development of different types of atomic weapons and the researches in creating thermo-nuclear armaments, not to speak of the planes, naval vessels, tanks and so on and so forth.

The United States Defence Secretary, Mr. Lovett, literally

goes into raptures over the growth of armaments in the United States on the basis of the American military budget of \$60,000 million.

Notwithstanding the voices of warning already resounding here and there, about the danger of the oncoming crisis of overproduction, the expansion of the war industry at the expense of peaceful industry is proceeding at full blast, with the volume of war production in the United States at present, as is known, amounting to at least \$2,000 million a month, which is three times the level of the last month of 1950.

Notwithstanding the fact that the policy of the armaments drive and preparation of another war is increasingly undermining the economies of the countries which have chosen such a line in their home and foreign policy—a policy disastrous for the economies of these countries—this line is being continued with the accompaniment of incitements, on the one, hand, by such employers' organisations as the National Association of Manufacturers in the United States and West European countries, who are raking in profits from war and war preparations, and, on the other hand, by the leaders of the foreign policy of these countries which have united in the aggressive Atlantic bloc.

In this connection one cannot but mention the recent statement of the spokesman of the United States Defence Department Foster, who called for the acceleration of the production of armaments both in the United States and in the countries of Western Europe allied with it, and who uttered threats about various dangers which the world, according to him, faces.

We must, Foster said, clearly understand that next year might be the most dangerous in the history of the West. If we accustom ourselves to this idea, he continued, and act accordingly, we shall be fully able to accomplish what we are

urged to do by General Eisenhower and many other leaders of the North Atlantic Alliance and cross the line in our programme of rearmament, Foster said. In other words in the armaments drive.

That is why the United States Government, and the Governments of Britain and France obediently following it, do not agree in reality to take measures for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the reduction of armaments and armed forces. To adopt such proposals and to take to the path of genuinely implementing them—this by no means tallies with the entire trend of the present foreign policy of the United States which is stubbornly steering a course of complicating international relations and preparing another world war.

Under such circumstances is it feasible to assume that the ruling circles of the United States—as well as those of Britain and France who support them in this matter—can really seriously strive for a reduction of armaments and armed forces and for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of international control?

That is why, to the aforementioned question put to us, we venture to reply that it is precisely here that one must look for an explanation of that resolute resistance which is being offered by the Governments of the United States, Britain and France to the adoption of the proposals of the Soviet Union and of the amendments in which these proposals are formulated and which are designed for real prohibition of the atomic weapon, real establishment of international control, real reduction of armaments and armed forces.

That is why in the speeches of Mr. Jessup, not to mention the speeches of Messrs. Lloyd and Moch, it is impossible to find—and we do not find—any striving to bring closer together the stands of the United States, Britain and France on this question with the stand of the Soviet Union. They stubbornly

resist this rapprochement, which, of course, is quite natural, since the Soviet Union insists, not on verbal assurances of readiness to carry out such important decisions as are really capable of eliminating the tension in international relations and of ensuring the peace and security of the peoples, but insists on these decisions themselves decisions such as the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon, the establishment of strict international control over the enforcement of this prohibition, the reduction of armaments and armed forces.

But these Powers cannot at the same time merely reject the Soviet proposals, the Soviet amendments. They have to give their position on this question a semblance of propriety. They have to cover up their position with florid verbiage, behind which it would be possible to conceal the real substance of the matter.

Worthy of attention in this connection is the report carried recently in the American Press to the effect that the Assistant Chief of the Mutual Security Agency of the United States, Richard Bissell, urged that the foreign policy of the United States be formulated anew, that this policy be formulated in such a way as to show-precisely to show, and, only to show-that the programme of European rearmament is a secondary matter compared with the broader aim of improving the social and economic position of the West European countries.

Bissell referred to the fact that America's prestige dropped alarmingly in the estimation of world public opinion during the past year because the people, according to Bissell, began to arrive at the conclusion that the United States stands solely for armaments and that all assertions that the United States seeks some other aims besides the armaments drive and the increase of armed forces, have been brushed aside.

There can be no doubt that the introduction at the Sixth Session, right here at our Sixth Session of the General

Assembly, of the draft resolution of the “three” on the reduction of armaments and armed forces, pursues a similar aim—to submerge in talk about the prohibition of the atomic weapon the real reduction of armaments and armed forces, real prohibition of the atomic weapon, and to reduce the whole matter merely to the collection of information on the armed forces and armaments and to concentrate efforts, as hitherto, on the armaments drive, on thwarting any reduction of armaments and the prohibition of the atomic weapon.

We all make no secret of the fact that it is precisely from this standpoint that we consider both the original draft of the resolution of the “three” and the altered draft of this resolution.

Notwithstanding certain editorial changes, the content of the draft resolution of the United States, Britain and France in the revised version remains exactly the same as that of their former draft. One can easily become convinced of this by carefully examining the revised draft of the above resolution. If this revised draft contains some new elements, it must be said that this by no means improves matters. This should first of all be said about the second paragraph of the preamble of the revised draft resolution of the “three” which refers to the so-called effective system of collective security.

Needless to say, the striving for effective collective security in itself, to which, as is known, special articles of the United Nations Charter, namely Articles 51 and 52, are devoted, cannot of course arouse any objections, if the Charter is really adhered to and if this formula is applied in conformity with the principles, aims and tasks of the United Nations. We know, however, that the formula or an effective system of collective security was already used, not only not in conformity with the United Nations Charter, but in direct violation of the Charter, when the resolution of November 3, 1950, imposed by the Atlantic grouping of United Nations members, approved

measures that had nothing in common with the principles laid down in the Charter.

The events of the past year have shown with still greater clarity that the programme of so-called collective measures envisaged in Resolution No. 377—of which we shall speak more in detail later when dealing directly with this question—in reality is a dangerous programme, a programme—I will say outright—of war, although camouflaged by phrases about security, phrases about peace.

The programme outlined in the report of the so-called collective measures committee is bound up with the further armaments drive, the mobilisation of manpower and material resources for the further prosecution of the war in the Far East undertaken by the Atlantic bloc, with the preparation for other war gambles, and consequently has nothing in common with the task now confronting the United Nations—the task of reducing armaments and armed forces.

It is known that the references to collective measures to “effective” so-called measures of “defence” and similar aims which camouflage the bellicose schemes and plans of] their sponsors, are extensively used precisely for the further spreading of war psychosis, the further expansion and intensification of war measures. The incorporation of this formula in the altered draft resolution of the “three” is incompatible with the aims the United Nations Charter sets before them when it speaks of effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of a threat to peace, and, for the suppression of acts of aggression and the prevention of other violations of peace, or, as it is stated in Article 51 of the Charter, for the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence and the maintenance of international peace and security.

The second paragraph of the preamble of the altered draft

resolution, speaking of this effective system of so-called collective measures, undoubtedly has in view the so-called system of collective security already reflected in the resolution of the General Assembly adopted at the Fifth Session. The U.S.S.R. delegation objected to this resolution; a number of other delegations objected to it because all these “collective measures” are in reality directed, not at defending peace, as is shown for example by the war in Korea, but at facilitating the implementation of the aggressive plans of the Atlantic bloc, which tries to play a leading part in deciding matters of war and peace in the United Nations.

If we turn to Paragraph 3 of the preamble of the revised draft resolution of the “three” which replaced Paragraph 2 of the original draft, the entire difference consists in that the phrase about the level adequate for defence but not for aggression has been omitted here—not to mention one more difference: this is that the words about the necessary means to this end, which were in the original draft at the end of this paragraph, have now been transferred to the beginning of this paragraph.

Mr. Jessup explained that the phrase about the level of armed forces and armaments was deleted because of the doubts about this formulation voiced by the representative of the U.S.S.R. and other delegates, and he presented this as some kind of essential change.

Although the revised draft resolution of the “three” no longer contains references to the “level”, nor any references to the “criterion” of the general limits and restrictions of all armed forces and armaments, this, however, by no means signifies that the sponsors of the draft have really decided to abandon their stand on this matter.

Such a supposition would be completely groundless, and this is clearly seen from Point 6(a) of the revised draft

resolution, which reproduces the idea expressed in Paragraph 3 of the preamble and in Point 5(b) of the original draft.

Indeed, Point 6(a) instructs the commission to define in what way the general limits and reduction of all armed forces and all armaments can be calculated and established. However, this of course obligates the commission to determine the very same level, to determine the very same criterion of which the original draft spoke. Thus the matter remains in the, very same original form.

At the appropriate time the U.S.S.R. delegation proposed that another point be substituted for Point 5 of the original draft. The same holds good also for the present Point 6 of the revised draft, which we propose to replace by another point, namely that the atomic energy and conventional armaments commission be instructed to prepare within three months practical proposals for the application of the said decision for submission to the Security Council, having in view the decision of the General Assembly on this question.

We consider it inexpedient to give the commission such a narrow assignment as is contained in Point 6 of the revised draft resolution, which, moreover, again boils down to defining the "level" and "criteria", which is exceedingly inexpedient, as has been shown by the experience of the fruitless discussion of such questions.

We consider more expedient and more practicable the proposal of the head of the Syrian delegation, who spoke of the need to give the commission freedom of action and not to vest it with restricted powers which could hamper it in finding ways for solving the problems confronting it.

The proposal of the Soviet delegation is heading in this direction and this seems to us correct. This opens up better prospects for the commission in its future work.



AN important question is the reduction by the permanent members of the Security Council—the United States, Britain, France, China and the U.S.S.R.—of the armaments and armed forces in their possession at the moment of the adoption of this resolution, by one-third in one year, as from the date of the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Moch tried to joke here on this score—he himself being the one who enjoyed it most—by relating anecdotes about a man who has one suit of clothes and who is asked to cut this suit by one-third. The representative of France, however, would do better not to joke about such matters affecting the situation in certain countries where, with the policy they are pursuing there, many people will soon be without a single suit of clothes. (*Laughter.*)

The point spoken of in the amendments of the Soviet Union proposes that the General Assembly should deem it “essential for the Governments of member-States of the United Nations and of States that are not at present members of the United Nations Organisation to submit forthwith to the international control organ, and in any case not later than one month after the adoption by the General Assembly of the decisions for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the reduction of armaments and armed forces, complete information regarding the state of their armed forces and all types of armaments, including the atomic weapon, at the time of the adoption of the said decisions”.

I see no need to speak again at length in favour of these two provisions which I have just outlined.

I pointed out that the objections to this proposal, i.e. our proposal for the reduction by the great Powers of all armaments and armed forces by one-third, are based on the utterly wrong

assertions that the adoption of such a proposal would preserve for the Soviet Union its alleged military superiority. We also pointed out that the objections to the proposal of the Soviet Union, moreover, are based on the false theory of the so-called “balance of power”.

We cited arguments, presented historical facts refuting both this theory and the stand of those who are now again trying to revive this theory and to apply it to the present conditions, asserting that precisely the “balance of power” among the great Powers can be a guarantee of international peace and security. We have unfortunately heard nothing in reply to this criticism, except the unconvincing arguments of the Bolivian delegate on this subject.

The Bolivian delegate deemed it necessary to present objections to our arguments, but the Bolivian delegate had to admit that after hearing here from the Soviet delegation about the Washington Agreement of 1921-22 and taking an interest in this question—which we, of course, can only welcome—he began to study this Agreement and arrived at the conclusion that this Agreement was aimed at ensuring peace in the Far East by establishing a balance of armed forces among the United States, Britain and Japan, but that in 1934 militarist Japan denounced this agreement, became an aggressor and unleashed the war in the Far East.

But I spoke of the very same thing. What then did the Bolivian delegate change or add to what I had said, except that he revealed the secret of his “erudition” in this matter?

But having said what he did, he unfortunately did not draw from this the proper conclusion. Evidently he was hampered by lack of time and haste in the study of this question. Yet, it would not have been difficult for the Bolivian delegate to draw a conclusion by carefully weighing the facts of which he learned from his, apparently chance and cursory, examination

of this question. And there could be only one conclusion: the Washington Agreement did not prevent Japanese aggression, and the so-called “balance of power” collapsed under the weight of contradictions which then rent the Powers that concluded the Washington Agreement, contradictions which continue operating in the camp of capitalist powers at the present time also.

Peru’s delegate, too, committed a great error in stating that the Soviet Union, while seeking prohibition of the atomic weapon, at the same time strives to preserve for itself freedom of action as regards other types of weapons of no less destructive effect.

I must remind the representative of Peru, as well as the representative of the Lebanon who expressed the same idea, if I am not mistaken, that as long ago as 1948, in the additional proposals to the Soviet draft plan for the work of the Conventional Armaments Commission, the U.S.S.R. submitted a proposal pointing to the need for complete prohibition of the production and use, not only of the atomic weapon, but also of the other types of weapons designed for mass destruction.

Thus the question of the need to remove and prohibit, not only the atomic weapon, but also all other types of weapons of mass destruction of people, raised by them with a delay of three years, was already put forward by the Soviet delegation in 1948. Since then there has not been the slightest hint on the part of the Soviet Union that it has changed its stand on this question. Such a formulation of the question fully conforms to the stand and the general policy of the Soviet Union, which it has maintained ever since this question arose.

This, in particular, finds expression and will find expression also in that I can now declare that we fully support the amendment proposed yesterday by the Egyptian delegation, which not only mentions the unconditional prohibition of the

use of the atomic weapon, but also speaks of all other types of weapons of mass destruction.

We support this fully and entirely, Mr. Delegate of Peru, and you can be perfectly at ease on that score.

If you really want all other weapons of mass destruction to be prohibited along with the prohibition of the atomic weapon, then vote today for the prohibition of the atomic weapon. But you will not vote for this. And you referred here to the principal types of weapons of mass destruction besides the atomic weapon only in order to cover up the fact that you will vote for a resolution which contains not even a hint of the prohibition of the atomic weapon, to cover up your rejection of this prohibition by artificial, hazy, indefinite, vague and ambiguous phrases on this score.

And you say that our position is not clear, that there is something we want to conceal, that we want to utilise something in our own interests when we demand that analogous types of weapons in the possession of other States be withdrawn from the national armaments. You are wrong. You are entirely wrong. You are following too servilely along the road which you ought not to follow.

The delegate of Peru also made a mistake in the interpretation of the concept “unconditional” prohibition of the atomic weapon.

I find it strange and amusing to speak of it. I know that they do not like it when I say that I am amused. But really “it’s no sin to laugh at something really funny”. We say “unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon”. And you tell us that we make “unconditional” dependent on control! We never did anything of the kind.

You are entirely mistaken in your understanding of the expression “unconditional prohibition”. I must explain that as we understand the unconditional prohibition of the atomic

weapon, it is not at all dependent on control, on its organisation its forms, on the methods of performing the functions of control, etc. No, when the Soviet Union demands unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon it means that the prohibition of the atomic weapon must not be made dependent on any conditions such as the “stages” put forward in the “Baruch plan” or on any other conditions capable of nullifying or even restricting in any measure the operation of the ban on the atomic weapon. This is how we understand it and therefore we really insist on the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon.

We have always argued that control cannot automatically bring about the prohibition of the atomic weapon. Control can only fulfil the functions of control, that is functions of verifying the observance of this prohibition. And if there is no prohibition, then there is no purpose in control—whether prohibition is proclaimed unconditionally or with conditions.

It seems tame that after more than five years of debating this question it is time to understand each other’s position. The delegate of Peru has probably still not yet gained a proper understanding of this question.

The delegate of Peru referred to mathematical paradoxes. In this, too, he committed an error, because it is far better to deal with, and use, logical arguments and not mathematical paradoxes. A paradox always remains a paradox, and it is a paradox for the very reason that it has no right to claim to be the truth. But logic always remains logic, i.e. it differs from paradox in that it has the right to claim to be the truth, for what is logical is real, and, vice versa, what is contrary to logic cannot be recognised as real or true.

How far Peru’s delegate actually is from the realm of truth, from the realm of reality, is obvious from his absolutely unsubstantiated and biased remark alleging that the policy of

the Soviet Union has led to the disappearance of trust in the world. With all the reservations of a well-bred person, he nevertheless said such a thing. Is it possible that he who said this really believes what he said—believes that trust has disappeared in international relations because of the Soviet Union? Do you really think so? I doubt it, because only persons who wear blinkers and who cannot see what is going on around them because of these blinkers, can think so.

For all the facts before us, around us, facing us—all of them prove that it is by no means the Soviet Union's fault that trust has disappeared from international relations. I shall not, of course, enumerate these facts, Mr. Chairman, not because Mr. Jessup may lose his self-control and demand a cessation of the exposition of these facts, as he did yesterday during the speech, of my colleague, the Byelorussian delegate, but because we have spoken of this many times here and I do not want to take undue advantage of the First Committee's time and patience. I shall merely say that in such a case the delegate of Peru adheres to the view—in speaking of the facts—that if a statement is contrary to the facts then so much the worse for the facts. I could draw a certain parallel here between the speech of the delegate of Peru and that of the delegate of France. The delegate of France also tried to make insinuations against us, although he knows very well that if he does he will be exposed at once. Digressions such as Mr. Moch permitted himself here, hinting at some fifteen countries who have allegedly lost their independence through the fault of the Soviet Union—digressions of this kind are a form of military cunning springing from the consciousness of absolute, inability to defend a position which cannot honestly be defended and from the desire to divert attention from the question under discussion, even at the cost of methods impermissible in decent society.

As for the substance of the question we are discussing, Mr. Moch preferred to repeat here the phrase that the Soviet Union is trying, he says, to preserve its superiority in armed forces and to eliminate the superiority of the United States, Britain and France where it, according to Moch, exists. He again spoke of the size of the Soviet Union's armed forces, of the number of divisions, aircraft, which he allegedly knows with surprising exactness, and he deliberately understated the corresponding data concerning the armed forces of the United States and its allies.

Need we return to this question? And if we need to return, then is it not enough to suggest to Mr. Moch and those who are prepared to follow him in this matter that they at least take pains to read the minutes of the Special Sub-Committee of the Appropriations Committee of the United States House of Representatives for 1951. These minutes give data on the armed forces of the United States, Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal and even Luxembourg. According to these data, the total number of armed forces of these countries is almost 5½ million. These data, even compared with the mythical data used here by Mr. Moch and others in talking about the armed forces of the Soviet Union, are sufficient to expose the entire groundlessness of the whole stand and argumentation of Mr. Moch and others in this matter.

Nevertheless Mr. Moch, following Mr. Jessup, continues to repeat arguments which, in face of such facts, are utterly senseless. He incorrectly depicts the matter, representing our proposal for prohibition of the atomic weapon and reduction of armaments and armed forces as a unilateral demand designed to deprive the United States of atomic superiority and to preserve our own superiority in all other respects.

This is wrong. This is wrong if only because prohibition of

the atomic weapon should extend to all countries possessing the atomic weapon, and therefore all such countries should be deprived of the superiority which the possession of the atomic weapon gives them.

As for conventional armaments, here too the reduction of armaments and armed forces by one-third by the five great Powers in the course of one year will give no advantages to the Soviet Union. This is obvious if only from the way the matter stands with regard to the present state of the armaments and armed forces of which we have already spoken, and particularly from the absolutely indisputable fact that the purpose of the Soviet Union's armed forces is to protect its frontiers and not to carry out any aggressive plans, which are alien to the Soviet State and to Soviet foreign policy.

Even Mr. Acheson admitted that it was natural that a large country with a large population and with a great length of frontiers should also have a large army. A large army of a peace-loving State cannot be a threat to any State, even to a State with a smaller army or even with a very small and weak army. On the contrary, a small but aggressive State pursuing an aggressive policy and cherishing plans to dominate the neighbouring countries and even the idea of world domination, is a real menace to world peace, as for instance, was old Prussia, which was by no means a large State but was an aggressive State, a warlike State, and was therefore always a threat to peace even though it had a comparatively small army.

This is confirmed by numerous facts from the history of the nations, and these facts ought not to be forgotten, just as the lessons of history ought not to be ignored. Certain delegates, however, are not inclined to remember the facts of history, are inclined, on the contrary, to close their eyes to these facts and, even more, to contemporary facts. This refers, in particular, to those who tried here to dispute the fact that the responsibility

for international tension lies with the Atlantic bloc countries headed by the United States of America. But is it not a fact that this tension is caused by the frantic armaments drive, by the organisation of new military bases and the expansion of the already existing bases in foreign countries? I shall remind you, for instance, that today, at the present moment, the United States is organising five new air bases and, it seems, atomic bases in Morocco. In any case the atomic weapon has now been adopted as a part of the armaments of the entire American army. Does this not cause an increase in tension, nervousness, alarm? Does it not arouse anxiety, shake various nations' security and confidence in their security? Do not the unleashing of military actions in the Far East, the knocking together of new military blocs and the open preparation of a new world war—as testified to by numerous facts from the activities primarily of the United States of America—complicate, and cause tension in, international relations?

But who is implementing all the measures that have been enumerated? Who is conducting this frantic armaments drive? Who is building new military bases and expanding old ones in various parts of the world, with the chief aim of encircling the Soviet Union and the people's democracies with a belt of these bases?

Certainly it is the United States, which is setting an example in this armaments drive in its own country too, which must bear the responsibility for rearmament, i.e., for the armaments drive now taking place in certain countries of Western Europe. To be convinced of this it is sufficient to see what took place in Rome, at the Atlantic bloc council, and what is now taking place generally in the camp of the Atlantic bloc.

Let us take France for example. A few days ago the newspaper *Le Monde* wrote that the American Government was continuing to bring pressure to bear on the French

Government to get it to exceed the “French budgetary possibilities”, as *Le Monde* writes, established in October 1950, i.e. to get the budget increased still more, and this in spite of the fact that the French Ministry of Defence has set the expenditures, as is known, at 610,000 million in 1951, 725,000 million in 1952 and 752,000 million in 1953, not counting Indo-China, the overseas territories and the expenditures on the so-called N.A.T.O. (North Atlantic Treaty Organisation).

Naturally the French Government, as the same *Le Monde* reports, must ask Harriman for an increase in American aid to make up for the deficit which, according to *Le Monde*, “may endanger French armaments beyond repair”.

But a similar situation has also arisen at the present time with regard to Britain, Belgium, Italy and Western Germany, where all measures regarding the so-called rearmament—more correctly speaking, armaments drive—are determined by the policy and directions of the United States aggressive circles.

President Truman’s acting Special Representative in the Economic Co-operation Administration in Europe, Porter, recently declared, at the very beginning of December this year, that Europe’s main task now is rearmament and not rehabilitation. Moreover, he warned that the burden of rearmament will be heavy but that the European workers and farmers must bear this burden.

Who then, we ask, is the moving spirit of the so-called rearmament, or, more correctly speaking, the frantic armaments drive which the United States aggressive circles are whipping up and which is already causing their friends in Europe and other parts of the world to split all their seams?

This is a question worth thinking about before coming out with risky arguments in defence of the American policy of the armaments drive, before taking decisions in this direction in support of this policy of an armaments drive.

It cannot be denied that precisely such are the activities of the aggressive circles of the United States of America, who determine also its corresponding foreign policy.

Therefore we have the right to assert that the responsibility for the present world tension rests precisely with these aggressive circles of the United States, Britain and France who head the aggressive Atlantic bloc.

Every day brings a stronger and more resolute exposure of the nonsensical stories of an alleged threat from the Soviet Union. It is time it was understood once and for all that the Soviet Union has never threatened anyone and does not threaten anyone. And this has been proved by all of over thirty years' history of the Soviet State, which has been advancing steadfastly along the path of strengthening peace and international co-operation and ensuring the security of nations. On the other hand, every day brings fresh facts proving that the threat to peace and the security of nations comes from the aggressive Atlantic bloc. It is this that explains the specific nature of, the drafts of various resolutions submitted for the consideration of the General Assembly by the leaders of the Atlantic bloc. Such is also the nature of the revised draft resolution of the "three", which, as we have already shown during the discussion of a number of its basic points, does not solve a single problem related to the limitation and reduction of armed forces and armaments nor, all the more so, to the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of strict international control. Yet in this matter there must be complete clarity. Guided by precisely such considerations, the delegation of the Soviet Union proposed the inclusion in the draft resolution of the "three", as the first item of the operative part, of a point proposing that the General Assembly proclaim the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of strict international control to ensure the

observance of this prohibition. In this point the U.S.S.R. delegation proposes that the General Assembly instruct the Atomic Energy and Conventional Armaments Commission to draw up and submit for the consideration of the Security Council a draft convention providing for measures to ensure the implementation of the General Assembly's decisions relating to the prohibition of the atomic weapon; the cessation of its production, the use solely for civilian purposes of the atomic bombs already produced and the establishment of strict international control over the implementation of the said convention.

Can there be any comparison between these unambiguous, clear-cut, resolute and definite proposals of the Soviet Union and the hazy, indefinite proposals, accompanied by all kinds of reservations and conditions contained in Point 3 of the draft resolution of the "three"? It is high time to realise clearly the profound difference in principle between these two resolutions.

On one side, on the side of the Soviet Union, there is a proposal to proclaim the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of strict international control, to draw up a convention in the shortest time providing for measures to ensure the implementation of this prohibition. This is what we have on one side, on the side of the Soviet Union.

On the other side, on the side of the United States, Britain and France, there is neither a declaration of the prohibition of the atomic weapon nor a decision to establish international control. There are, however, not a few hazy phrases which add up to instructing the Atomic Energy and Conventional Armaments Commission to draw up for inclusion in the draft treaty proposals on the reduction of all armed forces and on the establishment of effective control again with the object of ensuring the observance of the prohibition of the atomic

weapon.

But where is this prohibition, the observance of which is to be controlled? You say: This is self-evident. But then, permit us to ask you to state this clearly and exactly: *to prohibit the atomic weapon.*

But the three Governments—the United States, Britain and France—do not venture to affirm the prohibition of the atomic weapon in clear and precise terms. They evade this question. They confine themselves merely to instructing the Commission to draw up proposals of some sort—and not on the prohibition of the atomic weapon at that, but merely on the establishment of control which aims at prohibiting the atomic weapon.

One might think that there is some joke here, so lacking in seriousness is this entire point if one has in view a real desire to solve the problem which is contained in these exceptionally important words: prohibition of the atomic weapon, establishment of control to ensure the observance of this prohibition—a few short but exceptionally important words for which millions of people are now struggling—millions of people who will win victory in this struggle despite all the subterfuges, tricks and resistance they encounter on this path, but which they cannot fail to surmount and which they will beyond doubt victoriously surmount.

The delegation of the Soviet Union also proposed the inclusion in the draft resolution of the “three” of its new point on the establishment of the international control agency within the framework of the Security Council. We pointed out that the establishment of such an agency should be provided for in every sincere plan for a substantial reduction of all armed forces and armaments. The new Point 3 proposed by the delegation of the U.S.S.R., placed under No. 5 in the text of our amendments, points out that the task of this agency should be “control of the reduction of all types of armaments and armed

forces and control of the enforcement of the prohibition of the atomic weapon, so that this prohibition is carried out accurately and conscientiously and so that this international agency must disclose information on all armed forces, including paramilitary, security and police forces, and all armaments, including the atomic weapon”, and it also envisages effective international inspection, to be carried out in accordance with the decisions of the aforesaid international control agency, and envisages that this control should include the verification of the information submitted.

Is it possible to speak more clearly than our amendment does of the real aim, tasks and functions defining the rights and duties of this control agency?

In order that there may be no lack of clarity whatever regarding the establishment of the international control agency, the U.S.S.R. delegation proposed that the future convention shall provide that the international control agency be entrusted with control over the prohibition of the atomic weapon, that it shall provide for the agency’s composition, rights and duties and also instruct this agency to carry out, immediately after the conclusion of the aforesaid convention, inspection, i.e. verification of all the undertakings for the production and storing of the atomic weapon in order to ascertain whether the convention on the prohibition of the atomic weapon has been implemented or not.

The sponsors of the draft resolution keep silent about our proposal for an immediate inspection, immediate verification after the conclusion of this convention, irrespective of whether this international control machinery is functioning or not—immediately to verify the production and storing of the atomic weapon. They prefer to evade this matter. Yet, this proposal is of great importance. It proves that the Soviet Union does not propose, and does not intend, to postpone the control of the

prohibition of the atomic weapon to some later, or very last, stage, as provided for in the “Baruch plan” and as advocated by the representatives of the United States, Britain and France.

I must mention another circumstance. The Memorandum of the Sub-Committee’s Chairman, Mr. Padilla Nervo, states among other things, on page nine of the Russian text, that these three Powers consider that the establishment of an international control agency is implied in their draft.

But why only implied? Why do the Governments of the United States, Britain and France only imply the establishment of such an agency, while they foam at the mouth arguing that precisely such an agency is the real key to the settlement of the entire problem of the banning of the atomic weapon?

And does not the Memorandum of the Chairman of the Sub-Committee itself state that only the draft amendments of the Soviet Union contain direct reference to the need for establishing an international control agency?

Yet in the Sub-Committee, however, by the way, certain of the three Powers very stubbornly insisted that this phrase should not be included in Mr. Nervo’s Memorandum. We had to exert no little effort to show that the truth is the truth and that the Memorandum should reflect the truth. I asked then to be shown the point in the draft resolution of the “three” which speaks of the establishment of an international control agency.

But it could not be shown because it is non-existent.

Is not this a characteristic circumstance?

The representatives of the United States, Britain and France are ready to imply many things. They imply the establishment of an international control agency, they imply the prohibition of the atomic weapon—they are ready to imply—they will not be found wanting in this matter. But instead of implying, it is necessary to make a direct statement, but this is exactly what they avoid doing.

They say: "We do not vouch for ourselves. If the Assembly takes the decision on the prohibition of the atomic weapon and there is no club over us, like an international control then we do not vouch for ourselves."

But we do vouch for ourselves and even without a club we will carry out this decision.

Accept this decision!

Mr. Jessup says that Point 4 is a new point. It contains the same idea as in the Soviet amendment No. 5 and like their revised Paragraph "b" of Point 3, makes clear what was clearly expressed in the original tripartite draft, namely that an international control agency must be set up to ensure the carrying out of the disarmament plan, Mr. Jessup said.

But now, if we turn to the revised Point 3(b), it says nothing about the establishment of a control agency. This is said indirectly only in the phrase dealing with the inspection which should be carried out in conformity with the decisions as this point states, of an international control agency that is to be established.

But I can say that you are playing with words. Here there is reference to an international control agency that *is to be established*. But by the same token it may be said that everything is to be established, having in view that it can be established. To say that an inspection will be carried out in conformity with the decisions of the control agency that *is to be established* by no means signifies the decision to establish such an agency. And if it does signify this, then why not bring in clarity, why not eliminate unclarity, ambiguity? Why in such a case not say precisely and definitely: *the control agency is being established*?

You, however, will not find a proposal to establish such an agency anywhere, either in Point 3, of which I have spoken here, or in any other place, or in this very new Point 4 of the

revised draft resolution. This Point 4, really a new point says that a commission is instructed to formulate plans for the establishment of an international control agency within the framework of the Security Council. This is what is said here: to formulate plans for the establishment of an international control agency within the framework of the Security Council. It is important to note, however, that this point also does not speak of the establishment of the international control agency itself. Consequently, here we have the same evasion of the question instead of a precise and definite statement on this score.

From all the aforesaid the following conclusion is self-evident: the Governments of the United States, Britain and France, rejecting the proposal for the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon or, to be more exact, the proposal that the General Assembly declare the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon, avoid a direct commitment to establish an international control agency, resorting in this question to camouflage with the help of tangled, nebulous phrases. The new Point 3 proposed by the delegation of the Soviet Union and Point 3(b) in the revised draft resolution of the “three” differ not only in wording, not only in formulations—between them there is a tremendous difference of substance. This difference also determines our disagreements.

If the authors of the draft resolution of the “three” really want the convention to include a reference to the establishment of an international control agency, there is nothing to prevent them from doing so. And this must be done. But they do not do this. This is being done by us, the delegation of the Soviet Union, and herein lies the advantage of our proposal.

On December 15 Mr. Jessup, it seems, spoke three times. In his third speech on December 15 Mr. Jessup displayed no little playfulness and exerted no little effort in an attempt to

cheer up the First Committee, telling it about the golden chariot drawn by sixty white doves, the magic wand and Cinderella. Apparently Mr. Jessup has mixed things up, imagining perhaps that he is already not in the Political Committee but among children dancing in a ring around a Christmas Tree (*Laughter*). Christmas really is approaching. But this would not be so dangerous for the First Committee. Mr. Jessup, however, did not succeed after his witticism in adopting a serious tone, even after he had turned to the analysis of serious questions discussed in the First Committee.

Really, can one take seriously Mr. Jessup's remark that since the third amendment of the Soviet delegation—on the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and the preparation of a convention envisaging measures that ensure the implementation of this convention—consists of two paragraphs, of which the first paragraph speaks of the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of control, while the second paragraph contains an instruction to the commission to prepare a draft of a corresponding convention, this means, so he said, some kind of remote connection between these two questions, even the hidden aim to evade the establishment of an international control after the prohibition of the atomic weapon is declared.

Mr. Jessup reproached the Soviet Union with not having shown flexibility for five years in objecting to the "Baruch plan". But what flexibility did the United States of America show in insisting for five years on this plan, declaring that it is the very best plan and that there is none better—even if it did make a reservation: if a better plan appears we will think about it. But they know in advance that no better plan will appear, because they consider it the best of all possible plans. Yet they insist, they continue persistently to adhere to the position of this "Baruch plan" in spite of all the fully substantiated and

serious criticism to which it has been justly subjected from various sides. I gave the facts. Even such an organ as the British newspaper the *Times* says the “Baruch plan” is a Utopian plan. Therefore it is senseless to defend this plan unless the aim is to have no plan at all.

Here is the stand of the United States, Britain and France. They say: But you, too, insist on having your way: “No ‘Baruch plan’, but accept our plan.” Then let us examine reasons why we do not want your plan. Because it turns a so-called international control agency into an American super-trust, subordinates to it, and turns over to it the entire economy of the country, whose entire fate will thus be determined arbitrarily by decisions of this international control agency which, even in the words of the advocates of this plan, cannot but be an agency which will implement the policy of the United States of America. This plan threatens the sovereign rights of nations and States. Therefore it cannot be agreed to by those who value the sovereignty of their country and their people. The “Baruch plan” is unacceptable precisely because it threatens the sovereign rights of nations and States. It is also unacceptable because it is fruitless, for it postpones the most important thing to the latest stages, again making it dependent on a number of conditions, which in their turn are entirely dependent on your discretion.

If mention is made of stages, of ownership which under the “Baruch plan” the control agency has of all atomic raw materials and all atomic undertakings, even those allied to the atomic industry, it will become clear that this plan cannot, of course, be accepted by those States which do not want to commit suicide.

Mr. Jessup said as before that the Soviet Union proposes prohibition of the atomic weapon on paper. But we have already pointed to the fallacy and groundlessness of this

objection. This was pointed out in his speech of December 15, by the Egyptian delegate, whose words on this score I do not think it superfluous to repeat before the members of the Committee today.

The Egyptian delegate said:

“It is impossible in practice to establish an organisation for control over the production of the atomic weapon and for the utilisation of all atomic energy for civilian purposes, which also means control, without this requiring much time.” “What must we do meanwhile?” the Egyptian delegate asked. “Could we not draw a line between the production of the atomic weapon, control over this weapon and atomic energy and the actual use of this weapon?” “We have”, he said, “a certain number of conventions such as the Red Cross convention, the convention banning the use of poison gas, and many others which pursue humane aims. They envisage no other control and no sanction other than the moral sanction.” “Perhaps you remember”, the Egyptian delegate said, “that at the beginning of the First World War the United Kingdom, France and Germany pledged themselves not to use poison gas.” “There was a convention prohibiting the utilisation of poison gas, and although this convention has not yet been ratified by all”, the Egyptian delegate said, and I will add on my own behalf that it has not yet been ratified for some mysterious reason by the United States of America, although over forty years have passed since then—I continue quoting the Egyptian delegate—“the pledge not to use poison gas was strictly observed by the three Powers and by the other countries despite the fact that Europe was faced by so-called total war for the first time.”

“Why cannot we find”, the Egyptian delegate said, “on the same basis some means of prohibiting the use of atomic weapons, at least of those already existing, inasmuch as full control over the production and utilisation of atomic energy for

civilian purposes will be a prolonged and tiring process.”

Thus spoke a representative of a small country, and it has already been recommended here that the voices of small countries be listened to and our delegation fully supports and has always supported these recommendations. Even more, their voices should be respected. Even more, these countries should be respected.

This is the best test of whether aspirations are peace-loving or aggressive. And this should be remembered by the gentlemen sitting on my right as well. Particularly by them, and not only in connection with Egypt, Mr. Lloyd.

I do not intend to delve into the question of how much time will be really required for establishing a system of international control and for setting in motion the entire machinery of the international control agency.

If indeed the establishment and setting in motion of the machinery of the international control over the prohibition of the atomic weapon will be—as assumed by the Egyptian delegate and as this specifically is also assumed by the representatives of the United States who spoke here about the long duration of this period—is really a prolonged process, all the more is it necessary to recognise that the prohibition of the atomic weapon must not be dependent upon the completion of this process of organisation of control, because if it is such a prolonged process, this will be only an additional argument in favour of the impermissibility of tying up the prohibition of the atomic weapon with control, with the organisation of control.

This is an additional argument in favour of our stand, in favour of the stand not only of the Soviet Union but of certain other delegations which have already expressed this view both in their speeches and in their draft resolutions.

If the organisation and setting into motion of the machinery of international control over the prohibition of the atomic

weapon is dragged out for many months and perhaps even for years, and the prohibition of the atomic weapon is linked with this control and putting it into operation, this would be utterly impermissible, because thus the very prohibition of the atomic weapon, of its production and its use, would be really postponed *ad calendas graecas*—for an indefinitely long period—and mankind would always be in danger of an atomic war being precipitated at any minute. We are not afraid of it, if we are to speak of the Soviet Union, as we have never been afraid of those who try to attack us or who attacked us. We have never feared them! But We are a country of peace and for this reason we want to prevent any danger of war hanging over mankind and holding out perhaps the greatest calamities.

As for the delegation of the Soviet Union, while defending its proposal that the General Assembly declare an unconditional ban on the atomic weapon, it upholds also the ‘necessity of taking all measures to reduce to a minimum the term for establishing international control. And we even established one and a half months ago this term—February 1, 1952—for preparing a corresponding convention. We are told that this is an unfeasible term.

Gentlemen, are you seriously concerned over the unfeasibility of this term? Let us discuss this term if you accept our proposal, at least in principle. Accept it, and then we will reach an agreement on the term. The question of the term will not be an obstacle. It would be ridiculous if we subordinated the decision of such an important question as the prohibition of the atomic weapon to the question of the term.

But when you say an “unfeasible term”, you think that you have discovered Achilles’ heel, by striking at which you can strike down Achilles himself. You are, however, greatly mistaken. You are realists and for this reason we say: Let us reach an agreement on the prohibition of the atomic weapon.

Here we have the General Assembly declaring: Prohibit the atomic weapon! But you say: "We do not vouch for ourselves, because there is no control over us and we do not know whether we shall pass this test."

And we vouch for ourselves, vouch that we shall pass the test even if there is no control. In order to verify this, the well-known British proverb should be followed: "The proof of the pudding is in the eating", otherwise you will never know how it tastes. But you do not vouch for yourselves. This, of course, may give rise to serious apprehensions on the part of those who intend to be your partners, because everyone always presumes that *everyone* vouches for himself if he undertakes some obligation. But you do not vouch. To a certain extent you may be right in your own way, because many resolutions have already been adopted which you do not fulfil. Many international agreements have been concluded with you which you do not fulfil. Is it worth while to enumerate all these resolutions which you adopted but have not fulfilled?

Incidentally Mr. Jessup has enumerated here those draft resolutions which were submitted by the Soviet Union and rejected, as well as the resolutions which were adopted against the will of the Soviet Union and against its vote and have not been fulfilled by the Soviet Union. But he forgot one category of resolutions, those for which the United States voted, as well as Britain and France, and which have not been fulfilled by them.

It will not be amiss to recall again, in this connection, that the Utopian "Baruch plan", as it is called, provides a convenient means for drowning in talks about international control the actual organisation of international control and enforcement of the prohibition of the atomic weapon.

Now, as follows from Mr. Jessup's recent statement, he does not seem to dare to deny the moral, political and even

legal force of the General Assembly decisions, of which we spoke last time.

But he nevertheless continues to object to our proposal that the General Assembly proclaim an unconditional ban on the atomic weapon and the establishment of international control, claiming that it will be impossible to adopt such a proposal before a control mechanism is set up and put into operation.

Being aware of the weakness of his position, Jessup stated that he could agree to the general idea of the moral, political and legal force of the General Assembly's decisions.

As I have already said, Mr. Jessup referred to certain earlier resolutions of the General Assembly which indeed have neither moral, political, nor legal force for the Soviet Union, although according to Jessup, they are important decisions on the question of peace and international security.

But we impugn precisely this last circumstance first of all. We voted against these decisions precisely because we impugned their usefulness for the cause of peace and international security. In other cases we did not and do not recognise the legality of these decisions—for instance the legality of the ignominious resolution on proclaiming the Chinese People's Republic an aggressor, on using the United Nations in the armed American and Syngman Rhee intervention in Korea, and a number of other resolutions. We openly objected to them. We openly voted against them and it would be absurd to demand that we fulfil these decisions. Indeed, we are here to settle international affairs and not internal State affairs. But in international affairs a State cannot be compelled to do something it objects to. But then the General Assembly is composed of sovereign States, although some of them do not follow their own path and even cannot always express their opinion, and although they are under very strong pressure, exerted on them in interests contradicting the

principles and provisions of the Charter. . . . Mr. Jessup confuses facts here. Had we voted for some resolution and then violated it, then it would be right to rebuke us accordingly.

But the actual state of affairs is just the opposite. I shall speak about the third category of the General Assembly's resolutions which Mr. Jessup passed over in silence, for which the United States voted and which the United States does not fulfil. Take, for instance, the resolution of January 24, 1946, on the study of problems that had arisen in connection with the discovery of atomic energy. Has it been fulfilled by the United States? It has not! Here is another resolution dated December 14, 1946, and establishing the general regulation and reduction of armaments and armed forces. Has it been fulfilled by the United States? It has not! Here you have the resolution of November 3, 1947, on measures which must be taken against the instigators of another war. This resolution has not been fulfilled by the United States either. As regards the U.S.S.R., in our Press, in statements—I do not mean only official but even quite ordinary statements—nowhere will you find calls for another war! And what about you?

I have already spoken about the frenzied, mad propaganda with which your notorious magazine *Collier's* has besmirched itself. Just listen to your radio. Look at your Press, at all your speakers—*the most responsible ones*, standing at the top of the State ladder—and you will see and hear endless calls for war. We shall after this discuss the question concerning the allocation of the \$100 million—can there be anything more disgraceful than that, than your Act dated October 10, 1951?

A decision on the impermissibility of war propaganda has been adopted, but this propaganda is conducted in the United States on the broadest scale; it spreads, forming such a sea, such an ocean, in comparison with which the Atlantic Ocean is a mere puddle! A decision on the extradition and punishment

of war criminals, a decision on mutual relations between the United Nations members and Spain, a decision on false and libellous information—none of these decisions is being fulfilled by the United States. And what about the international agreements, the Yalta Agreement, the Potsdam Agreement? And you will assert that it is not you who have split Germany into two parts, that it is not you who have set up the Bonn puppet government, that it is not you who are dragging Western Germany into the Atlantic bloc to use it as a springboard for attack. An attack against whom? This is said openly—against the Soviet Union, against the people's democracies. Does it accord with international agreements? Is this what is called respect for international agreements? Is this what is called respect for the United Nations Charter? Does this correspond to the decisions which I have briefly enumerated here, and does this show respect for the decisions of the General Assembly? It has become customary for you to violate both the decisions of the General Assembly and international agreements which you at one time called gentlemen's agreements! Here is the ignominious affair with the thrusting of Greece into the Security Council. We have had, it seems to me, seventeen rounds of voting because the United States seeks the election of Greece at any cost, despite the absence of any legal grounds for this. You will probably achieve your aim, because the influence of the dollar is unfortunately still great; as great in general is the economic dependence of certain countries on the United States—a dependence—which still makes itself felt!

And yet in face of such, and similar, facts the representatives of the Atlantic bloc make bold to lecture us concerning respect for the decisions of the General Assembly!

In 1946 we concluded a gentlemen's agreement. We are accurately implementing it. But it is precisely the United States

that is violating this agreement for all to see. And after that they dare to say that they are not sure that the Soviet Union will fulfil the decisions it signed. Let these gentlemen name at least one decision which bears our signature and which we have violated at any time. Let them show it to us. They will not be able to do this, while we can present to the United States dozens of such facts.



SOME delegations have submitted amendments to the draft resolution of the “three”, mostly unessential amendments. But there is one amendment which the U.S.S.R. delegation regards as an important amendment worthy of serious attention: the amendment of the Egyptian delegation of which I have already spoken.

There is another amendment, in the form of a draft resolution submitted by the Polish delegation and proposing that a decision be taken on setting up, under the Security Council, a commission on atomic energy and conventional armaments after the dissolution of the Atomic Energy Commission. It also recommends the Security Council to dissolve the commission for conventional armaments. The Polish draft resolution suggests that the draft resolution of the “three”, as well as the amendments to that draft submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union, be referred to the atomic energy and conventional armaments commission.

The delegation of the Soviet Union thinks that this proposal is important and to the point. The experience of the Sub-Committee’s work has shown that a careful and patient examination of a question, particularly one of such exceptional importance as that which is now before our Committee, yields positive results.

It is indeed impossible to deny that for the first time during this period we have succeeded in reaching agreement, albeit on secondary questions, and that, which is more important, despite sharp differences of principle separating us and you—the United States, Britain and France—both sides displayed due tact, patience and thoughtfulness in considering various questions which, of course, cannot be disregarded when questions of primary political importance are being settled.

This is why the delegation of the Soviet Union maintains that the experience of the Sub-Committee's work has shown that the thorough and patient study of questions, particularly of such exceptional importance, as I said, gives positive results.

The Chairman of the Sub-Committee, Mr. Nervo, points out that despite the existing differences—unfortunately big and serious differences—in the proposals of the Soviet Union and of the three Powers on a number of questions of primary importance, a certain degree of agreement has been reached in the Sub-Committee on a number of aspects of both the programmes, and points out that the discussion of these questions in the Sub-Committee helped to broaden out the range of agreement on certain questions, even if they are of a secondary nature.

This gives every reason for supporting the proposal of the delegation of the Polish Republic which, as we understand it, proceeds from the possibility of further fruitful efforts in the search for a generally agreed solution of the question of the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon, the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the establishment of an international control agency to enforce the observance of the decisions adopted on this score.

The U.S.S.R. delegation has always been striving for agreed decisions. It is striving for this now, too, being confident that such agreed decisions can be reached in the

committee of “twelve”, provided there is good will, mutual respect and genuine striving for the consolidation of international co-operation, peace and the security of nations.

Therefore we fully support the proposal submitted by the delegation of the Polish Republic.

Speech by A. Y. VYSHINSKY December 19, 1951

SEVERAL days ago the General Assembly, on the proposal of the delegation of the Soviet Union, adopted the decision to include in the agenda as an important and urgent item the question submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union concerning the aggressive actions and intervention of the United States of America in the internal affairs of other countries expressed in the appropriation of \$100 million for financing the recruiting of persons and organising armed groups in the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania and in certain other democratic countries and outside the territories of these countries.

The General Assembly has instructed the Political Committee to examine this question, which is really important and urgent. What is in question is the Act of 1951 on so-called mutual security, signed by the President of the United States of America, Mr. Truman, on October 10 this year, a law which envisages special appropriation of \$100 million for financing, as the law states, any selected persons who are residing in or escapees from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania—I have already mentioned these countries—either to form such persons—these are the exact words of the Act of October 10—into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation or for other purposes. This law, as can be seen from its very text, provides for the establishment of armed detachments from among traitors to the homeland and war criminals who fled from their countries and are hiding on the territories of the United States of America and a number of

other States; it provides for financing the said armed detachments and individuals for the commission of various criminal acts.

The aforesaid is sufficient, it seems, to make it clear that this law constitutes crude intervention by the United States of America in the internal affairs of other countries, that it represents an unparalleled violation of the standards of international law and is incompatible with normal relations between countries and with respect for State sovereignty. This law cannot be regarded as other than an aggressive act designed further to complicate relations between the United States and the Soviet Union and to aggravate the international situation.

It was exactly in this way—and with full justice—that the adoption of this law was appraised by the Soviet Government, which on November 21 sent a Note on this subject to the United States Government. In this Note the Soviet Government also drew the attention of the Government of the United States to the fact that the adoption by the United States of such a law constitutes crass violation by the American Government of commitments it has assumed with regard to the Soviet Union on the strength of the exchange of letters on November 16, 1933, between the People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, M. M. Litvinov, and the President of the United States of America, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

This agreement imposes mutual commitments on both Governments—on the Government of the United States of America on the one hand and on the Soviet Government on the other hand—commitments with which the promulgation of the American law of October 10 this year is utterly incompatible. Under this agreement the Government of the Soviet Union and the Government of the United States mutually undertook, as is said in Point 3 of the letters exchanged, not to form, subsidise,

support or permit on their territories military organisations or groups which have as their aim an armed struggle against the other side.

On the strength of this same point they mutually undertook—i.e. on the one hand the Government of the United States, and on the other hand the Government of the Soviet Union—to prevent any recruiting on behalf of such organisations and groups.

Under Point 4 of this agreement the Government of the United States undertook with regard to the Soviet Union and, mutually, the Soviet Union undertook with regard to the United States, to prevent the formation or presence on their territories of any organisations or groups, and to take on their territories preventive measures against the activity of any kind of organisations or groups . . . which have as their aim the overthrow, or preparation of the overthrow, or change by force of the political and social system.

The law of October 10 on the appropriation of \$100 million dollars for subversive activity and sabotage against the Soviet Union is proof that the United States Government crassly violates the commitments it assumed on the strength of the agreement of 1933 and continues the policy of further worsening relations with the Soviet Union and further aggravating the international situation.

Only this morning the First Committee completed examining the question of the reduction of armaments and armed forces raised on the initiative of the Governments of the United States, Great Britain and France. We remember that throughout the entire examination of this question by the First Committee—and this took more than a month—the representatives of the United States, beginning with the Secretary of State and ending with the members of the American delegation here present, tirelessly asserted that the

Government of the United States strives to lessen the tension in international relations, strives to improve the international atmosphere. They sought in every way possible to assure us that the United States is not in the least interested in aggravating the international situation and that, on the contrary, it strives to eliminate everything that can contribute to such aggravation.

The law of October 10 promulgated in the United States resolutely refutes assurances of this kind. It exposes their false and hypocritical nature. The law of October 10 pursues obvious aims of financing the subversive activity of individuals and armed groups, directed against the Soviet Union and other countries mentioned in this law. It is aimed at setting up saboteur groups, forming military detachments in the aforementioned countries, committing acts of sabotage and terror and—this is especially desired by the organisers of this so-called “mutual security”—at making uprisings with the object of overthrowing or changing by armed force, in the U.S.S.R. and the people’s democracies, the political and social system established in these countries. It is seen from the aforesaid what the Act of October 10, 1951, represents, and what the behaviour of the Government of the United States towards the Soviet Union and the people’s democracies, and its foreign policy, represent.

The Note of the Soviet Government of November 21 pointed out that:

1. This law constitutes an unparalleled violation of the standards of international law and is incompatible with normal relations between countries, is incompatible with respect for State sovereignty;

2. The adoption of this law cannot be regarded as other than an aggressive act;

3. The adoption of this law represents crude intervention

by the United States of America in the internal affairs of the U.S.S.R. and the other aforementioned countries, and, lastly,

4. The signing of this law by the President of the United States constitutes crass violation by the American Government of the commitments it assumed on the strength of the exchange of letters of November 16, 1933, of which I have already spoken.

That is why the Soviet Government has deemed it necessary to ask the General Assembly to intervene in this matter. The Soviet Government insists that the law on so-called "mutual security", adopted in the United States on October 10 this year, which envisages the appropriation of funds for subversive activity against a number of States, be condemned as an aggressive act, as intervention in the internal affairs of other States which is incompatible with the principles of the United Nations Charter and generally accepted standards of international law. The Soviet delegation also insists that the General Assembly recommend the United States Government to take the necessary measures for repealing this law.

In conformity with this, the U.S.S.R. delegation submits its draft resolution of the First Committee and asks that it be examined carefully and thoroughly here.

The U.S.S.R. delegation has submitted the following draft resolution:

"The General Assembly condemns the 'Mutual Security Act of 1951' adopted in the United States of America, authorising the appropriation of money for the purpose of conducting subversive activities against a number of States, as an aggressive act and interference in the internal affairs of other States which is incompatible with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the generally accepted standards of international law.

"The General Assembly recommends to the Government of

the United States of America that it take the necessary measures to repeal this Act.”

**On Aggressive Actions and Interference in
the Internal Affairs of other Countries by
the United States of America. Speech by A.
Y. VYSHINSKY. December 19, 1951**

THE diffuse speech made here by Mr. Mansfield, one of those who helped to prepare that same, famous—and I shall already say bluntly after what I have heard here—shameful law of October 10, has probably convinced many of the entire validity of the charges which we have made here against the American Government. Everything that Mr. Mansfield said here, despite the numerous distortions, flagrant misrepresentation of facts, insinuations, slanderous attacks against the Soviet Union, against the Soviet Government, has fully confirmed two facts: the indisputable fact that the Government of the United States of America is extremely alarmed by the growing danger to its domination—this is the first fact; and that it has decided to intensify its interference in the internal affairs of other States—this is the second fact.

Even what is taking place at our present session shows that the United States of America, that the Government of the United States of America, that the American monopolies are losing their grip on levers for bringing pressure to bear on a number of countries which are becoming increasingly aware of the whole unbearable weight of American oppression and which are beginning, in one form or another, whichever they can choose according to their strength, to protest and struggle against this oppression.

All that has taken place even at this session testifies to the profound justice of the remark I have already cited here of one

capitalist newspaper to the effect that the prestige of the United States of America in the eyes of the whole world is falling disastrously.

What was said here, and not only that, but even more the way many countries of the Middle and Near East, Asia and Eastern Europe voted, abstaining on the American resolution, has shown that they do not trust your words and honeyed speeches about peace and peaceful co-operation. This should have been a lesson to the gentlemen of the Atlantic bloc, a lesson which they ought to have taken into consideration and which should have determined their conduct in the Political Committee.

They obviously did not understand the meaning of this lesson, however, but they will most likely soon understand it. The events which are developing in the world, not according to their plan, but by virtue of immanent laws governing the development of social relations, will teach them to evaluate better and more attentively what is going on around them and will take down a peg those who consider themselves a nation exercising domination over the whole world.

What did the representative of the United States of America try to prove to us here? He repeated an endless number of all kinds of worthless fabrications and preposterous nonsense about an iron curtain, absence of rights, oppression allegedly prevailing in the Eastern countries, and opposed to this the heaven on earth which allegedly prevails in the United States of America. But, mind you, it must not be forgotten that in the United States Negroes are lynched, are shot on the orders of ordinary police officials even after they have been acquitted by an American court itself; one must not forget that in the United States a Negro is not permitted to enter premises specially intended for whites. And this is called human rights here, and used as a screen, as a defence against the charges

now being made against the United States of America.

Mr. Mansfield hashed up everything trying to prove what cannot be proved. He declared here, for example, that we proclaim every thought of freedom a crime against the State. But this is downright nonsense. It is even strange to hear this from one of the members of the United States House of Representatives of whom I had had a higher opinion until now.

To hear these gentlemen, it may seem that we consider “thought of freedom” a crime against the State! But the idea of freedom and freedom itself is what the Russian people and other peoples inhabiting Russia fought for in pre-revolutionary times, and they achieved victory, establishing real freedom crowned with the glory of the October Socialist Revolution! While the “freedom” which the American congressman extolled here and which prevails in the United States of America, is freedom of the dollar, freedom to die of starvation, freedom of unemployment, freedom to be terrorised by all kinds of gangs of Al Capones, Pendergasts and suchlike “bosses” who regulate and determine even the outcome of Presidential elections in the United States of America. Such “freedom” we do not recognise and will never recognise!

We are told about “freedom” and “democratic rights” by those in whose country bandits such as Al Capone and Pendergast rule. This no one dares deny. You might at least have been ashamed to claim to be a model of genuine freedom and genuine democracy! Mansfield talked a lot of nonsense of all kinds about the U.S.S.R. American airmen who, “accidentally” you see, lose their way, disappear or are arrested! But this is an idle invention, for in reality they are airmen who also combine the duties of scouts and spies that are arrested. True, scouts and spies are not honoured in our country; neither are American spies, for whom our laws make no exception. Such airmen, gentlemen, are subject to arrest,

trial, sentence, and even to capital punishment in accordance with our laws. Perhaps Mansfield has in mind the recent case of the American so-called transport plane which was forced to land by our airmen. Permit me to dwell on this in more detail than the American delegation may desire. Indeed, recently an American military transport plane, having violated the Rumanian boundary in the Resita area, flew over the territory of Rumania and, violating the Hungarian boundary in the area of Gyula, attempted to continue its flight over Hungarian territory. Carry-out its reconnaissance espionage assignments, it entered the zone of location of Soviet aircraft stationed there in accordance with Article 22 of the Peace Treaty with Hungary-and was indeed compelled to Land by the Soviet airmen and Soviet fighter planes on duty. The airmen were taken out of the plane and arrested.

The members of the plane's crew were interrogated: the commander of the plane Captain Henderson, second pilot Captain Swift, aircraft-mechanic Senior Sergeant Duff, radio operator Sergeant James Albert Elam. It turned out that this army transport plane belongs to the 85th Wing of the 12th American Air Force. The question arises, why should a plane belonging to the American Air Force, to its 12th Air Force and 85th Wing, which is part of this Air Force, fly over Rumanian and Hungarian territory? Why? It is appropriate to ask:

“Is it not possible to find other nooks and shades
For your, promenades?”

If you think that it is impossible, then we ourselves will take measures to discourage American scouts from flying over foreign territory. This is not Britain and not France, over whose territories it is permissible to fly, and not only to fly but to settle in them as in one's own home, with one's own military

and military atomic bases of which Mr. Churchill spoke, referring to American bases in Britain, and to lord it there as they do.

The American military transport plane was inspected and it was established that it was in perfect condition. Consequently, this was not a case of accidental landing or accidental departure from the normal route; the communications, navigation equipment and mechanisms for difficult, bad weather and night flying were in perfect order. Investigation of the flight route and the presence of an expert crew on the plane testify to the fact that this transport plane flew in prohibited areas intentionally, for definite reconnoitring purposes. The plane was inspected and on it were found operational military maps of the most important areas of the Soviet Union, including the Ukrainian Republic—for your information, colleague Baranovsky. . . .

(The representative of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic: I am informed of this.)

. . . maps of the Volga region, maps of Czechoslovakia, maps of Rumania and Hungary. The question arises, why did the plane require maps of areas of these States just mentioned? Let Mr. Mansfield explain this. A portable radio station in soft packing was found on the plane, adjusted for parachute landing and intended, not for action aboard the plane, but for use in field conditions. The American authorities try to explain this by saying that the portable radio station was required on the plane in the event of an accident. in the event of the pilot having to' make a parachute landing.

But this explanation, of course, is absolutely artificial, because first of all one should not fly where it is not permitted to fly. Then perhaps parachute landing would not be necessary in the area where the plane flew, although it had no business to fly there at all. As a result we have here quite strange logic: to

fly in this direction in a legal manner is impossible, but he does fly and takes along a portable radio installation just in case it is necessary to make a parachute landing. Had this matter been legal, then this plane should not have flown along this unforeseen, unlawful route at all, and then there would have been no grounds for arresting the pilots, who, Mansfield said, were simply lost. . .!

Six parachutes were found on the plane, although there were four members of the crew; moreover the number of parachutes, the place where they were kept in the plane, indicate that these parachutes were not at all intended for use by the members of the crew but for some other purpose. Finally, several bundles with twenty warm blankets were found ready to be dropped from the plane. What is this? Is all this accidental?

Mr. Mansfield, I make bold to assure you that this crew was arrested, that they were given due attention by our military border authorities and—I hope—will be given due attention by the appropriate judicial bodies, because these men were flying for reconnoitring purposes, were carrying out the assignment of your Atlantic bloc, implementing its plans. That is why, when the United States representative exclaims with pathos, referring to our side: “Look what is happening to our airmen”, or, as he said, “to airmen of our country in the U.S.S.R.”, then I must say that his pathos is affected, that it does not correspond to circumstances. A most simple and clear explanation can be given in this case, as will be given in all other cases where American pilots take air promenades over Soviet territory and take all kinds of photographs of our frontiers, photographs of various objectives that interest them, and generally carry through reconnoitring, which is evidently part of the plans of the entire system of so-called “defence” of the Atlantic bloc—which is not “defence”, but preparation of another world war.

Mansfield said that in the U.S.S.R. correspondents of a free country are regarded as spies. This is untrue. Honest correspondents have never been regarded in our country as spies and have always enjoyed all the privileges of the free Press which exists in the Soviet Union. But correspondents who play the same part as the pilots from the American army plane, who in their turn play the part of such “correspondents”—then they, of course, are subjected, and will be subjected, to prosecution on our part because we in our country have not tolerated, do not tolerate, and will not tolerate spies and scouts. As to how the matter actually stands in this field, I would advise Mansfield and his colleagues to utilise at least the Christmas adjournment to find an hour or so to read the book of Annabelle Bucar, former responsible staff member of the American Embassy in the Soviet Union, in Moscow, director of its information bureau. Annabelle Bucar wrote a book entitled *The Truth About American Diplomats*. From this book they would learn something instructive and perhaps, given elementary honesty, they would refrain from the blatant and slanderous statements which Mansfield made in his speech.

Perhaps Annabelle Bucar will arouse not very pleasant recollections in some, and bring them some sad thoughts that prevent them from reasoning calmly. I recommend another book too, for instance, the book of Ralph Parker, outstanding British correspondent. Most likely Mr. Lloyd has heard this name, and if not I regret it very much. I can send him this book. He can also acquaint himself with it. This will always be useful. In his book, which he entitled *Conspiracy Against Peace*, Ralph Parker describes the “artistry” of these spies gathered in Moscow in his day, in the British Embassy. In this book Parker describes the deeds of the British spies dressed in diplomatic tail-coats and covering up their activities with

diplomatic passports.

These are the numerous facts that I would not even cite here, that I would not even mention, but which I am compelled to mention now because these people have come, not from our midst, but from your midst; worked not in our institutions, but were your trusted representatives in those spheres of diplomatic activity where you sent them; and subsequently refused to return to your countries and put out documentary books exposing all the unseemliness, all the criminal actions of the American—and incidentally British—diplomats in the people's democracies and the Soviet Union.

It is these books that you ought to have in view—and just try to deny even a single fact mentioned in these books!

Mansfield has said here—not said, but literally shouted—that hundreds of thousands have refused to return to our country.

So, our repatriates have refused to return home. A strange affair! It is a flagrant lie! Indeed, has the American Government, have the British authorities, has the French Government that has gained notoriety through the scandalous affair in the displaced persons camp called “Beauregard” (this camp is situated in France)—have they admitted our authorised repatriation officers to these camps in order to establish contact with our citizens and help them to get out of the captivity in which they found themselves after the war? Indeed, they found themselves not in captivity under the Germans against whom they fought, but in captivity under the French, British and Americans, in their camps for so-called displaced persons in Western Europe. Have you not constantly hindered their return to the homeland, trying in every way to impede the establishment and maintenance of connections between them and our officers especially appointed for repatriation affairs, so as to keep precisely these people under your influence, under

your control? These hundreds and thousands of people you have tried to retain in captivity in order subsequently to utilise them as hirelings, *as war hirelings*, as you are now using them, covering up this action by your law—first by the August law, and then by the Act of October 10, 1951.

Despite all our efforts to achieve free intercourse with our compatriots, regardless of all our efforts to secure for them the opportunity to return home, we are hindered, we are prevented in every way from doing this; thousands upon thousands of obstacles are being put in our way. And now you permit yourself to allege that here are thousands of our people who do not want to return to Russia!

But you hamper their return to the U.S.S.R. Remove your fences, take away your barriers, raise this iron—really iron—curtain which conceals our compatriots from their homeland, our citizens languishing in your camps for so-called displaced persons in Western Germany and in certain other countries, and you will see then that as a result of free intercourse with representatives of the Soviet Union these thousands of people, our sisters and brothers, will run *en masse* to their beloved homeland!

You retain in captivity our children. In American courts you are examining the question of whether these children—our Soviet children—can be returned to their parents, who ask that their young children be returned to them, be restored to their homes, to their own families.

You are organising American trials at which you deny our right to demand the handing over of these children to their parents, who are insisting upon the return of their children. These are the facts. And after all this you dare to utter here demagogic, slanderous, insulting phrases against our State, with which you nevertheless still maintain normal so-called diplomatic relations.

We already know these attempts “to liberate” our people. These attempts were first made on the very next day after the victory of the Great October Revolution. Then, too, you saw your task in “liberating” the Russian workers and peasants from Soviet Power, and for this purpose you launched your armed intervention in Soviet Russia and your dollars flowed like rivers of gold into the pockets of Whiteguard generals in order to help . . . whom? Bulak-Bulakhovich, Yudenich, Denikin, Kolchak, Krasnov, Chaikovsky, Mensheviks, White Socialist-Revolutionaries, saboteurs, terrorists!

You had tried this already thirty years ago. This had cost you a pretty penny, Messrs. Americans. Then, too, you sought shelter behind blatant phrases to the effect that you were going to “rescue” the Russian people, “liberate” Russia.

But the October Revolution was the great historic act of liberation of the Russian people and numerous other peoples living in the U.S.S.R. from the power of the landlords and capitalists who sold and betrayed Russia to foreign monopolists—American bankers and American monopolists included.

What has Mr. Mansfield told us here? He has said nothing on the substance of the question, assiduously evading the facts which expose the United States interference in the affairs of the U.S.S.R. and other countries. But he has said much too much about everything else and tried to prove everything that has no relation to the matter under discussion. He has evidently forgotten, if he knew at all, of course, the wise French saying: “He who proves too much, proves nothing”.

As a matter of fact he engaged in extolling traitors and war criminals, saying nothing about the substance of the matter. He engaged in slandering the Soviet Union. He propagated the idea here that without American aid the Soviet Union would perish in poverty and ignorance, in slavery and in disorder. But look at the Soviet Union as it is today, and at what it was

twenty years ago, ten years ago, five years ago, two years ago. With every year the Soviet Union gains strength, develops economically, and its science, engineering, art and culture flourish. The Soviet Union has already freed itself from all economic dependence on foreign States. It has raised to a standard unprecedented in the history of the Russian State the welfare of the Russian people and the numerous other peoples inhabiting the great Soviet Union, who have fraternally united and created the great Socialist State.

It does not spend tens of thousands of millions of its money on guns which should—in the phrase of the well-known Wilson—take the place of butter; instead of butter the American people will at best have margarine. And in our country, in the U.S.S.R., there is more than enough butter, and if you in the United States were wiser, you could, by trading with us, derive more benefit from this than from your “margarine” speeches, Mr. Mansfield, which we heard here today.

But let us assume that you could not act otherwise because you have your orders and you are obeying them. In that case, what have you proved here? You have proved only that you cannot stand what is being done in the Soviet Union and in the people’s democracies. And it is precisely because you cannot stand what is being done in the Soviet Union and in the people’s democracies, that you cannot calmly bear the flourishing of a new life in these countries—it is because of this that you consider it necessary to interfere actively in our internal affairs. Your entire speech testifies to this. “We”, you say, “can no longer tolerate this, and therefore we are organising forces to change this order”. That is the meaning of your speech.

What then is the substance of the charges against you, Mr. American Congressman?

You are charged with interfering in our internal affairs. You say: "We do not like what is being done in your country, we cannot tolerate what is being done in your country, and therefore we interfere in your affairs". But we are not asking why you interfere—we know why—but we say to you that you are interfering in our internal affairs. And do not dare to interfere in these affairs. By your long speech you merely proved that you are indeed interfering, that you want to interfere in the affairs of other States. But we must warn you that we shall not allow you to interfere in our affairs, no matter how much you may want to do so. Yet I repeat—you want to interfere, you are trying to interfere in our internal affairs. And this you have proved completely here!

Of course, you needed to drag in all kinds of fables here—first you had to drag in the Comintern, and when the Comintern was dissolved then the Cominform. Now you have dragged in the Soviet Government evidently not understanding at all that the late A. A. Zhdanov was never a member of the Soviet Government, that A. A. Zhdanov was Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party. You are making a gross error in confusing governments with parties. A party is a party; a government is a government.

When you act in the capacity of a government, when you enact laws which are incompatible with the elementary standards of international law, incompatible with normal relations with other States, then the question arises of responsibility for the deeds of the government acting in such a manner.

We of course can by no means condemn the activities of the Comintern or Communist Parties in other countries—we are communists ourselves. But that is one matter, and the activities of a government are another matter; it is another matter to enact laws which are directed against other

governments, laws whose object is interference in the internal affairs of other States, laws which are nothing else but aggression. But has Mr. Mansfield uttered a single word to the effect that the law of October 10 is not directed against the Soviet system, the Soviet State, the Soviet Government? No, instead of this he merely alleged that fifteen years ago the U.S.S.R. itself violated in some way the Agreement of 1933 and that then the American Government protested against this. Again Mansfield evaded the main question. In this case he acted according to the method of a person who in reply to a charge against him, says: You did the same thing yourself, you are like that yourself! . . . This is the substance of the United States delegate's reply!

We say to you: "You are violating the Agreement of 1933, which you have signed." And we are told in reply : "You yourselves violated it fifteen years ago." But the issue at present is—have you violated the agreement now, or have you not? Answer this question!

Let us assume that at one time we violated it. For this we were called to order. Let us assume that this was so—I do not admit it, I deny it, and I shall prove to you that we have never violated any of our agreements—but let us assume for one moment that we have. But that was in the past. And now I ask you, I put the question to you: "Have you violated the Agreement of 1933?"

You have violated the Agreement of 1933. What proofs have we got? Here they are!

The Agreement of 1933 states with crystal clarity what I have already quoted here and what I can quote once more. Here for instance, is paragraph three of the 1933 Agreement:

. . . Neither Government shall "form, subsidise, support, nor permit on its territory military organisations or groups having the aim of armed struggle against" the other.

Have you signed such an agreement with us? Yes, you have! Are you observing it now, or are you not? This is the question we ask you. Furthermore, we do not merely ask this question, but we say outright: You have violated this Agreement because you are forming sabotage groups, whereas the Agreement says: “not to form”; you are subsidising these groups—\$100 million have been appropriated, no small sum this—while in the Agreement is written: “not to subsidise”; you are supporting these groups, whereas in the Agreement it is written: “not to support”; you are permitting these groups on your territory, whereas in the Agreement it is written: “not to permit.” I ask: Is the one compatible with the other or not? We think that this is incompatible, we think that if such are the facts, then consequently you have at the present time violated the 1933 Agreement, and no subterfuges, no sophistry, will absolve you from responsibility for this.

This can never free you and will not free you from responsibility for the given questions and this is the point at present. Either you must answer for this, or you must change your policy, or you must repeal your Act, which constitutes a violation of this Agreement, or you must say: “We consider the agreement abrogated.”

But you have not the courage and the necessary sincerity to correct your mistake. You persist in it. Mansfield has crammed his speech with all sorts of wild fabrications and nonsense. He refrained only from accompanying his fables by alleged Russian proverbs especially invented for his purposes. Incidentally, as regards the proverb presented by Mr. Lloyd as a Russian proverb; “The more a cow moos, the less milk she gives.”

There is simply no such proverb. A bad joke has been played on you, Mr. Lloyd, and one can only wonder that you so hastily fell for this “proverb”, when it should be clear to you

that between a cow's mooing and the amount of milk she yields there is no physiological connection. It is true, I am not a veterinary, but anyone who, in the least degree, knows anything about the biology of animals will easily understand that there can be no such proverb, because it is ridiculous to make the amount of milk a cow yields dependent upon her mooing.

This is equivalent to saying, for instance, that the more a person speaks the less he is able to reproduce posterity. But I think there is no connection, nor can there be any. I regret the absence among us of Mr. Arce, the well-known diplomat, physician, obstetrician; and in addition, Mr. Arce hails from Argentina—he would surely have fully supported me in this question.

But now it seems to me it is appropriate to recall a real Russian proverb about the cow, but then it will apply to Mr. Mansfield's speech. As regards his speech one can repeat the proverb: "It neither moos nor calves."

Let us return to the substance of the matter. The question is what is taking place at present in the United States and in its legislative bodies? We can assure you that it would be absolutely immaterial to us what was taking place there, if it did not affect us; but it does affect us, for an Act has been promulgated in the United States which says: \$100 million are being appropriated for such and such purposes. . . . For what purposes? Precisely for those prohibited by the Agreement concluded in 1933 between the United States and the U.S.S.R. Can you deny this? Mr. Mansfield cannot deny this. No matter what he might invent, he cannot deny this and will not deny it.

Let us turn to this Agreement. It says that the Soviet Union and the United States undertake not to permit the recruiting of persons on their territories for such organisations and groups. The United States pledged itself not to permit the recruiting of

such persons on its territory. But Mr. Mansfield admitted that such recruiting is being conducted in the United States. He said that the purpose of the law of October 10 is to assist “escapees”, who are being persecuted for political reasons, to take part in the defence of the North Atlantic community. He explained that Kersten’s amendment refers to “selected persons” residing in the countries of Eastern Europe or “escapees” from these countries. But this signifies the admission of such a purpose as the recruiting of so-called “escapees” with the object of forming “military formations” of them so that they might “aid” the Atlantic bloc, which Mansfield depicts as defensive. We shall not argue now as to whether this bloc of yours is aggressive or not aggressive. Let us assume that it is as you say: “For one’s own defence.” But for “defence” from whom did you form this bloc? From the U.S.S.R. and the people’s democracies. Meaning, against whom. Against the U.S.S.R. and the people’s democracies. But the United States Government pledged itself under the Agreement of 1933 not to form such groups in its country! It undertook under this Agreement not to permit them, to prevent the formation of such groups on the territory of the United States. And here the United States violated this agreement. Mr. Mansfield could not refute this fact but he tried to defend himself by referring to some aims of “defence” in the name of which the United States Government permitted the aforementioned violations. But whatever the motives—the fact remains a fact: the Agreement of 1933 has been violated by the United States Government, and, moreover, it has been flagrantly violated. And everything that Mr. Mansfield has said here entirely and completely confirms the charge we have made against the Government of the United States. And we made the charge that in the United States a law has been enacted by virtue of which the formation of military groups

from citizens of our country, and in analogous cases from Hungarians, Rumanians, Poles, Czechs and also from “escapees”, is permitted on the territory of the United States—and furthermore, even on our own territory—through spies, parachutists dropped on our territory in places chosen as convenient in their opinion, in the hope that there it will be possible to hide from our watchful eye—in order that these groups or entire military organisations may be used for the fight against the Soviet Union and people’s democracies.

Will Mr. Mansfield deny these facts? I shall touch upon these facts in more detail later. They show beyond any doubt that the Government of the United States subsidises these groups, arms them and prepares them for subversive activities in the U.S.S.R. and in the other aforementioned countries. The most important fact proving this is the law authorising the appropriation of \$100 million to finance the establishment of such groups. The Government of the United States not only supports these groups but takes the initiative in organising them. The Government of the United States permits the presence of its territory of these groups and military organisations, whose object is participation in armed struggle against the Soviet Union.

What proof have we of this? I shall now pass on to this question. But before I do so, I would like to dwell more on the statements of Mr. Mansfield himself and his colleague Vorys—the two Congressmen who figure here—on the public statements they made with regard to the law of October 10 at a Press conference which they called specially on this matter. They said—Messrs. Mansfield and Vorys—that in this law there were no aggressive acts, no threats directed against the Soviet Union or any people’s democracy, and that in general there was nothing in this law to justify the charge against the United States of interfering in the internal affairs of other

States.

But at this Press conference Mr. Mansfield or Vorys—it is difficult to say who said what, because what each said separately is not given, it is given generally—Mansfield and Vorys said that, indeed, this law envisages provision of the opportunity to persons who have fled from the aforementioned countries (they should simply be called scoundrels) to join their efforts with the forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. This is precisely the formation of those same military organisations for which \$100 million were appropriated under the law of October 10.

It is important to point out that both these Congressmen, Mansfield and Vorys, took part in preparing this law and, what is more, voted for this law. Thus they are directly to blame for the appearance of this law, and they, as a matter of fact, admitted at their Press conference that the object of the law of October 10 is the organisation of armed detachments formed of refugees from these countries (I add—of traitors to their country) for inclusion in a foreign army intended for attack and not for defence. They want to cover up the aggressive nature of the armed forces of the Atlantic bloc by calling them the “defensive” army of the Atlantic Pact. But this is camouflage, deception. Thus it is a fact that Messrs. Mansfield and Vorys have admitted that the object of this law is to enlist these people to assist the armed forces of the Atlantic bloc in the struggle for which they are preparing in accordance with the aims of this bloc.

Of course, the position of these Congressmen, at the Press conference obliged them to keep quiet about the real plans and aims of the Act authorising the appropriation of \$100 million. Others, however, spoke very loudly, and in particular John Foster Dulles, whom we all know, also spoke loudly. Mr. Dulles spoke very firmly and definitely on this matter in

Detroit on November 27 at the Advertising Council dinner. In his speech—I am citing from the *New York Herald Tribune* which gave the text of Dulles' speech—Dulles called for the creation of a “striking force of great power”, as he put it, “stationed at convenient places around the perimeter of the Soviet Union, rather than defence forces for each nation threatened by Russia”. Of course, the statement that the U.S.S.R. threatens anyone is empty talk, false and slanderous propaganda hostile to the Soviet Union.

But is this not an outright appeal for the creation of those same bandit detachments in which Messrs. the Americans now set their hopes, as was the case in 1917-18 during the years of intervention in Soviet Russia? The whole task, as they understand it, is now to organise an armed detachment of 25,000 men, to turn these people into a “striking force of great power” stationed at convenient places, as Dulles said, in order that it may strike the Soviet Union at the necessary moment. Is not this preparation of war? Is it not interference in Our internal affairs if plans are being made to strike at the Soviet Union, to destroy the “Kremlin regime”, as they say? A futile task! For there is no power in the world that could cope with such a task!

And what does the same Dulles propose further? He proposes the strengthening of co-operation in “curative and creative efforts” to remake the free world “into something so much better than it is that no one will bother with the communists' prattle”. This is a call to destroy the communist world, i.e. to destroy the States where communists live, work, create, build the new and advance to the great goals of a world brotherhood. To destroy—that is what Mr. Dulles says, adding that some other way must be found to halt the Red Armies, other methods than “by trying to match them on the ground at

every point, man for man, gun for gun, tank for tank". Dulles regards this as a hopeless task in the coming struggle against the Soviet Union. -Apparently he believes that their tank will not stand up against our tank, that their gun will not stand up against our gun and that their soldier will not stand up against our soldier, because he is not certain that his soldier will not cease being his soldier and become our soldier!

This is what is said by, and this is what perturbs perspicacious Dulles, penetrating Dulles, the brains trust of the State Department and of all of you, who is searching for some other path, who thinks that he will succeed in accomplishing the task that worries him in some other way. In what way? By corrupting the soul of man. He wants to take a course which would corrode the minds of the men in their clutches, deprave their minds, dissolve their will power and conscience, subordinate them to their criminal will. By what means? By bribery, treason, by using the basest of the—traitors to their country, war criminals—by using the poverty and hunger of thousands of unfortunate people whom you are selling wholesale and retail in various countries like beasts of burden.

You already disgraced yourselves thirty years ago when you organised the armed intervention in the Soviet Union, supporting the Whiteguard generals whom I have already mentioned here; you are embarking on the same road which Hitler travelled in using the traitor Vlasovites. But Vlasov and his ilk did not help Hitler and did not escape the just trial and wrath of the Soviet people. For the Soviet people are strong in the justice of their cause, which you will never succeed in sullyng with your insinuations, slander and fabrications, no matter how hard you try.

How can this speech of Mr. Dulles be understood, I should like to ask you gentlemen, as other than direct support for organising subversive, sabotage, armed groups within the

countries of which he spoke', groups pursuing far-reaching aims—the overthrow of the existing Governments in these countries, the destruction of the established social and State system in them? The same is indicated in the statement of the U.S. State Department in response to our Note of November 21. By the way, we have not yet received a reply to this Note, although it was said here that we were too hasty, in not waiting for a reply to the Note of November 21 and already raising this question in the General Committee on November 22. The United States Government, however, has had sufficient time since then. If it wanted to give an answer to this Note, this could have been done long ago. However, there is still no answer. Evidently because it is much easier to talk here than to give an answer in a serious political document.

In its statement the U.S. State Department admits that the Act of October 10 provides for giving help to war criminals, traitors to their country, although it calls them simply “escapees” who have taken refuge on the territory of the United States. A meaningless reservation is made that this “help” will be rendered when it is established that this will contribute to the defence of the North Atlantic area.

Thus the attempt is being made to take cover behind false phrases concerning the “defence” of the North Atlantic area. By the way, where do the bounds of this North Atlantic area end? It seems that they end on one side in Western Germany, on another side in the Black Sea, on the third side near the Philippines, on the fourth side in the Pacific in general. I say nothing about the Middle and Near East. The bounds of the North Atlantic bloc have reached that area, too. Where do the bounds of this so-called North Atlantic area end? Judging by statements of the representatives of the United States, these bounds, I would say, are limitless.

And so you and your State Department itself, have

admitted that in order to defend these limitless bounds you need these auxiliary, mercenary troops, I would say modern Swiss mercenaries—although I would not like to give the Swiss the pretext for taking offence at the fact that their old troops who performed the same unseemly role, are now being compared with the troops of these vile, corrupt, rotten, thoroughly depraved people.

I would like now to pass on to an analysis of another proof, specifically the testimony of people competent in this matter. Here, for example, is the testimony of former Assistant State Secretary of the United States Adolf Berle, Jr., if I am not mistaken, who spoke in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives giving his explanations regarding the Act of October 10. When he was asked in this Committee what proposals he had for solving this problem of which Mr. Mansfield spoke so much here, he replied that he would prefer to speak about it at a secret session.

It is surprising that Mr. Mansfield, who is searching for the truth, did not demand that we should hold a secret session. Perhaps he, too, would tell us something about what Berle intended to say at a secret session of the House of Representatives Committee? I am ready for this. Let us arrange a secret session, Mr. Chairman, in order that Mr. Mansfield may tell us what Mr. Berle was ready to say at a secret session of the Committee and what, of course, is known to Mr. Mansfield but about which, for understandable reasons, he keeps silent. However, from what Berle said at that public meeting of the Foreign Affairs Committee on July 19 it is seen that what was in question was the preparation of no more and no less than an uprising in the countries behind the so-called “iron curtain”. It is this word “uprising” that is recorded in the minutes of this Committee. I have read these minutes which I received from the United States and in case of necessity I can

let you have them so that you may read how, by the way, your own stand on this question is presented there.

And so, on July 19, after several fragmentary and evasive replies to certain incautious questions put by the members of this Foreign Affairs Committee, Berle said first that he would like to speak about these proposals of his at a secret session but afterwards blurted out the affair by stating that it was a question of organising an uprising in the countries behind the “iron curtain”, of using for this purpose groups from among traitors to these countries. From these same minutes—they can be read here from beginning to end—it is seen that the Committee discussed the question as to how best to organise the incitement to struggle against the lawful Governments of the aforementioned countries.

Mansfield tried to expound here a rather strange theory of mutual assistance. He says: We help these escapees (we say: traitors, betrayers) because they will help us, meaning the members of the aggressive Atlantic bloc.

This, however, is a poor explanation. It is tantamount to the keeper of some robbers’ den referring to the need for mutual assistance as regards the bandits whom he conceals, supplies with arms, supplies with money and incites to crimes, covers up the traces of their crimes, and so on. He also acts on the basis of the “principle” of mutual assistance. Mutual assistance—in the name of what? In what cause? For what purpose? By what means? We say that the references to mutual assistance made here are a false phrase used as camouflage because this is assistance in a conspiracy against other States. You want to use, under the pretext of this “mutual assistance” or “mutual security”—and you yourselves speak about this here all the time—these people in order, relying on their help, to render them on your part *your own* help, in seeking to accomplish your criminal ends, for which purpose this entire affair has

been undertaken.

But let us leave this to Mr. Berle alone.

Let us turn to such a document as the minutes of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives of July 25 in which the conversation of Congressman Vorys, Mr. Mansfield's colleague, is reproduced. I do not know whether he is present here now, I do not have the honour of knowing him personally, but I do know that he is a member of the American delegation. And so this Vorys, who is also a member of the American delegation, also a Congressman, also a member of the House of Representatives, had a conversation with Kersten, another Congressman, author of the amendment for the \$100 million. In this conversation he, among other things, spoke of organising military formations of up to 25,000 men to be incorporated in the American army so that, as he puts it, the Poles, Hungarians and others might participate in these military formations which would have to take part in the so-called "defensive" war of the aggressive Atlantic bloc against Poland, Hungary, etc.

There was direct reference to General Anders and to the Polish legion of this Anders, and it was hinted that it was necessary to organise something like this legion. It is recorded in these minutes that Kersten, with whom Vorys spoke, said that of great importance would be the fact that such persons—Poles, Hungarians and others—would fight in their own formations. . . .

Kersten wants these military formations, organised on the basis of these \$100 million, to fight as Polish, Hungarian formations, and so on. He said that this fact would strike like a thunderbolt at the iron curtain, that it would have a destructive force as regards the regime in Poland and so on. And in this, Kersten said, lay its great value.

What do the minutes for July 25, 1951, show? They show

that Kersten, author of the amendment for \$100 million appropriated to finance the subversive, sabotage, terrorist and other activities, definitely meant the organisation of military formations comprised of people who fled from Poland, Hungary, the U.S.S.R., etc. He says; “etcetera”, but the full meaning of this whole perfidious plan is precisely to destroy the existing regimes in the U.S.S.R., in Poland and other people’s democracies, i.e. the direct object of this plan is the overthrow of the present lawful Governments existing in the aforementioned countries.

At the same meeting—I quote from the same minutes for July 25—Kersten declared that they must help to promote the formation of national military units from citizens of the East European countries fit for military service who had fled from behind the “iron curtain” or would flee from there in the future, in order to incorporate them in the European army.

Thus it is from these same so-called “displaced persons” or from those who are to run away—by the way, this is also one of the aims of the appropriation of the \$100 million fund: *to help* all kinds of shady characters *to run away* from our countries—that armed units are to be formed for use in overthrowing the regimes in the East European countries.

Kersten said that he thought that it would be more effective for these people to belong to formations recognised as their own formations.

Vorys interrupted him with the remark that he probably meant the Polish legion, for instance.

Kersten continued: the Polish legion and the like. He said that he thought that they should surmount all kinds of legal difficulties and really help to form such units with the object of including them in the body of the N.A.T.O. (Atlantic Pact).

I quote these minutes further.

Vorys said that he was in full agreement with Kersten. He

said that if possible it was necessary to preserve their national designations with the aid of regimental standards, chevrons and the like, as formations of the European army could no doubt do, although they could have the same uniform. This would result in a substantial saving in comparison with including them in the American forces where the pay and maintenance are higher than in the European countries.

This means: it is not enough that they want to buy these “displaced persons”—they want to buy them cheaply at that, they want to economise in this matter, for American soldiers, they say, must be paid more than these. . . tramps—let the interpreter find an appropriate word, I shall be very grateful to him—beggars, tramps (*vagabonds* in French)—these may be paid less. True American prudence, and moreover perfectly “democratic”, and “progressive” as well. But mind you, here is something interesting: they want to preserve the national designations for them—regimental standards, military insignia, chevrons, etc.—and to present all this as a national army which is going to “liberate” its country! Need I say that the Soviet people will in a befitting manner meet these “liberators” whom they already met more than once, when the fourteen States headed by eminent leaders launched a campaign against the Soviet land—and fled back whence they had come without as much a glance behind them.

In the Foreign Affairs Committee many members took part in discussing the question of these military formations. For instance, chairman Mr. Kernahan, as the minutes say, asked from what source this army would receive its uniforms, pay and food. Member of the Committee Vorys replied that he believed that this was one of the questions worked out under the direction of General Eisenhower for the European army, as part of which they would have the same uniform and a unified command. He did not add, however, that they will not have the

same food, since the food, as we have seen, is to be cheaper. And he said further that this, he believed, would be realised through contributions of the European countries and finally through contributions from the United States. Therefore the European countries may be satisfied that some kind of additional contribution will be required of them for this futile cause. At least that is what Mr. Vorys thinks, and, evidently, Mr. Mansfield too.

Permit me to ask what do these minutes show? They show that when they prepared the Act of October 10, 1951, its sponsors set the direct aim: to recruit mercenaries from among the war criminals and traitors who had fled from the U.S.S.R. and people's democracies with a view to using them in the armed struggle against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies and, as the Act says, for the organisation of military formations, or for other purposes, i.e. for subversive acts, for the destruction of internal communications, for terror, and lastly for flinging them into fratricidal war against their own countries.

The *Congressional Record* of August 18 prints Mr. Kersten's statement which goes into detail about these plans to form a mercenary army of traitors for preparation of the campaign against the U.S.S.R. and the people's democracies. In this statement Kersten says that it is necessary to begin to move, as he put it, towards the final liberation of the countries of Europe. The meaning of this "liberation" of Europe is clear. It means an attempt to overthrow the Governments existing in Eastern Europe, the Governments which administer these countries, which were chosen by their peoples and have the confidence of their peoples.

Kersten pointed to small groups of deserters and war criminals, praising them as a "potential of freedom". He gave as an example the army of the traitor General Anders. He told

that Committee about his conversation with some high-ranking army officer who explained to him the significance the use of battalions of war criminals and traitors from the countries of Eastern Europe would have in the event of a conflict with the Soviet Union.

This is what he said. We must not wait, he stated, we must begin to form such organisations. We must have in mind the creation of a corresponding foreign legion which will take part in the defence of Western Europe and in the liberation of Hungary, Rumania and Poland. He named these three countries. I repeat, we know-and you all know—what this so-called “liberation” means, what this word “defence” means. We know what is behind these hypocritical words. This means nothing else but plans for armed intervention and the overthrow of lawful Governments and restoration in these countries of the already overthrown power of landlords and capitalists hated by their peoples.

On August 17 Kersten already spoke out directly about his amendment. This was no longer general talk, but he spoke concretely and directly about his amendment. He said that his amendment provided for a possibility of rendering assistance to the underground organisations which possibly existed in these countries or might appear in future.

“Assistance” has been dragged in here for the same purposes of camouflaging the criminal plans by which the sponsors of the establishment of these military formations are really guided.

Mansfield said that in 1935, when the Comintern Congress met in Moscow, the United States President sent the Soviet Government a Note protesting against the action of the Soviet Government because the congress issued appeals to the communists in other countries. But the congress appealed then to parties which existed legally in these countries. It appealed

to legal parties allowed by the given Government. But is there any ban prohibiting an appeal to a legal party in any country? There is no such ban. There is, however, a ban prohibiting the issuing of appeals to underground parties, to underground organisations and the more so to support for an underground movement. Mansfield tried to avoid this question, to substitute another question for it. This other question is the question of the Kersten amendment to the Act of October 10, the first point of which provides for financing underground organisations which carry on hostile activity against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. This amendment gives such underground organisations direction in order that they should not be useless; this amendment places on the inhabitants of Eastern Europe themselves a big share in the entire matter of liberating Eastern Europe, as the sponsors of this amendment said.

I must note that this point was liked very much by certain Congressmen, one of whom, Mr. Armstrong, could not refrain from stating that, indeed, this amendment would inspire those people to go over to the American side and to struggle jointly with it. He said that he really believed that if the United States inspired them sufficiently, thousands would desert and join the forces of freedom.

This is how the real aims, tasks and meaning of this Act of October 10, 1951, are being disclosed more and more.

Another Congressman, Mr. Cooley, supported Armstrong, stressing that it was necessary to take measures, so he said, to win over those people into the camp of conspirators against Eastern Europe. But the real aims and tasks of the Act of October 10, which provides for financing persons and armed groups on the territories of the U.S.S.R. and a number of States for conducting within the aforementioned States subversive activity and sabotage, of which I have already spoken, were

revealed most fully by the very same Kersten at the meeting of the Committee on October 20 this year. In this statement, published in the *Congressional Record*, Appendix A-6950, Kersten said that the Mutual Security Pact, i.e. the Act of October 10, envisaged methods by which the United States could render help to the underground liberation movement in the communist countries. This provision, he said, was contained in the amendment which he had submitted to the House of Representatives and which was adopted.

But who does not know that in organising crusades against communism, as Hitler tried to do in recent years, and prior to Hitler, for example, the fourteen States, about which I have already spoken, tried to do, the enemies of the Soviet people carried out their armed intervention against the Soviet Union.

Behind the cover of the alleged menace of communism these gentlemen are organising campaigns also against the national liberation movement in the various countries, against the peoples of these countries who are fighting for freedom and independence. They are waging a struggle against the great Chinese People's Republic, against the people's democracies which are marching along the road of building socialism. The successes of the movement for peace and democracy throw into confusion and trepidation the enemies of democracy and peace who are mobilising all the forces of reaction to fight against the freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples.

In this, and in this alone, lies the entire purpose of the Act of October 10—it is to organise and support an underground movement in the U.S.S.R. and in the people's democracies, a movement which is non-existent, but which the obscurantists and warmongers try to organise by planting in these countries their spies, secret agents, saboteurs and terrorists. This follows directly from the statements made by Kersten and others which I quoted before, which I quoted from official documents of the

American Congress. Kersten spoke about this openly. This Act provides precisely for such aims, having in view the encouragement by the United States authorities of terrorist activities in other States. And of this I want to speak here especially, because this is also directly related to the activity of the United Nations.

It is known, gentlemen, that the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly had an item on the draft Code of Crimes Against the Peace and Security of Humanity. This draft code has Article 2, Section 6, which provides that commission or encouragement by the authorities of any State of terrorist activity in another State or the toleration by the authorities of any State of organised activity designed for committing terrorist acts in other States, shall be outlawed.

Messrs. Delegates, I am not certain that you remember sufficiently well this point, inasmuch as this question was examined in the General Committee and consequently the Members of the First Committee might simply not know about this. I would earnestly ask the Committee Members to acquaint themselves with the corresponding documents. This highly important question of the Code of Crimes Against the Peace and Security of Humanity was in the preliminary agenda of the Assembly, but then a decision was taken to postpone it. And now the history of this question is coming to light.

Kersten, on learning that the American delegation was ready to support this draft at the present Assembly, sounded the alarm. Kersten voiced apprehension that the adoption of Article 2, Section 6, which outlaws any encouragement of terrorist activity, could prevent the adoption in the United States of his amendment to the Act of October 10. . . . For this reason he began to insist that the American delegation should revise its stand and should strive to have this question removed from the agenda of the Sixth Session and put off at least until the next

session. Kersten thus tried to eliminate what he considered to be an obstacle to carrying out the measures which subsequently assumed the shape of the so-called Act of October 10 with Kersten's amendment. As can be seen from Kersten's statement in the U.S. House of Representatives, his anxiety on this score was so great that he thought it necessary to consult the United States Representatives in the United Nations about it, specifically Austin, who, however, in his letter of reply to Kersten (the letter is available, it can be made public if necessary) tried to put Kersten at ease on this point, maintaining that it would hardly be possible to bring the Act of October 10 under Article 2, Section 6, of the Code of Crimes Against the Peace and Security of Humanity, interpreting this Act as an encouragement of subversive and terrorist activity. In his letter to Kersten on this score Mr. Austin wrote literally the following:

“As you know”, he wrote, “from our experience, being a legislator yourself, much, however, depends on the interpretation of the main words. As it seemed to me, the main words are: ‘terrorist activity’, ‘terrorist acts.’ “ And Austin added: “It must be admitted that the present state of the world demands something different from the old standards of international law.”” In so doing, Mr. Austin asserted that any code worthy of the name of the United Nations could not but recognise such a vital fact of the present time.

It turns out that it is necessary to abandon the recognised principles and standards of international law which can prevent the American Government from carrying out measures of subversive and terrorist activity in defence of so-called “freedom”, but in reality in the interests of carrying out the bellicose plans of the aggressive Atlantic bloc.

* Retranslated from the Russian.

Thus Austin already at that time prepared, so to speak, an alibi, chose reasons, arguments, which could be used in order to deflect from the Act of October 10 the charges that this law represents a criminal act against the peace and security of humanity. Austin's arguments, however, did not put Kersten at his ease and Kersten continued insisting on his point, proving that without terror—these are his own words—it is impossible to get along in this matter. Here is what he said at the meeting of the House of Representatives on October 20, as published in the same minutes of the *Congressional Record* A-6950:

“To say that terror would not play any part in the liberation movement of Eastern Europe means being utterly ignorant of what the liberation movement is.”*

The practical politician Kersten, a past master in these matters, teaches politics to the United States diplomatic representative Mr. Austin. Kersten said—I am quoting from the same minutes—that one of the main aims of the real liberation movement (he had in view the underground movement which is meant here all the time) was to spread terror among the population. He said that liberation would not be achieved only by propaganda and parliamentary manoeuvres. It demanded strong actions at the proper time, Kersten said.

What does all this mean? What is the meaning of all these words of Kersten in the letter, in the official document recorded in the minutes of the House of Representatives, if not a reproach by Kersten to his colleagues concerning an unbusinesslike attitude in settling the question that interested them all? Kersten's words amounted to the following:

“You, gentlemen parliamentarians, are chattering about some parliamentary manoeuvres, but it is necessary to use terror. Terror can achieve what you are striving for. It is

* Retranslated from the Russian.

necessary to bring into play strong means.”

And so the amendment to the Act of October 10 appears—the basis of preparing for extensive carrying out of subversive activity, the basis for an extensive and cynical plan for unparalleled intervention in the internal affairs of other States. Kersten continued insisting that the draft Code of Crimes Against Peace and Security, condemning the subversive, terrorist activity of one State against another State, should be removed from the agenda of the Sixth Session of the General Assembly. And we know that owing to the measures taken by the United States delegation, with the Co-operation of the delegations of certain other countries belonging to the Atlantic bloc, the draft of this Code was in fact removed from the agenda.

I have no doubt that the representatives of certain other countries, not knowing the entire filthy background of this question, kindheartedly, out of practical considerations, agreed to postpone the draft of this Code of Crimes Against the Peace and Security of Humanity until the next session. But here you have the background of this disgraceful affair!

It is not this, however, that is of interest to us at present. We are interested in something else. We are interested in the fact that it is precisely here that the real meaning of this Act, I would say its authentic nature, as lawyers put it, is revealed.

And what can be said against this, if it is impossible to delete these minutes, if it is impossible to erase from our conscience, from our memory, all these facts which show that the claims presented by the Soviet Government to the United States Government are fully substantiated? We are not interested in starting some kind of a dispute with the United States of America, and our appeal to the General Assembly is simple and elementary. We hold that the General Assembly must condemn the actions of the United States Government

and propose that the Government of the United States repeal this Act.

We are told that we understand this law incorrectly. But it cannot be understood otherwise than as it was understood by us, and not only by us.

If this law is really incorrectly understood here, then the best thing that the United States Government can do is to repeal this law as incorrect, as incompatible with the elementary principles of international law and good-neighbourly relations, with the elementary relations among self-respecting States.

What I have said far from exhausts everything that I can say on this score, and should this be necessary I will ask the Chairman to give me the floor once again. But what I have said here is the result of my desire to introduce full clarity on this question and show that we are dealing with a serious problem, that of eliminating what really hampers normal relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States, since the actions of the United States Government and the American Congress are evidence of such a hostile attitude towards the Soviet Union and the people's democracies that the Soviet Government cannot allow it to pass without protest, without a demand that such actions be condemned and without an address to the Government of the United States with an insistent demand for the repeal of this Act, which is unjust, harmful and dangerous—dangerous first and foremost to the United States itself.



After A. Y. Vyshinsky had finished his speech, the Chairman of the Committee tried to exert pressure on the delegates, calling upon them to keep their speeches solely within the limits of the question under discussion. In so doing

the Chairman obviously intended to present the speech of the U.S.S.R. delegate as a digression from the question under discussion.

In reply to the Chairman's statement A. Y. Vyshinsky said:

I will briefly say only that with all due respect for every explanation of the rules of conducting the meeting, which are laid down by the Chairman, exercising his indisputable right, I hold that nothing that he said applies at all, in any case, to what I have said up to now. And I give warning that, regardless of everything, I shall speak in a similar spirit and on a similar plan if necessity and the interests of clarifying this matter demand it.

On Aggressive Actions and Interference in the Internal Affairs of other Countries by the United States of America. Speech by A. Y. VYSHINSKY December 21, 1951

A WHOLE number of representatives of various delegations have spoken here, each one in his own way. But if one is to try and define the general line of these speeches, try to bracket these speeches, so to speak, together—and this, it seems to me, will be perfectly correct and will fully correspond to the real state of affairs—one should bear in mind that the representatives of Canada, Belgium, the Kuomintang, Costa Rica, Yugoslavia, Brazil, etc. (allow me to include in this number also my neighbour, the representative of Britain), are members of one and the same aggressive Atlantic bloc or are trailing in the wake of this bloc, and that determines their stand on this question. It would, of course, have been strange to expect them to say anything except what they have said here, trying to outdo one another in spouting all kinds of slander and insinuations against, and rabid hatred for, the Soviet Union and the people's democracies.

It would be strange if they had acted differently, deciding suddenly not to discharge this function of theirs, their role, their duty to the masters upon whom they completely depend and at whose expense they now in large measure live and somehow make ends meet.

This applies not only to those whom I have enumerated here, but also to all those who delivered here hypocritical, false speeches like the speech of the Brazilian delegate, I would say, illiterate speeches which were designed to distort the truth.

The reason for these malicious speeches is clear. An important question is at issue; the point is that the Soviet Union constitutes—and herein lies the main reason for the attacks on

the U.S.S.R. on their part—the chief and most important obstacle, I would say, the insurmountable obstacle on the path towards another world war, the path which is being followed by your aggressive Atlantic bloc that is pushing all mankind into the abyss of this war.

By lodging the complaint against the United States, we raise our voice against war in this case as well, and we shall always uphold this stand of ours consistently and to the end. This is not a matter for jokes, gentlemen. The Act of October 10 and our protest against this Act are not Christmas toys as the much too playful Canadian delegate and certain other much too playful young men tried to present the matter, undertaking here a task beyond their strength.

The Act of October 10 is one more step on the road to another world war. It is funny and strange to hear—and you yourselves, who say it, do not believe what you say—that this is an Act which will never be applied, that it will never be, used for those “fantastic aims”, as Mr. Mansfield, for example, said here yesterday.

You know that laws are written, not in order that they should not be put into operation, not in order that they should not serve as a basis for practical activity. Laws are written in order to direct practical activity and in order that this practical activity should yield some practical results expected of it because of the operation of the given law.

Bankrupt, therefore, are these dodges, this casuistry that a law does not yet represent action, as the United States representative Gross said in the General Committee. No, a law is action. Every law is in action from the moment it is approved, from the moment it begins to be applied. It happens, however, that a law is approved after the actions provided by the given law are already being carried out. This is exactly how matters stand as regards the Act of October 10 with its Kersten

amendment. This is exactly how matters stand, because it was in action long before it was promulgated, before it was simply put into legal shape by the decision of Congress in October 1951.

Today, I shall endeavour once again to explain in a popular way the meaning of this Act. But I say in advance that I consider it futile and absolutely unnecessary to enter into polemics with each of those gentlemen who were seeking here to curry favour with the United States of America, coming out, not with objections to, and criticism of, our stand, but with crude slander against our country. I shall not enter into polemics with those whether it be the representative of the Belgian or Costa Rican delegation, or the inveterate American agent from the Kuomintang, or the Titoite agent, who did their best here to vilify the policy of the Soviet Union, or from some other delegation of which unfortunately there are not a few here—who are speaking or have spoken at the meeting today in conformity with the preliminary American briefing and who have repeated what was said by their master before them; I prefer to speak about the master. I shall only say two words, in order not to come back to it any more, concerning Mr. Lloyd's speech. If we exclude the cow of which he spoke here again and which apparently does not give him any rest, if we exclude this unfortunate cow, what did Mr. Lloyd say? I listened to him carefully, even when he so demonstratively shook some documents, ostensibly trying to quote something to prove how the Act of October 10 should be properly understood, but he proved nothing.

He referred to Report No. 703 which supposedly was to give a real and correct interpretation of the Act of October 10 and the Kersten amendment. He even read several words, but they were words from the text of the very same amendment of the Act of October 10, constituting nothing that could be called

an “interpretation of the law”. And this is natural, because Mr, Lloyd has no documents that could be used for interpreting the Act of October 10, documents other than numerous documents which I already had the honour to read here before the First Committee, page after page, line after line, naming the dates when these statements were made, indicating the pages of the official minutes, concerning which neither Lloyd nor Mansfield nor anyone from their group in general found it necessary to say a single word here.

Indeed, has anything been said here in refutation of what I have related here, citing the testimony of such authoritative people as Kersten himself, the sponsor of this Act, as Vorys, Mansfield’s colleague, also a member of the American delegation and co-sponsor of this amendment or, in any case, one of those Congressmen who approved this amendment, or when I quoted the explanations made by Congressmen Armstrong, Cooley, Richards, Morano or Assistant State Secretary Berle, or State Department adviser Dulles, well known to us all? Has Mansfield or anyone else during all this time introduced even the least correction into all the quotations of documents we have cited here? Have they refuted even one comma in what we said here when we quoted all these documents? And after this, they, with innocent mien, dare to say that nothing has been proved, that there is no proof! They dare to say with such a feigned air of nobleness that if any State is accused of something, then proof is submitted. We have done so. Proof has been submitted.

One could say that unsatisfactory, unconvincing proof has been submitted. But in such a case those making this statement would have to prove that this proof is unsatisfactory and unconvincing. But what they have said? They have said that the pronouncements of certain Congressmen have been cited here, but that Congress consists of 531 persons, men and

women, and the opinion of individual Congressmen is not the opinion of Congress. But I ask you: Congress did agree with these opinions? And you, as Congressmen, agree with this opinion, and Vorys agrees with this opinion, and Kersten, whose amendment Congress adopted, agrees—the Kersten who taught Austin that without terror it is impossible to get along in this, as you call it, “liberation” movement.

After all this, I ask you: Is it Congress or is it individual Congressmen? And does not Congress consist of Congressmen who decide matters and who express their opinions about the decisions they have taken? It is of these opinions that we speak. The main principle of interpreting a law consists in establishing the opinion of the legislature itself. The opinion of the legislature, however, is reflected by the members of the legislative body. The opinion of the legislature, however, is formed of the opinions of these members. Cite any opinion other than the one I have quoted here and then you will have the right to say that this is really the opinion of Congress, and not the opinion of Kersten, not the opinion of Mansfield, not the opinion of Morano, not the opinion of Armstrong, not the opinion of Vorys, not the opinion of a certain Zablocki, and so on and so forth. You have not done this because you could not do this, and you could not do this because you have no data whatever for this—I state *none whatever!*

That is why, when Mr. Mansfield, and following him the representatives of certain countries supporting him, have stated here that the Soviet Union should have presented convincing evidence that the charges presented against the United States were based on facts, but that it had not presented this evidence, I must draw the attention of all the members of the Committee to the fact that this assertion is devoid of all grounds. The evidence has been presented. It has been examined here, as Mr. Lloyd has said today, it has not been refuted in any way, not a

single change has been introduced in the explanation of the people esteemed from your standpoint, and it must be indisputable that these explanations and our evidence are evidence which has the full force of real evidence—*prima facie* evidence, as lawyers say, i.e. first-hand, most authentic evidence.

All of you, of course, remember what this evidence consists of. I would ask the members of the Political Committee, if they look at this matter seriously and do not hurry to wind this matter up in some way so as not to bring in full clarity and so as to prevent an extensive examination of this question—I would ask them to study the minutes available to all, the minutes of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives of July 19, July 25, October 10, and October 20 this year, which contain sufficiently exact and definite explanations by all the members of the American Congress to which I referred *bona fide* last time—this was not subjected and could not be subjected to any doubt; neither was it corrected nor, moreover, refuted.

These are the facts, gentlemen. You, of course, can vote in an obedient majority for what you will be prompted to vote, but you have no right whatever to say that we have not proved the case against which, I know, some of you will vote, for you kept silent when the substance of the matter was discussed, you are keeping silent now and will keep silent tomorrow.

I am prepared to ask for the prolonging of our discussion. Let this evidence be examined, all of it. Let it be placed on the table.

You will not do this, because you dare not do this. You have no opportunity to do this, because you have no arguments, no proof with which you could counterbalance our arguments and proof.

To finish with this matter, I deem it necessary to sum up

what we have proved, relying solely on the explanations which the American Congressmen gave in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. What have they testified. What have they admitted?

They have admitted firstly that the amendment to the Act of October 10 incorporated in this Act, and consequently the entire Act of October 10 as a whole, has as its aim *the financing and recruiting* of persons and whole groups from among so-called “escapees” from the Soviet Union and the people’s democracies and *organising them into military formations*, organising them into *armed groups* which could be used, as could individual persons in carrying out the plans of the Atlantic bloc. What plans? You say plans of “defence”. We maintain that these are plans, not of defence, but aggressive plans. But let us not consider for a while the question of what kind of plans these are, in any case these are plans of the Atlantic bloc.

Here is what these Congressmen testified in the first place. Can you deny this? You cannot and you did not deny this.

They have admitted, secondly, that the organisation of such military formations and the enlistment for participation in such military measures of persons selected from among those who fled from the Soviet Union and the people’s democracies as well as those residing within the territory of these States, pursue the object of *setting up “a striking force of great power, as Dulles said, stationing it at convenience places around the perimeter of the Soviet Union and using it as a destructive means against the political regimes, against the State and social system* firmly established in these countries by the free will of their peoples.

They have admitted, thirdly, that these military formations and individuals enlisted for hostile activity against the aforementioned countries will, with the funds allocated for this

purpose—\$100 million—*be formed on the territory of the United States* and other Atlantic bloc countries on the one hand, or on the territories of those aforementioned countries on the other hand.

They have admitted, fourthly, that these military formations will be set up as *national military units, with their national regimental standards, military insignia* and corresponding national commands.

They have admitted, fifthly, that these *military formations will be included in the Atlantic bloc army* as national legions. It is also meant that they may be included in the so-called European army.

They have admitted, sixthly, that besides forming them into military formations with the above aims of which I have spoken, individual groups or persons from among war criminals, deserters and other so-called refugees *will be used for terrorising the population* of the aforementioned countries (for spreading fear, as the Congressmen said) and *for committing terrorist acts* which, according to Kersten—the author of this amendment—must play an important part in the realisation of the plans for supporting the so-called “liberation” movement in the East European countries.

This is what has been said inside and outside the House of Representatives Committee, by various gentlemen, concerning the Act of October 10. We have already pointed to at least six conclusions which can be formulated with the utmost clarity on the basis of official documents published by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the United States House of Representatives.

It is not accidental that no one, not even the official representative of the United States, attempted to say a single word to correct, let alone, to refute anything of what we have said. This is clear, since corresponding data, facts, are

necessary for refutation. To refute means to take the documents into one's hands, it means to read and to explain what is written in these documents. I would very much like Mansfield and his friends to try and do it. Then it would be possible to see what it all means, what these words mean: "terror", "uprising", "devastating blow at the iron curtain", "crushing blow at the Kremlin regime"?* But they evade doing this. They confine themselves to hollow phrases, unworthy of serious people and a serious attitude towards this matter, they confine themselves to a bald denial. One thing only is being repeated, over and over again: "Nothing has been proved, no proof has been cited." And this is done in reply to a great number of our proofs. But what other proof do you want? Certainly there is more proof, but Congressman Vorys refused to disclose it at the open meeting of the Committee. And this is quite understandable. This proof leaks out in certain cases and I shall speak about it later, irrespective of the pronouncements of Messieurs the Congressmen. The fact, however, remains. The actual aims of this Act are being revealed. This is seen also from that scandalous affair in which the draft Code on Crimes Against the Peace and Security of Humanity was removed from the agenda of the Sixth Session of the General Assembly. This code was removed from the agenda because Kersten and other esteemed Congressmen feared lest it should be adopted with its Article 2, which stated that terrorist and subversive acts of one State against another must be outlawed. Kersten and Co. were frightened by this Article, frightened because they thought that such an Article, if adopted by the Assembly, would prevent or many case make more difficult, the passing through Congress of the October 10 Act and Kersten's amendment to it. I spoke about this in detail yesterday and

* Retranslated from the Russian.

today I want only to recall it.

Does not this fact show sufficiently clearly and convincingly the meaning of the October 10 Act and Kersten's amendment, what real ends they serve, what shady and shameful purposes they pursue? I would have understood it if, having analysed all these documents as thoroughly as our conscience and honour prompted us to do, they proved that the actual state of affairs was different from the one we presented to the Committee. But not one of the United States' supporters has done this, not one has even made the attempt to deny or prove anything.

Like poor provincial lawyers, they evaded this question without even asking for an adjournment of the meeting, as it would have been more appropriate to do. And now they themselves allege that the Soviet Union has not brought forward any proof or any facts, they assert this after all the facts and proof cited by me have been put forward and no attempt has been made either by Mansfield or his Brazilian, Canadian and other accomplices in this ignominious affair to advance any arguments to substantiate their position. Do you think that after all this it is possible to brush aside really convincing facts and proof by a simple and bald denial? You can vote with your hands, but you have not been able to do so with your heads. We are not afraid of this voting, however, for, as the proverb goes, the truth will out. The truth will speak for itself and will find its way from this hall to the people who value truth, know how to defend the truth and who will help the truth to vanquish untruth. We cannot be frightened by voting of this kind.

Everything said hitherto, all the explanations given hitherto by the authors and co-authors of the amendment to the Act of October 10 render perfectly clear the real meaning of this amendment which Mansfield again cited here, pretending that

it really does not contain anything odious or compromising.

As Mansfield said, this point authorises the appropriation of a sum not exceeding \$100 million of the total sum to be appropriated for forming selected escapees from the countries behind the iron curtain into elements of military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. By accepting this provision, the joint committee desires to make it clear that the persons who would be formed into such forces would join them only of their own free will.

This is what Mansfield said on December 19. On December 20 he explained that it was indeed the intention of Congress that the funds allocated under Kersten's amendment to the Act of October 10—these \$100 million—be used at the discretion of the President, with a view to enabling escapees from Europe, or persons who flee in future, to take part in the defence of the so-called North Atlantic community.

But for what purposes, really, have these \$100 million been allocated? To form military units. Of whom? Of escapees. Of what escapees? Of people who have fled from the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, or who may still flee from these countries. Such are the purposes for which these funds are to be expended, on the President's orders.

It is significant that Mansfield has now already discarded his spurious theory about the charitable purpose of the Act allocating \$100 million, allegedly earmarked to help those who are suffering and craving for this dollar aid. Kersten said outright that in his own understanding these \$100 million were designated to finance those who would take part in the armed forces of the Atlantic bloc. Consequently, this is not aid to refugees, poor and miserable, who need material aid, nor to the destitute. No, as Kersten said, this would be firstly, persons fit for military service, and secondly, as Mansfield said here, they would not help these persons to arrange their life, but would

pay them for participation in the Atlantic bloc armed forces. These are, precisely, the mercenary Swiss of our time.

Can anyone in this, case be deceived by references to “defence” and the allegedly “liberatory” aims pursued by this bloc?

Mansfield spared no words to apply in practice this “inverted vocabulary” of which he spoke and which calls war peace; aggression, defence; plans for suppressing and oppressing peoples, liberation movement. . . .

The falseness of these words has already been exposed here.

At one of the meetings the Egyptian delegate gave a fine reply to the verbiage of the British and American delegates, regarding the peaceful “defensive” aims of their policy. He said that so far this policy in Egypt has been expressed in the exploits of British bulldozers which raze to the ground the houses of Egyptian citizens, and in many cases whole villages.

To whitewash the shameful and far too glaring subversive and terroristic nature of this entire affair, Mansfield, as a member of the United States delegation, which, as he said, represents the executive power of the American Government, stated yesterday that this law would never be applied by the executive power for those fantastic purposes of which the Soviet delegation spoke at the meeting of this Committee.

But this law has no other purposes except those of which our delegation spoke and which may indeed be called fantastic, if one considers the inevitable failure of the attempts to achieve these aims. But this is a plan in action, even though its schemes, which the aggressive circles of the United States and certain other countries entertain with regard to the Soviet Union and the people’s democracies, are truly absurd and crazy.

The statement made by the United States delegate is not

without political trickery, for later he said that the question of using these military formations, set up as we have seen for subversive and belligerent purposes against the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, is still to be decided by the Atlantic bloc countries after joint consultations, and that if such formations are ever set up they will be used against aggression.

Here again we have the same juggling with words: aggression, defence, etc.

This is a direct attempt to foist responsibility on other members of the Atlantic bloc with whom the United States promises to consult in future on the given question, although a reverse process, a reverse order, would seem more normal—first to consult one's allies, if one has any respect for them at all, and only then to promulgate laws which place certain responsibility on them. But then, this is a family affair of the Atlantic bloc members and can interest us but little.

This fully exposes the bankruptcy of the attempts to represent the proposal submitted to the General Assembly that the United States be called to order, and the Act of October 10 be repealed, as an effort to slander the United States and to undermine some merely invented defensive measures of the Atlantic bloc. It is, after all, a fact that the Act of October 10 and Kersten's amendment constitute unheard of violations of the basic and elementary principles and standards of international law. This was precisely what Austin undoubtedly had in mind when in his letter to Kersten he said that the state of the world today called for something different from the old international law, that the international law was consequently outdated, did not answer the policy of the United States, too much encumbered its activities as well as the activities of the entire Atlantic bloc. The old international law of which Austin spoke, it turns out, hampers the present so-called new line of American foreign policy. This law must be revised. Some new

ways must be devised for the development of this law and its implementation.

In his letter to Kersten, Austin sought to convince him that no code worthy of the name of the United Nations could fail to recognise such a vital fact of the present time, i.e. could fail to recognise that the generally accepted standards and principles of international law are now unsuitable for the United States and should be replaced by new standards of international law. This is a “vital fact” according to Austin. What kind of new standards are these? They may be described by two words: “cloak and dagger!” A cloak made of phrases about “defence” and concealing the dagger of aggression!

Now we see that “new” of which Austin wrote in his letter and which found its expression in Kersten’s amendment that does away with the generally recognised basic principles of international law, discarding these principles and replacing them with those peculiar “new” “principles”, which open a broad way, not for law which is called upon to serve the strengthening of co-operation among peoples, but for lawlessness which breeds division and discord; not for peace which international law must serve, but for war, which is still obstructed by this law!

This is not accidental. Kersten’s amendment to the Act of October 10 is one of the stages on the road of aggression, an the road chosen by the camp of the Atlantic bloc in which the leading role has been assumed by the United States, which is pursuing a foreign policy accordingly.

The United States delegate repeatedly asserted that the Atlantic bloc—he called it the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation or North Atlantic community—was not aggressive and pursued, he said, exclusively defensive aims. This is an old matter, however, and has already long been settled for many. But if this matter is referred to in the light of

the Act of October 10 and Kersten's amendment, then it may be affirmed that this law alone, this amendment alone, the meaning of which has been fully established by the authentic interpretation of its authors themselves, is the best and perhaps one of the most indisputable proofs of the precisely aggressive nature of the Atlantic pact. And if the Atlantic bloc possessed nothing else but this act of October 10, authorising the appropriation of \$100 million for subversive activities which the Atlantic bloc is conducting and intends to continue conducting in other countries, then this alone would be sufficient to prove the really aggressive nature of this bloc!

Mind you, it is unprecedented for a State maintaining normal diplomatic relations with another State, in time of peace, to form on its territory, and to announce this openly, military groups, and to enlist for this purpose citizens of other States—citizens residing on its territory with the object of utilising them in a war against their homeland, against their State. But the United States Government is not only forming the citizens of other States residing on its territory into such military groups; it sets itself the aim—and announces this aim openly in its law—of forming similar groups and enlisting individual citizens of these countries in participation in the struggle against the lawful governments of these very countries. This is unheard of!

Having taken such a path, naturally, it is also necessary to see that a corresponding revision of international law is made—a revision of its fundamentals, its principles, of the generally recognised principles and standards of international law. This proves necessary because measures such as those envisaged in the Act of October 10 with Kersten's amendment are incompatible with the generally recognised principles and standards of international law.

Mr. Mansfield tried to find at least some sort of

justification for the American Government's unheard of measures. He said that during the invasion of Soviet territory by the Nazi aggressors, the Soviet Union did not refuse to give rifles to foreigners who asked for them and that many such people fought together with the Red Army in the past war, just as many people from the countries occupied by the aggressors fought in the Allied ranks in the West. But this is a monstrous analogy because even Mr. Mansfield ought to have understood that we have absolutely incompatible phenomena in the two cases, absolutely different things. It is one matter for a State which has been attacked by an aggressor to accept the assistance of foreigners to resist this attack, but it is another matter when in time of peace, when there is no attack and no threat of such an attack, a State farms citizens of other States into armed detachments and prepares them with the object of sending them at the proper moment against these States, against the homeland of these people who are hired, bought for struggle against their own people, against their own homeland. It should be added to this that such assistance on the part of foreigners, which may be accepted by a State which has been subjected to an attack, is possible only under conditions in which war has already broken out and this does not at all resemble what the United States is doing now, when in time of peace and, even more, during normal diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, military farces intended for a future struggle of the United States against the Soviet Union are being formed on the territory of the United States from among so-called displaced persons who were driven from the Soviet Union and the people's democracies during the war.

We have normal diplomatic relations and at the same time in the United States, Soviet people are being formed into detachments against the Soviet Union.

And in doing so they say: "Yes, we are forming these

detachments, training them, drilling them—but this is merely ‘aid’ to the poor refugees.”

Since when is such “aid” permissible? Has such a thing ever been heard of?

In time of peace the Government of the United States allocates funds to equip and form espionage, sabotage, terrorist gangs and whole military formations, enlisting for this purpose so-called refugees, really renegades, traitors to their countries. Of course, there are among these people some who have been deceived or who are dying of starvation and who no longer think about their honour, who think only about a stale crust of bread—but when you pick these persons up, when you draw these persons into your military detachments, when you dress them in national military uniform and train them, pay them and prepare them to take part subsequently in an armed attack against us—we have the right to say that you are committing an unheard of crime against international law, against the principles of international law, against the normal diplomatic relations existing at present between such States, against peace. We have the right to say this! And we say it!

The Government of the United States, in time of peace, right now, today, is giving these persons military training, it is dropping them by parachute on to the territory of the Soviet Union and the people’s democracies for the purpose of committing crimes against the Governments existing in these countries, against the State and social system of these countries. You are doing all this, this has been proved.

And we say: The analogy which Mansfield drew here is monstrous and fallacious; it is all the more fallacious in that the Soviet Union has never resorted to the organisation on its territory of armed groups or military forces intended for struggle against any country with which it maintained diplomatic relations. *Never.*

We are asked: Will not the Soviet regime admit into its armed forces such communists as desire to settle in the Soviet Union and who have expressed the wish to defend the U.S.S.R. in the event of it being attacked?

But here Mr. Mansfield showed a gross lack of understanding of the question or else ordinary unscrupulousness, some *volte-face*. He simply cheated at cards, hoping at least to break even in this manner.

The point at issue is an entirely different one. The point at issue is not that the United States should not permit the settlement in the United States, i.e. not grant asylum, to those who would like to settle there and to defend the United States if anyone attacks it. An entirely different point is at issue.

The point at issue is firstly, encouragement of a stream of so-called refugees from other countries into the United States, refugees fit for military service and willing to hire themselves out and to join special military forces in the guise of national army units of the States from which they have fled. Secondly, the point at issue is their utilisation for aggressive purposes under cover of affected, hypocritical phrases about defence. And not for those purposes alone, for other purposes, too, as Kersten's amendment says—for purposes, as the author of this amendment, Kersten, himself admitted, of a terrorist nature, for committing terrorist acts on the territory of the States from which they arrived in the United States of America.

Thirdly: With this aim in view they systematically parachute these persons on to the territory of States for corresponding criminal activities on the instructions of leaders of the United States intelligence and military agencies.

If Mr. Mansfield were capable of approaching conscientiously and honestly the question which he asked as to whether the Soviet Government would permit on its territory communists who have expressed the desire to defend the

U.S.S.R., etc., then he could have found an exhaustive reply in the interview granted by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, J. V. Stalin, to Ray Howard, President of the American Scripps-Howard newspaper trust, in 1936. This has direct relation to the question asked here and is of such great significance that I consider it necessary to quote fully both Howard's question and the reply of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., J. V. Stalin.

Howard: "At the time of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A., President Roosevelt and Mr. Litvinov exchanged identical notes concerning the question of propaganda. Paragraph four of Mr. Litvinov's letter to President Roosevelt said that the Soviet Government undertakes 'not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organisations or groups—and to prevent the activity on its territory of any organisations or groups, or of representatives or officials of any organisations or groups—which have as their aim the overthrow or preparation for the overthrow of, or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States territories or possessions'. Why, Mr. Stalin, did Mr. Litvinov sign this letter if compliance with the terms of paragraph four is incompatible with the interests of the Soviet Union or beyond its control?"

Stalin: "The fulfilment of the obligations contained in the paragraph you have quoted is within our control; we have fulfilled, and will continue to fulfil, these obligations.

"According to our Constitution, political emigrants have the right to reside on our territory. We provide them with the right of asylum just as the United States gives right of asylum to political emigrants. It is quite obvious that when Litvinov signed that letter he assumed that the obligations contained in it were mutual. Do you think, Mr. Howard, that the fact that there

are on the territory of the U.S.A. Russian Whiteguard emigrants who are carrying on propaganda against the Soviets and in favour of capitalism, who enjoy the material support of American citizens and who in some cases represent groups of terrorists, is contrary to the terms of the Roosevelt-Litvinov agreement? Evidently these emigrants enjoy the right of asylum, which also exists in the United States. As far as we are concerned, we would never tolerate on our territory a single terrorist, no matter against whom his criminal designs were directed. Evidently the right of asylum is given a wider interpretation in the U.S.A. than in our country. But we are not complaining.

“Perhaps you will say that we sympathise with the political emigrants who come on to our territory. But are there no American citizens who sympathise with the Whiteguard emigrants who carry on propaganda in favour of capitalism and against the Soviets? So what is the point? The point is not to assist these people, not to finance their activities. The point is that official persons in either country must refrain from interfering in the internal life of the other country. Our officials are honestly fulfilling this obligation. If any of them has failed in his duty, let us be informed about it.

“If we were to go too far and to demand that all the Whiteguard emigrants be deported from the United States, that would be encroaching on the right of asylum proclaimed both in the U.S.A. and in the U.S.S.R. A reasonable limit to claims and counterclaims must be recognised. Litvinov signed his letter to President Roosevelt, not in a private capacity, but in the capacity of representative of a State, just as President Roosevelt did. Their agreement is an agreement between two States. In signing that agreement both Litvinov and President Roosevelt, as representatives of two States, had in mind the

activities of the agents of their States who must not and will not interfere in the internal affairs of the other side. The right of asylum proclaimed in both countries could not be affected by this agreement. The Roosevelt-Litvinov agreement, as an agreement between the representatives of two States, should be interpreted within these limits.”

Here is an answer to the question asked here. It was given as long ago as 1936 by the head of our Government, Joseph Vissarinovich Stalin. This reply separates with complete clarity the question of the right of asylum from the question which is under discussion now.

You may grant asylum to whomsoever you please, just as we have the right to grant asylum in our country to whomsoever we please. That is not the point in question. We are not encroaching on this right of asylum, which is proclaimed and fixed in our Constitution, but, we say: You, a Government, your Government officials, have no right to help Whiteguards and those elements who set themselves the aim of struggle against the Soviet system, the overthrow of Soviet Power and not because they may achieve this aim, but because this is an immoral aim prohibited by the Agreement of 1933. We urge you to be more honest and moral than your agents, who are violating the Agreement of 1933.

From what I have read, it follows; *firstly*, that the question of violation of the 1933 Agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union by the promulgation in the United States of the Act of October 10 must not be confused with the question of right of asylum; *secondly*, that the right of asylum must not be confused with the granting of such right to terrorists; *thirdly*, that the Soviet Government does not and would never tolerate on its territory. a single terrorist, no matter against whom his criminal designs were directed; *fourthly*, that the question of propaganda in favour of capitalism and against

the Soviet Union and vice versa, propaganda in favour of socialism and against capitalism, must not be confused with the *question* that official persons of both countries which signed the Agreement of 1933 must refrain from interfering in the internal affairs and internal life of other countries, and, what is most important for us now, must not finance the activities of political émigrés, must not help them through the official agencies of the United States of America and of those who sympathise with Whiteguard émigrés; *fifthly* and *lastly*, that the 1933 Agreement had in view the activities of United States and U.S.S.R. agents who must not and shall not interfere in the internal affairs of the other side, nor help all sorts of Whiteguard, terrorist, subversive and other elements, let alone use for such purposes so-called “displaced persons”, with the help of official or unofficial agencies of the United States of America.

Mr. Mansfield apparently does not want to understand this. Those who support him, those who support this ignominious affair to please the United States, flagrantly ignoring the interests of truth, apparently do not want to understand this either. Some of the United States supporters who have spoken here, Mr. Mansfield himself primarily, did not scruple either yesterday or today directly to distort various facts so as to substantiate their false position in some way.

Mansfield, for instance, said that in 1917 all Allied and neutral missions in Petrograd had received a circular Note allegedly reading as follows;

“Soviet Power deems it necessary to maintain diplomatic relations not only with Governments but also with revolutionary socialist parties whose aim is to overthrow the existing Governments.”* But it is enough to ponder over this

* Retranslated from the Russian.

quotation cited by Mansfield to see at once that it is nonsense. It is really impossible to think that the leaders of the young Soviet Republic were so naive as to write in a Note addressed to Governments, that we find it expedient to maintain diplomatic relations with you, with the given Government, and also with those revolutionary parties which seek to overthrow you. But this is sheer nonsense!

Actually there *never was* such a Note. This is merely an invention, because the only Note dated November 8 (21), 1917, about the formation of the new Government—Council of People’s Commissars—contains a reference to the text of the armistice agreement, democratic peace without annexations and indemnities, on the basis of the self-determination of peoples. In that Note, the Soviet Government asked that this statement be considered as a formal proposal of immediate truce on all fronts and the starting of peace negotiations, and pointed out that the Government addressed that proposal simultaneously to all the belligerent peoples and to their Governments.

Thus there is no such Note as would speak of the Soviet Power’s decision to maintain diplomatic relations not only with Governments but also with revolutionary socialist parties whose aim was to overthrow the existing Governments. This is sheer fabrication.

In the same way the quotation ascribed to the secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks), M. A. Suslov; who at that time was Editor-in-Chief of *Pravda*, is distorted. In his speech on the defence of peace and the struggle against the warmongers in 1949, M. A. Suslov said: “To unite the broadest sections of the population in the struggle for peace, diverse ways and means must be used: mass demonstrations, meetings, assemblies, writing of petitions and protests, popular polls, establishment

of peace committees in towns and villages, as broadly practised, for instance, in France and Italy.”

Mansfield omitted the words: “To unite the broadest sections of the population in the struggle for peace, diverse ways and means must be used.” But this is the main thing, because the methods are determined by purpose. Precisely these words about the purpose have been omitted by you, Mr. Mansfield, the words about “struggle for peace”, while this is the crux of the matter.

As regards the sentence from the speech made by A. A. Zhdanov in 1947 concerning the “Marshall plan”, Mansfield compiled a six-line quotation from two quotations torn out from different pages, and separated by at least five pages of the text. Mansfield took the first three lines from one page, then he turned five more pages and took three last lines from the last page, pasted them together and got what he has read here, and even that with distortions. But this is not the main thing. The main thing is that he did not mention the most essential facts when speaking about our objections to the “Marshall plan”.

And this basic fact is that A. A. Zhdanov pointed out that the “Marshall plan” pursues expansionist aims with regard to other countries—to make certain countries dependent on the United States financially and economically, to subordinate the whole world to the domination of American imperialism.

Mansfield did not say that the Soviet Union’s attitude towards the “Marshall plan” was determined precisely by the fact that this plan expressed a new expansionist and reactionary line in United States policy, designed for struggle against the Soviet Union and the people’s democracies, against the anti-imperialist liberation forces in all countries.

It was correctly pointed out in A. A. Zhdanov’s speech—but Mansfield has passed this over in silence—that the American reactionaries, alarmed at the successes of socialism

in the U.S.S.R., at the successes of the new democracies and the growth of the working-class democratic movement in all countries of the post-war world, are inclined to assume the task of “saviours” of the capitalist system.

The openly expansionist programme of the United States, A. A. Zhdanov said, calls to mind the adventurist programme of the fascist aggressors that had ignominiously failed. American diplomacy resorts to methods of intimidation, bribery and blackmail, easily wrests from other capitalist countries, and first and foremost from Britain, consent to giving legal form primarily to American positions in Europe and Asia, in the Western zones of Germany, in Austria, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, Iran, Afghanistan, Japan, etc.

This is what A. A. Zhdanov spoke about in 1947 while defining our negative attitude towards the “Marshall plan” which sought to lead the world along this disastrous road and, as is known, has completely failed. Mansfield, however, kept silent on this score and thus distorted our position.

Mansfield and others did their best to prove that the peace committees are instruments for carrying through Soviet foreign policy in foreign States. Such statements, of course, are beneath criticism.

The peace committees embrace hundreds of millions of people from different classes and social groups, of various religious and political convictions, in all countries. It would be absurd, it would reek of hopeless stupidity, to present the powerful popular movement for peace in all countries of the globe as a movement inspired by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

It would be gross distortion of the actual state of affairs, an obvious slander, for in actuality the yearning for peace, the striving to avert the threat of another world war, is the natural striving of the peace-loving peoples, trying to prevent a

recurrence of the calamities of world war, which brings nothing but misery to mankind.

Soviet foreign policy has as its object the attainment of those very aims—strengthening of peace and elimination of the threat of another war. The peaceful Soviet foreign policy enjoys the trust of millions upon millions of people in all countries of the world precisely because it conforms to the aspirations, hopes and strivings of these multi-millioned masses, who believe that the forces of peace will vanquish the sinister forces of war.

Even more ridiculous is Mansfield's statement that the peace committees, as he put it, are part of the general apparatus designed for direct action. What is this "direct action"? Is this a hint at forcible methods of struggle? But it is known that the direct action of the peace committees consists in the resolve of the people to hamper the unleashing of another war. This indeed is feared by the organisers of another war, who amass fabulous profits from war and even from the preparations for another war.

Mr. Mansfield and his colleagues are displeased because the cause of peace is from day to day acquiring more and more supporters, and are therefore feverishly attempting to frustrate the cause of peace, to impede the people's efforts to avert the war danger. But we believe that these attempts will end in complete failure. . . .

I cannot help referring to that part of Mr. Mansfield's speech which he devoted to Korea and in which he made another attempt to represent the war of the American interventionists in Korea as aggression from North Korea supported by the Soviet Union. But, gentlemen, all of you remember, at least many of you do so personally and the rest of you know from documents, that this question of aggression in Korea was discussed in detail in the First Committee at the

Fifth Session.

At that time we cited a number of documents and facts exposing this lie, facts which reveal the systematic preparation of the attack against North Korea by the Syngman Rhee-ites and the United States, and then the United States armed attack on North Korea. We cited numerous facts and documents but we heard no denial of those facts and documents. No one countered those documents with any other documents, no one refuted them in any way, no one even tried to refute them, leaving out the bald unsubstantiated denials and abuse to which several delegates resorted, especially the New Zealanders and the Australians.

At that time, in connection with a speech in the First Committee, I referred to Syngman Rhee's letter to the American Professor Oliver from Pennsylvania. I quoted textually that part of this letter in which Syngman Rhee wrote that now, psychologically, was the most appropriate moment to take aggressive measures and to unite with some part of the Communist Army in the North which was loyal to the South Korean regime, in order to liquidate the remaining part of that Army.

In this letter Syngman Rhee gave assurances that the South Korean army would push part of Kim Ir Sen's people into the mountain region, and starve them to death there.

In a letter published in this connection at that time, Professor Oliver confirmed that he had indeed received such a letter from Syngman Rhee, and that that letter said exactly what I read in the First Committee.

At that time I also quoted a letter from the South Korean Ambassador to the United States, Cho Biori Ok, of October 12, which said openly that the plan for the destruction of the Government of North Korea should be regarded as the basic plan of the Syngman Rhee Government, which it should carry

out when it was ready and when the favourable moment arrived. It arrived apparently on June 25, 1950.

Another document I made public was a letter from the same Ambassador Cho Bion Ok to Syngman Rhee himself, dated November 3, 1949, which said: The unification of Korea can be achieved only by using the sovereign power of our Government. Any policy of conference or compromises is excluded. Finally, on December 30, 1949, that is quite close to the moment of attack on North Korea, Syngman Rhee said at a Press conference: We must remember that in the new year, in connection with the change of the international situation, we must unite South and North Korea by our own forces.

I cited the fourth, fifth, sixth and tenth documents of the same kind which say clearly that the campaign against the North was a matter which had been decided, as General Robertson said; that the United States would render South Korea all necessary moral and material support in the struggle against communism, as Dulles said on June 19; that in the period of July-August it was necessary to make extensive preparation for the campaign against the North, as the United States Ambassador to Korea, Muccio, said.

On December 15 this year the American magazine *Nation* carried an article which says that several weeks before the beginning of the war in Korea, the South Korean Army was lined up along the 38th Parallel and was in a state of preparedness.

But, gentlemen, why were you silent then when we especially discussed this question? At that time you did not lift a finger to refute a single line of the aforementioned documents. And now you have mustered courage and you slander us, inventing all sorts of cock-and-bull stories.

Aggressors say that they are defending themselves against aggression. You were silent then, it would be better for you to

keep silent now, too; you raised no objections then, refrain from raising objections now. Otherwise, everyone who knows the history of this question will laugh at your today's remarks, substantiated by nothing but bald statements.



As regards the Act of October 10, the delegates of the United States tried to affirm that this Act was simply a law, something theoretical without any practical significance, inasmuch as—allegedly—no actions were implemented. But these are empty words. This is obvious from the following facts. A few days ago the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the Soviet Union tried two American saboteurs,—Osmanov and Sarantsev—displaced persons, those selfsame displaced persons whom the United States is systematically enlisting, and intends to continue enlisting, in its service. In August of this year these saboteurs were parachuted from an American plane on to the territory of the Moldavian Soviet Republic, but they were detained. False documents, weapons, poison and other means of committing acts of sabotage and terror, and also large sums of money, were found on them.

Incidentally, this is for the information of the Greek delegates in particular: according to the report which you can read in the *New York Herald Tribune* of December 20, these American spies underwent special training in Greece in topography, parachute jumping, organisation of sabotage and terror. They were brought from Greece to the place of landing on an American plane in the company of American officers. According to the report of the *New York Herald Tribune* which I am using in the present case, it also seems that these parachutists, spies and saboteurs, had instructions to go to

Turkey after fulfilling their mission so as to meet American intelligence officers. Owing to circumstances over which they have no control this meeting, naturally, cannot take place.

Will the gentlemen defending the October 10 Act tell us now that all these objects—forged documents, weapons, poison and other means of committing acts of sabotage and terror—were simply the standard equipment of this plane, normally required for ordinary flights in the European zone, as Mr. Mansfield said here and as is stated in the State Department's Note of December 18 with regard to the transport plane which at the beginning of December made promenades over the territories of Hungary and Rumania, but which was forced to land by Soviet fighter planes?

The American parachutists who were caught admitted that they had been recruited by the American espionage service in Western Germany, where they lived in a displaced persons camp, and that they received preliminary training in espionage, sabotage and terrorism.

During the investigations and trial it was established that, after completing their training for subversive activity, Osmanov and Sarantsev were brought to Greece and from there, in an American plane accompanied by American officers, flown to the place of parachuting on to Soviet territory. At the trial the accused Osmanov and Sarantsev fully admitted their guilt.

The object of the State Department's Note and Mansfield's explanations was to prove that the appearance of the American army plane over Hungary and Rumania was nothing unusual, that it was simply an accident as a result of its having lost its way, that the bundles or blankets were required under some order, that this order had other provisions of some sort that permitted the plane to have on board all means and equipment intended for the convenience of those who flew in it. But at the

same time they keep silent about one fact: maps, poison, and other such “equipment”. In that case for what purpose did Sarantsev and Osmanov have weapons, poison, etc.? Or for what contingency did the plane, which allegedly lost its way, have on board maps of the Ukrainian Republic and the Volga region? Is it not clear that if one examines these facts, if one recalls the Notes of the Bulgarian Government, Hungarian Government, Rumanian Government, Czechoslovak Government and Polish Government, listing numerous facts of similar activities of the American espionage agents, if an examination is made of these actions of the espionage agencies in the service of your so-called defensive Atlantic bloc, then it will become perfectly clear that the assertion that the Act of October 10, which subsidises such measures, is some sort of abstract law that has not begun to operate, has no basis whatsoever.

This law has begun to operate, it operates, and it operates for the purposes of which it unambiguously speaks, and no one will dare deny this.

Therefore the delegation of the Soviet Union fully upholds its proposals submitted for the consideration of the First Committee and the General Assembly in the following wording:

“The General Assembly condemns the ‘Mutual Security Act of 1951’ adopted in the United States of America, authorising the appropriation of money for the purpose of conducting subversive activities against a number of States, as an aggressive act and interference in the internal affairs of other States, which is incompatible with the principles of the United Nations Charter and the generally accepted standards of international law, and recommends to the Government of the United States of America that it take the necessary measures to repeal this Act.”

**FREEDOM OF RELIGION
IN THE U.S.S.R.**



An illustrated booklet by G. SPASOV

TWOPENCE

WE HAVE LEARNED
The Truth About Soviet Union
(Statements by British and other delegates
who visited the U.S.S.R. in May, 1951.)

sixpence

VYSHINSKY SPEAKS
at UNO GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
(Speeches of November 8 and 16, 1951)

one penny

The above and many other titles dealing with various aspects of life in the Soviet Union, speeches, etc. are available from newsagents and bookshops or direct from the publishers, SOVIET NEWS, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, S.W.7.

A paper



that you need

**ALL THE QUESTIONS that you ask about the Soviet Union—
and all the questions you are asked—are answered in SOVIET
WEEKLY.**

**This illustrated paper gives you a full picture
of the Soviet people at work and at play, building a new system
of society, and struggling to preserve peace and friendship with
all nations.**

You need SOVIET WEEKLY. You can get it, price 3d. a week,
from your newsagent or bookseller, or direct by filling in the form
below.

----- (Cut here) -----

To Circulation Manager,
3 ROSARY GARDENS, LONDON, S.W.7

Please find 4/4 for 3 months; 8/8 for six months; 17/4 for one year, for
Soviet Weekly, post free. (Delete as necessary.)

NAME -----

ADDRESS -----