



**★ ON CONDEMNING  
THE PREPARATION OF A NEW WAR  
AND CONCLUDING A FIVE-POWER PACT  
FOR STRENGTHENING PEACE**



**★ SPEECHES BY A. Y. VYSHINSKY  
AT THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE  
UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY,  
NOVEMBER, 1949**



|  |    |
|--|----|
| Speech of November 14, 1949, before the Political<br>Committee ----- | 2  |
| Speech of November 16, 1949, before the Political<br>Committee ----- | 22 |
| Speech of November 29, 1949, before the General<br>Assembly -----    | 59 |

---

All quotations in the following speeches have been retranslated from Russian.

---

Published by the Information Bulletin of the Embassy of the Union of Soviet  
Socialist Republics, 2112 Massachusetts Ave., N. W., Washington 8, D. C.





A. Y. Vyshinsky

# Speech of November 14, 1949 before the Political Committee of the General Assembly

**O**N September 23, on the Soviet Government's instruction, the delegation of the Soviet Union submitted to the General Assembly a draft decision on condemnation of the preparation for a new war and conclusion of a five-Power pact for strengthening peace.

Briefly speaking, these proposals amount to the following:

1. To condemn the preparation for a new war conducted in a number of countries and particularly in the United States and Great Britain.

2. To recognize as running counter to the conscience and honor of peoples and as incompatible with membership in the United Nations, utilization of the atomic weapon and other means of mass destruction of people, and to regard as inadmissible further delays in the adoption by the United Nations of practical measures for the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and for the institution of appropriate strict international control.

3. To express the desire that the five Powers—the United States, Great Britain, China, France and the USSR—join their efforts to avert the threat of a new war and conclude among themselves a pact for strengthening peace.

## I

### The USSR Consistently Defends the Cause of Peace

**T**HESSE proposals constitute the natural consequence of that foreign policy which the Soviet Government has been unswervingly implementing from the very inception of the Soviet State, whose first action was the proclamation of the historical decree of November, 1917, on a just, democratic peace. They represent an expression of that principled line which the Soviet Union has pursued during the course of 32 years, from the very beginning of its existence, and which it has consistently defended and is defending at the United Nations.

It should be recalled that at the General Assembly's first session

(1946) the Soviet Government proposed to carry out a general reduction of armaments and armed forces.

This proposal formed the basis of the General Assembly's historical decision of December 14, 1946. The Soviet Government thereby expressed the firm will for universal peace and the readiness for peaceful competition in social and economic affairs of state and social systems.

At the second session of the General Assembly (1947) the Soviet Government took the noble initiative in condemning propaganda for a new war in any form whatever, and at the third session in Paris in 1948 the Soviet Government, further attempting to serve the cause of strengthening peace and international co-operation proposed to the five major Powers that they reduce by one-third their armaments and armed forces and prohibit the atomic weapon, instituting for supervision and control over the implementation of the aforementioned measures an international control agency within the framework of the Security Council.

However, this resolution was rejected by the majority of the General Assembly obediently following the United States and Britain which came out against the peace-loving proposals of the Soviet Union.

It must be noted that the same fate befell a similar draft resolution submitted by the USSR representative in the Security Council. The Anglo-American majority in the United Nations has heretofore persistently and systematically been rejecting all the proposals aimed against the preparation of a new war and at the consolidation of peace!

The present proposals of the Soviet Union constitute a continuation of the principled line invariably followed by the USSR—the line of struggle for peace and co-operation among nations, against the threat of a new war being prepared by a handful of adventurers, bidders for world dominion. Submitting its proposals for the purpose of eliminating the threat of a new war and for strengthening peace, the Soviet Union again raises its voice in defense of the peace-loving nations, against the new shambles being prepared by aggressive blocs of states headed by the United States and Great Britain.

The question arises: who can object to the Soviet Union's proposals, to the proposal that preparations for a new war be con-

demned, to the proposal that the atomic weapon be prohibited at last and strict international control be established, to the proposal that the five Powers conclude a pact for strengthening peace?

Nobody but enemies of peace and international co-operation, nobody but those who see in the preparation for a new war and in the new war itself a source for enrichment, those who see in war a means for the establishment of world domination and enslavement of other states and nations!

## II

### The Warmongers Are Attempting to Thwart the Soviet Union's Proposals

**T**HERE can be no doubt that such proposals can be objected to only by inveterate opponents of peace, representatives of the reactionary circles who have made war and the preparations for war their profession and who regard war as a source of profits for capitalist cliques and monopolies. This was openly admitted by one of the representatives of the reactionary circles in the United States, a professor of Harvard University, Sumner Slichter who without qualms declared at the congress of representatives of trade, finance and industry that the "cold war" against the Soviet Union is a "good thing."

"It increases the demand for goods," says Slichter, "helps to maintain a high level of employment, speeds up technological progress and thereby helps the country to raise its standard of living."

Professor Slichter further declared that "but for the cold war the demand for goods on the part of the government would have been many billion dollars less than it is at present, and expenditures of both industry and Government for technological research would have been hundreds of millions less than now. Thus we may thank the Russians," he said, "for helping capitalism in the United States to work better than ever."

It would not have been worthwhile to dwell on this cynical statement of a rabid obscurantist from Harvard University had it not exposed the actual motives of the warmongers' subversive work.

Unfortunately such facts are not isolated ones. The war psychosis still makes itself felt in the United States and in some other coun-

tries, being fanned by the provocative work of the reactionary circles in these countries. Indeed, hissing and hostile criticism of the Soviet Union's peace-loving proposals are already heard from this camp. Have we not already witnessed at this session a united slanderous onslaught of the anti-Soviet forces like the Kuomintang delegation, the delegation of the Tito clique, and others, headed by the delegations of the United States and Great Britain who came out here with insinuations and malicious fabrications against the USSR? There need be no doubt that there will be those from this camp who hereafter too will come out against the Soviet Union's proposals, inventing all kinds of subterfuges and submitting all sorts of drafts in order to frustrate these proposals which expose the shady plans of the instigators of a new war. The signal for attacking the Soviet Union's proposal was already given at the very beginning of the present session by the leaders of the Anglo-American bloc.

This precisely was the gist of Mr. Bevin's speech at the General Assembly on September 26, when he in his very first words came down on the Soviet Union and the Soviet proposals of September 23. Remaining true to himself, Mr. Bevin made an attempt to present these proposals, as well as the entire foreign policy of the Soviet Union, as a "serious blow" to the hopes for establishing co-operation in the United Nations.

Mr. Bevin took the liberty of grossly distorting the foreign policy of the USSR although, as proved by the entire foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the numerous documents, as well as by the repeated statements of Soviet delegations at the sessions of the United Nations beginning with the very first session in 1946, the USSR has invariably striven and is striving to strengthen the influence and role of the United Nations as an important instrument of peace, striving for undeviating abidance by its Charter in the interests of honest and consistent international co-operation.

Mr. Bevin devoted his speech at the General Assembly's plenary session on September 26 to attacks against the foreign policy of the Soviet Union seeking to justify measures which are reactionary and hostile to the cause of peace, such as the North Atlantic Pact, the Brussels Pact, the split of Germany, the armaments race, preparations for a new war, attempting to foist the blame for all this on the Soviet Union and its foreign policy. Specially dwelling in

that speech of his on the German question, although this has nothing to do with the General Assembly, Mr. Bevin, distorting facts, attempted to place on the USSR responsibility for creating, as he put it, a crisis in Berlin.

He wanted in this way to blacken the Soviet Government's proposal on condemnation of the preparations for a new war and the conclusion of a five-Power pact for strengthening peace. But if we are to speak at all about the Berlin "crisis," is there anyone who does not know that it was entirely the work of the Governments of the United States and Great Britain? It was they who brought about the so-called Berlin crisis hoping to cover up thereby their splitting policy toward Germany. It was they who attempted to create new complications in this question artificially provoking a railwaymen's strike so as to egg on the German workers against the Soviet administration in Berlin by means of police provocations. It was they who prevented a settlement of the Berlin issue in Paris having thwarted the agreement reached earlier between the representatives of the six so-called neutral powers and the representative of the Soviet Union. The violators of the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements who have now crowned their refusal to fulfill the international obligations, assumed by them on the strength of the aforementioned agreements, with the establishment of a separate puppet West-German so-called government of Bonn, have recourse to crude lies and slander alleging, as Mr. Bevin permitted himself to do on September 26, that the Soviet Government was sooner prepared to run the risk of war than to give up its aim to keep Berlin under its control.

All these inventions were needed by Mr. Bevin in order to poison in advance the political atmosphere and to divert public attention from the Soviet Union's proposals, in order to undermine the confidence in the proposals in favor of strengthening peace and international co-operation toward which the Soviet Government's efforts are directed.

The number of speeches of the representatives of the Anglo-American bloc that followed showed that Bevin's signal was received. Thus for instance, the Canadian representative, instead of soberly assessing the importance of the Soviet proposals for strengthening peace, indulged in slanderous fabrications against the USSR regarding some alleged "new imperialism of the postwar period,"



indulged in absurd talk about "regimes" allegedly imposed by the Soviet Union on its neighbors.

The Canadian delegate, of course, knew that there was not one word of truth in anything he said about the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. But what is truth to him!

It is important to trouble the waters, it is important to attempt it by slanderous fabrications in order to divert attention from the USSR proposals which deal a real telling blow to the warmongers plans! What the Canadian delegate said concerning the essence of the Soviet proposals proves that the crux of the matter is of least interest to him! Therefore he expected to brush aside the Soviet proposals by declaring these proposals to be simple propaganda! This is old and not at all convincing. The Soviet proposals are no propaganda because the mad armaments race in the United States, Britain, and their allies is a fact; it is also a fact that the military budgets are inflated, further undermining the well-being of the population and constituting even a heavier burden on the latter's shoulders. The uninterrupted preparation for a new war in the United States and Britain, which is expressed in setting up numerous American military, naval and air bases, in the organization of military blocs pursuing aggressive aims against peace-loving states—all this constitutes not propaganda but a fact.

Not propaganda but a fact is the shameful discussion which developed here in the United States before our eyes between the representatives of the United States air forces on the one hand and the United States naval forces on the other hand—a discussion unprecedented in the history of even the most reactionary and aggressive states—as to the best method of attacking peace-loving countries and the best methods of annihilating millions of people and destroying peaceful towns and entire states!

The Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Pearson, and his ilk choose to qualify as "propaganda" exposure of this barbarous ignominious "work" of a handful of imperialists preparing to perpetrate a new and most grave crime against humanity. However, the point at issue is not propaganda but to unite the efforts of all honest people, to forestall new crimes of bidders for world dominion, to halt the criminal hand of the warmongers raised over peace-loving countries!

But if we have to speak of propaganda then attention ought to

be paid to such statements as that of the United States Secretary of Defense Johnson, who, speaking in August, 1949, at the American Senate Committee which was discussing the program for military aid said that in Western Europe a military vacuum had been formed representing a great temptation for international communism. What is this if not propaganda of war against the Soviet Union, if not direct instigation to such a war!

It turns out that the Canadian delegate particularly disliked the mention made in the third Soviet proposal of the powerful popular movement in all countries for peace and against the warmongers. This, Pearson said, has a "specific connotation in the communist vocabulary." But Pearson and his adherents should know that the word "peace" in all vocabularies means peace, and this word, which has become the banner of masses many million strong in all corners of the world, serves as a guiding star for those who are full of determination to prevent a new bloody massacre, a new mad conflagration of war which threatens to reduce to ashes and dust thousands of cities and millions upon millions of people!

Peoples the world over do not want war, they demand peace! And this ever-broadening and growing demand for peace emanates from all countries like a great herald of the salvation and happiness of humanity!

This is the sun rising, from whose dazzling and beneficent rays all forces of reaction and obscurantism scatter! It is this movement of peoples for peace that irritates Pearson and his company who discern in the peaceful aspirations of peoples a collapse of their own aggressive plans.

The representative of the Tito clique here sympathetically echoed the Canadian delegate and also attempted to present the USSR proposals as propaganda and to utilize the discussion of these proposals as a pretext for new slanderous outbursts against the USSR.

These examples suffice to make it quite clear that the noble proposals of the Soviet Government evoked confusion in the camp where plans for a new war are hatched, that this camp will take measures to frustrate the Soviet Government's proposals brought forth on September 23 at this session. These proposals constitute a program for peace, coinciding with the interests of the Soviet people and the Soviet State to whom striving for expansion and

colonial conquests is alien. This is a program for peace meeting the interests of all peace-loving nations, of all progressive mankind. This is why the instigators of a new war conduct a crusade against this program, the implementation of which would signify the collapse of the policy of military adventures which have turned the heads of the ruling circles in certain countries and primarily in the United States of America and in Great Britain.

### III

#### To Condemn Preparations for a New War

**T**HE USSR delegation proposes condemnation of the preparation for a new war conducted in a number of countries and particularly in the United States of America and in Great Britain.

The General Assembly's second session in New York unanimously adopted a resolution denouncing propaganda of a new war in whatever form. We remember that the United States representative, Mr. Austin then publicly declared that the Soviet draft condemning war propaganda should be nipped in the bud. The American delegation failed to do this, failed to prevent the adoption of the resolution condemning the propaganda of war. However, it must be admitted that in the course of the two years which have elapsed since then, no one has done more than the reactionary circles in the United States to kill this resolution in fact, to deprive it of any real meaning. More than that. In the course of these years, in a number of countries, and particularly in the United States and Great Britain, war propaganda, far from subsiding, has increased even more, having assumed wilder and more hysterical forms. The armaments race is simultaneously developing further, military budgets are still more inflated, constituting a heavy burden on the population, and other measures pursuing aggressive purposes are being carried out with even greater persistence.

True enough, at the same time opposition to this propaganda continues to grow on the part of the democratic forces which number in their ranks hundreds of millions of peace champions who, with ever increasing energy, come out against propaganda of and preparation for a new war. In April, 1949, the World Peace Congress held in Paris and Prague was attended by 561 national organizations of struggle for peace, by 12 international associations of

participants in the peace movement representing 600,000,000 organized supporters of peace. And all this despite all the obstacles encountered by the organizers of this Congress, the work of which in Paris, as is known, met with opposition on the part of the French authorities. Not only on a national, but also on an international scale hundreds of millions of people have united who have set themselves the task of preventing a new shambles, of preventing the aggressors from carrying out their criminal plot against peace and the peaceful co-operation of nations. This powerful movement of peoples for peace is a reliable token of the defeat of war and the victory of peace. "The mighty movement for peace testifies that the peoples constitute a force capable of curbing the aggressors," G. M. Malenkov said in his speech marking the 32nd anniversary of the Great October Revolution. But it is precisely the successes of the peoples' movement for peace that to an even greater extent enrage the adversaries of peace, the instigators of a new war.

But the fact remains a fact: propaganda for a new war does not cease and, as heretofore, is receiving support and encouragement from certain governments, particularly from the United States and Great Britain, which however, continue to hide behind highfalutin phrases about peace and co-operation of nations.

But now not only propaganda is the point at issue. The points at issue are the practical measures taken by way of preparations for war, the drawing up of military strategic plans, such measures as show that the threat of war has passed from the realm of general phrases and surmises into the realm of practical deeds and material and organizational measures. In this respect an important role is assigned to such measures as the North Atlantic Alliance, the aggressive nature of which its sponsors seek to camouflage with false phrases about defense, peace, and security. The mendacity of such phrases is exposed even by the fact that this alliance is opposed to a number of peace-loving states on the one hand and includes in its composition such states as are located outside the so-called North Atlantic area. This fully reveals the aggressive plans of the North Atlantic Alliance. The falseness of the allegations to the effect that the North Atlantic Alliance serves the cause of peace is also exposed by the fact that this alliance represents a hard and set grouping of states and, what is of particular

importance, completely ignores the possibility of a recurrence of German aggression against which the genuinely defensive treaties of the Soviet Union with the People's Democracies are aimed. Worthy of attention is the circumstance that only one of the great Powers—a party to the anti-Hitlerite coalition—the Soviet Union, does not take part in this treaty. This circumstance alone leaves no doubt that the North Atlantic Treaty is aimed against the USSR, that the North Atlantic Treaty is an aggressive treaty no matter what false phrases about defense its organizers and participants may use as a smokescreen.

Messrs. Acheson and Bevin in their speeches in the General Assembly attempted to prove that the Atlantic Pact and the Brussels Pact contribute to peace and the co-operation of nations and do not allegedly pursue any aggressive aims. But even such a newspaper as the *Wall Street Journal* could not but expose the genuinely aggressive meaning of the North Atlantic Pact when it stated that the "Atlantic Pact is being advertised as a means for preserving peace. It will be a queer peace established by means of converting the western world into an armed camp." (Editorial of May 17, 1949.)

The aggressive nature of the North Atlantic Pact, which is a tool of direct, immediate preparation for an imperialist war, does not call at present for any particular proof. Indeed, it is not accidental that one of the British Members of Parliament who zealously eulogized the North Atlantic Pact as a step forward along the path of strengthening peace could not but exclaim: "But the question I should like to ask this afternoon is when are we going to stop being on the defensive and go on the offensive?" (*Parliamentary Debates*, volume 463, pp. 460-461.) This Member of Parliament has accidentally told the truth about the aggressive aims of the North Atlantic Pact.

No cunning subterfuge will succeed in concealing from the peoples the truth about the essence of the military alliances organized under the leadership of the United States and Great Britain, or the fact that the ever growing rings of air and naval bases are not intended for mythical defense against the non-existing threat of an attack on the part of the Soviet Union, as is well known to the instigators of a new war, but for attack. It is not for defense but for preparation for an attack that tens of billions of

dollars are being allocated for the preparation of a new war and constituting a new burden shouldered by the peoples living in poverty and want.

In his budget message to Congress Mr. Truman boasted that "the armed forces recommended in the 1950 budget are the most powerful ever maintained by this country in peacetime," and that "expenditures for the development of natural resources alone, including atomic energy, will amount to almost 2,000,000,000 dollars." But the President of the United States admitted that the expenditures under the 1950-1951 budget will probably exceed those of 1950 and that the expenditures for armed forces can be expected to surpass considerably the level established in 1950. It was not fortuitous that, besides the expenditures envisaged for military measures by the United States 1950 budget, the President of the United States proposed the inclusion of a not yet specified sum for delivering war materials to the participants in the North Atlantic Pact. This sum, according to press reports, will total another 2,000,000,000 to 3,000,000,000 dollars.

It cannot be said that such statements are apt to bring consolation to the American people!

Secretary of Defense Johnson quite recently made a speech at a meeting of the American Artillery Association in New York stating that the aim of the United States policy is "peace through force." He boasted of the extent to which national military authorities had already carried out industrial mobilization in case of war. According to Johnson, out of 1,595 plants built in the United States during the war 60 per cent have already been earmarked as reserve plants to be utilized in case of emergency.

Similar absurd braggery is to be found in the recently published book *World Mission* by the former Commander of the American Army Air Forces, General Arnold, who naively asserted in that book that with the help of the monopoly of the atom bomb the United States is maintaining a "balance of power in the world."

It is known that a few months ago General Bradley stated: "We are the only country out of 12 that has the atom bomb. We are the sole country capable of carrying out strategic bombing." This statement was subsequently interpreted as the readiness of the United States to use the atom bomb against "any" aggressor in the future military actions of the North Atlantic Alliance!

The extent to which war hysteria has spread in certain American circles can be judged by such facts as the arrangement of lectures in the United States on special strategy in a war against the Soviet Union. By way of example we can refer to such lectures for officers at the air warfare college in Maxwell Field.

Such "lectures" and such literary exercises are mushrooming in the United States day in and day out. The warmongers spare no efforts in attempting to outstrip one another in working up a war psychosis and in instilling in the minds of people the maximum of poisonous hatred for other peoples, the poison of the idea of war.

Again resurrected and current in the reactionary circles of the United States, Britain, and other countries of the same camp is the maxim of the epoch of the Roman Empire: He who wants peace must prepare for war, a maxim the actual purport of which is to camouflage the preparation for war with idle talk of peace.

The warmongers are in a hurry knowing that time is against them, that the forces of peace and democracy are growing faster than the dark forces of reaction and aggression. The United States Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, in an article in the September issue of the *Army Information Digest* recently urged "immediate actions" and frankly stated: "We cannot afford waiting for several years until the full restoration of industrial output in Europe. If we wait we shall again run the risk of doing 'too little and too late.'"

In such an atmosphere successful work of the United Nations is out of the question. An end must be put to such a situation by everybody who really strives for international co-operation and strengthening of peace. Lunatics and semi-lunatics must not be permitted to play with fire. This situation must be ended.

The proposal laid down in point one of the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Government—to condemn the preparation for a new war—is directed toward this aim. The adoption of this proposal would signify a tremendous stride forward in the struggle against a new war, in the struggle for strengthening peace.

## To Prohibit the Atomic Weapon; to Establish Strict International Control

ON September 21 and on September 26, Mr. Acheson and Mr. Bevin, respectively also touched upon the question of prohibiting the atomic weapon. Now the positions of the United States and Great Britain in connection with the discussion of the atomic issue at the ad hoc committee are quite clear. The United States and Britain continue to adhere to the old stands upholding their American plan for so-called international control—the plan of Baruch-Acheson-Lilienthal. Now it is already clear who created the impasse in this question and who is interested in having no convention concluded on the prohibition of the atom bomb, in order to have a free hand in this respect.

Delay in consideration of the question of the prohibition of the atomic weapon was certainly part of the plan of action of the United States.

This is clear from the statement made by the Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Lilienthal on July 6 of the current year to the effect that in 1946 the United States was actually unarmed as regards the atomic weapon. Mr. Lilienthal unambiguously added that "this circumstance resulted in the commission devoting its entire attention to the production of atom bombs in such a quantity and of such a quality as to create a 'warning' to the aggressor."

To render the significance of this avowal absolutely clear it must be said that according to Mr. Lilienthal's admission the entire attention of the commission was then, as it is now, concentrated precisely on the production of bombs. In the report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission submitted to Congress on January 31, 1949, it was pointed out that "production and perfection of the atomic weapon remained the job of the Atomic Energy Commission to which most attention was devoted. Important progress was made in this field in 1948. Production of fissile materials was expanded. New samples of the weapon were successfully tested, and further improvements are being introduced at present." (*The New York Times*, February 1, 1949.)

Thus, parallel to the diplomatic negotiations on the prohibition of the atomic weapon and to the demagogic public demonstrations



by the United States of the alleged "good will" in this respect, secret commissions were evolving measures that would assure for the United States an accumulation of atom bombs in maximum quantity and in minimum time.

It is quite understandable that under such conditions, which prompted to the United States the aforementioned line of policy on the atomic question—the line of accumulating atom bombs—no serious hope could be entertained to reach an agreement with the United States on the prohibition of atom bombs and consequently on the cessation of their production. Is it not therein that an explanation should be sought for the irreconcilable attitude in this question of the United States and, of course, of Britain when Messrs. Acheson and Bevin declared that until the USSR accepts the American plan there is no hope to find a basis for agreement. The same was essentially confirmed by the President of the United States who declared that the American plan was the best. Thus, the Government of the United States from the very first steps at this Assembly slammed the door as regards the question of finding ways toward agreement on the prohibition of the atomic weapon and establishment of control over the implementation of this prohibition.

Following Mr. Acheson, Mr. Bevin also came out with an identical line, but one presented in a less diplomatic form. But even then Mr. Bevin could not help resorting to an obvious juggling with facts which, as is known, British diplomats never hesitate to use, particularly when the Soviet Union is in question. We all remember how Mr. Bevin praised to the sky the American plan for control over atomic energy, asserting that it assures effective prohibition of the atomic weapon. He naturally is not at all concerned with the circumstance that this plan rests on the liquidation of state sovereignty of which this plan leaves no stone unturned, that this plan spells complete subordination of the national economy and the entire economic and cultural development of the country to the so-called international control agency.

Since we devoted sufficient attention to the atomic issue in the ad hoc committee, I shall say no more. I shall only say a few words in connection with Mr. Pearson's statement on state sovereignty.

In the ad hoc committee Mr. Pearson also said that he regards as absurd the USSR's assertion to the effect that the American

plan eliminates state sovereignty. According to Pearson this is, on the contrary, a step forward. "This is not a loss of sovereignty," he said, "but utilization of sovereignty."

But no matter how this American plan may be appraised from the viewpoint of sovereignty, one thing is doubtlessly true, namely that the American plan certainly means renunciation of sovereignty. This however in no way troubles Mr. Pearson because state sovereignty according to him is a harmful "reactionary concept" which must be relegated to the archives of antiquities as soon as possible.

There is no denying the fact that speeches gladdening the hearts of American monopolists flow from the lips of the Pearsons who easily dispose of state independence and the sovereignty of other countries which hinder American imperialists in the establishment of their domination over other nations and the whole world. A consorted offensive of the Anglo-American camp against state sovereignty is not at all prompted by any lofty "humane" motives of love for peace and mankind. The genuine motive of this offensive is the striving to clear the way for American imperialism and to remove from its path the last obstacles to the establishment of its supremacy the world over. The crusade of the Anglo-American bloc against the state sovereignty of other countries is directly connected with such measures as the North Atlantic Pact or the "Marshall Plan" directed toward assuring the unconditional subjugation of these countries to the influence of the United States which proclaimed that henceforth it assumes upon itself entire responsibility for the destinies of the world. In view of such an appetite, what talk can there be of respect for any state sovereignty! In such conditions to speak of state sovereignty, as pointed out by one scientist, is tantamount to attempting to fit a square peg in a round hole! The "Marshall Plan" is incompatible with state sovereignty. It is not accidental that even some British Conservatives are compelled to admit that the successful implementation of the "Marshall Plan" would signify the conversion of Great Britain into such a part of the European Federation as Virginia is now in relation to the United States of America and as, judging by many signs, Canada intends to become in the near future, the sovereignty of which country Mr. Pearson already vociferously renounced a few days ago.

This is how matters stand as regards the question of sovereignty.

The defenders of the American plan for so-called international control attempt to present it as proof of the readiness of the United States Government to relinquish their alleged advantages in the field of atomic energy, as some sacrifice on the part of the United States. Such talk is particularly groundless in present conditions which no longer permit of speaking of any advantages of the United States in the field of atomic energy.

Thus the United Nations still faces the task of finding a way for the practical solution of the question on prohibition of the atomic weapon and for the institution of genuine international control. The General Assembly must fulfill its duty and recognize as inadmissible further delays in taking practical measures for solving the aforementioned task.

The proposals of France and Canada now under consideration at the ad hoc committee do not assure a settlement of this question. Not wishes or declarations are needed, but practical businesslike measures.

The second point in the Soviet Union's proposals draws attention precisely to this aspect of the matter.

In its proposals the Soviet Government recalls the fact that civilized nations have long since condemned as the gravest crime against mankind the utilization of poison gases and bacteriological means for war purposes.

The Soviet Government suggests that the General Assembly act in the same way with regard to the atomic weapon as civilized nations have acted in regard to the utilization of poison gases and bacteriological means for war purposes. But the very reference to the prohibition of utilization of bacteriological means and poison gases evoked, however astonishing it may seem, objections at the very beginning of this session, primarily on the part of the British Foreign Secretary Bevin. Mr. Bevin pointed out that the fact that poison gases had not been used in the Second World War had not at all been due to the existence of a convention but merely to the aggressors' fear of possible retaliatory measures on the part of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. But fear of retaliatory measures during a war can take place always. But it must be clear that such consideration can in no way serve as an argument against the proposal to prohibit the atomic weapon if the conclusion of such a convention is really desired. On the contrary,

those who do not want to conclude such a convention can invent a number of objections of all kinds with a mere view somehow to evade proposals inconvenient for them. We must not reckon with such considerations.

Prohibition of the atomic weapon, which is a weapon of aggression and the utilization of which runs counter to the honor and conscience of peoples, is necessary inasmuch as such a measure serves the cause of peace and security of nations.

Point two of the Soviet proposals on this issue emphasizes the incompatibility with membership in the United Nations of utilization of the atomic weapon and other means of mass destruction of peoples. Inadmissible and incompatible with the dignity of the United Nations are those chronic delays which occur in regard to this question. Almost four years have elapsed since the question of banning the atomic weapon was raised before the United Nations.

Over three years have passed since the United Nations unanimately declared itself in principle for the inadmissibility of utilizing atomic energy for war purposes and in favor of instituting international control for supervising the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes exclusively. But no progress has been made.

The Soviet Government calls upon the Assembly to recognize as inadmissible further delays in the United Nations taking practical measures for the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and for the institution of appropriate strict international control.

## V

### Five-Power Pact to Strengthen Peace

**T**HE proposals submitted by the Soviet delegation to the General Assembly on September 23 of the current year contain an appeal to the General Assembly that the latter express the wish that the United States of America, Great Britain, China, France, and the Soviet Union, bearing main responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security join their efforts for this purpose and conclude a mutual pact for strengthening peace. This proposal represents a natural consequence of the foreign policy which the Soviet Government has been pursuing in the course of the 32 years of its existence.

It is known that the Soviet policy is a policy of peace, that the

Soviet Union is for peace and consistently with utmost resolution defends the cause of peace, waging a struggle against all and every attempt to violate peace and impose war on the nations.

The policy of peace pursued by the Soviet Union from year to year, from decade to decade, follows from all the characteristic features of the Soviet Socialist State, the Soviet socialist social order. This policy serves the interests of Soviet people, the builders of a new socialist society, as well as the interests of all peace-loving nations, of all mankind.

The peaceful policy of the Soviet Union determines also the measures which the Soviet Government takes in international relations, in the interests of co-operation among all countries which desire such co-operation, in the interests of consolidating peaceful relations among nations and assuring their security.

Carrying out its policy of peace the Soviet Government comes out and has come out against the organization of all and every military aggressive grouping, military blocs and pacts. The peaceful Soviet policy explains also that support which the Soviet Union invariably renders to the cause of strengthening the United Nations believing that in this respect an important and serious role cannot but belong, and actually does belong, to the United Nations.

It is known that in 1934 the Soviet Union joined the League of Nations proceeding from the concept that, as was said once by the head of the Soviet Government, J. V. Stalin, "despite its weakness the League can still be useful as a platform for exposing aggressors and as some, though weak, instrument of peace capable of hindering the unleashing of war."

We distinctly realize now, too, what difficulties are involved in the struggle for peace at present particularly in an atmosphere of various military combinations launched by certain states and primarily by the United States and Great Britain, in an atmosphere of formation and development of the activity of military blocs as, for instance, the North Atlantic or so-called Western European bloc.

But the Soviet Union has encountered difficulties in the struggle for peace before, too. Speaking of the international situation in 1934, the leader of the Soviet people, J. V. Stalin, pointed out that even in the difficult international conditions of that period the

Soviet Union followed its foreign policy defending the cause of preserving peace.

It would also be appropriate to recall the period immediately preceding the Second World War when war, as pointed out by J. V. Stalin, having undermined the mainstays of the postwar peaceful regime and having upset the elementary concepts of international law, cast doubt on the value of international treaties and obligations. "Pacifism and disarmament projects," J. V. Stalin said, "turned out to be buried in the coffin. Their place was taken by an armaments fever. All, from small to big states, began to arm, including first and foremost the states pursuing the policy of non-interference."

Even under those conditions the Soviet Union continued unwaveringly to pursue the policy of preserving peace, having concluded a number of treaties of mutual assistance against the possible attack of aggressors (with France in 1935, with Czechoslovakia in the same year, with the Mongolian People's Republic in 1936, with the Chinese Republic in 1937). This was a time, as we all remember, when the relations both between the capitalist countries and within those countries were seriously aggravated and when the disarmament tendencies of the preceding years gave place to tendencies of arming and expanding armaments. In relation to this period the leader of the Soviet people, J. V. Stalin, said: "Among these tempestuous waves of economic upheavals and military and political catastrophes the USSR stands like a rock continuing its work of socialist construction and the struggle for preserving peace."

The Soviet Government's efforts aimed at assuring peace were not unsuccessful since, as a result of these efforts, the Soviet Union concluded with a number of countries non-aggression pacts and pacts of peaceful settlement of disputes.

The Soviet Union, pursuing its peaceful policy, relied not only on its internal forces but also on the common sense of those countries which for some reason or other were not interested in violating peace. In March, 1939, J. V. Stalin, speaking of the relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries, again pointed out that "we stand for peace and the strengthening of business relations with all countries; we adhere and shall adhere to this position as long as these countries maintain like relations with

the Soviet Union, and as long as they make no attempt to trespass on the interests of our country.”

The Soviet Government's foreign policy program fully corresponds to the great task of strengthening peace and international security.

Having victoriously ended the Second World War the Soviet Union has signed a number of international agreements of tremendous historical importance. The agreements in Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam determined a number of most important measures in postwar settlement of tremendous historical significance.

The Soviet Union strictly and unswervingly fulfills the obligations it has assumed, insisting on the fulfillment of the obligations by other Powers which signed those agreements. In the interests of peace the Soviet Government has raised the question of concluding a peace treaty with Japan.

The Soviet proposal on universal regulation and reduction of armaments and armed forces, on prohibition of the atomic weapon, on condemnation of war propaganda in any form whatever, the proposal on a one-third reduction by the five Powers of their armed forces and armaments—all these proposals made by the Soviet Union in the course of 1946-1948 serve one aim: to strengthen peace, to assure security of nations. The same purpose is served by the proposals submitted by the Soviet delegation to the present session of the General Assembly concerning the condemnation of preparation for a new war and conclusion of a five-Power pact for strengthening peace.

The Soviet Government taking into consideration that the main responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security rests with five Powers—the permanent members of the Security Council—proposes that the General Assembly appeal to these Powers urging them to join their efforts for this purpose and conclude a mutual pact for strengthening peace.

The Soviet delegation expresses the confidence that these proposals will meet with due support on the part of other delegations. The Soviet delegation is convinced that adoption of these proposals will serve to strengthen peace, the interests of which the United Nations is called upon to serve.

# Speech of November 16, 1949 before the Political Committee of the General Assembly

## The Five Powers Bear the Main Responsibility for Peace

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

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

A number of speakers objected to the main proposal of the Soviet Government for the conclusion of a pact of five Powers and referred to the fact that all member-states of the United Nations bear the responsibility for peace. This of course is true, since no single member-state of the United Nations can be relieved of responsibility either for the instigation and preparation of a new war or for the cause of peace, but no matter what may be said here on this score one cannot dispute the fact that the main responsibility for peace is borne by the five permanent members of the Security Council and that this responsibility devolves upon them precisely because of the special role which they play in international relations by virtue of their international position. For this reason one must resolutely reject the attempts to minimize the degree of responsibility for the cause of peace borne by the



five great Powers, must reject attempts, by talk of equal responsibility of all member-states of the United Nations, to relieve the great Powers of this responsibility which really rests primarily and most of all with them. This responsibility of the great Powers is a fact which one can in no way evade. Those who deny such responsibility or try to minimize it in every way possible, hiding behind all member-states of the United Nations, merely prove not only their unwillingness to bear such responsibility but also their unwillingness to take effective measures which it is necessary to take in the interests of the consolidation of peace and security of nations.

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

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

First, it is evidence that for a number of years the war propaganda conducted in a number of countries, and primarily in the United States and Britain, does not cease, and of late the preparation of a new war too has developed extensively.

Second, this is evidence of our persistent striving to draw the General Assembly into an earnest elaboration of measures for the consolidation of peace. This is evidence that the USSR pursues a really consistent policy, wages a consistent struggle not only against the propaganda of war but also against the preparation of a new war.

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

## II

### American Militarists Seek to Conceal the Preparation of a New War

**M**R. AUSTIN denies that the preparation of a new war is conducted in the United States. To deny is insufficient. It is necessary to prove that preparation of war is not being conducted.

I have cited a number of facts, a number of proofs that preparation of war is being conducted. Perhaps the presented facts are insufficient, perhaps Mr. Austin considers that they do not prove anything? In that case Mr. Austin ought to prove it. But he has made no attempt whatever to prove anything, to show in what way the insolvency of our proof is manifested. Not a single fact was adduced in refutation of our assertions, which are corroborated by numerous data.

Has Mr. Austin refuted the maniacal pronouncements on war made by General Bradley? Has he refuted the maniacal utterances of the United States Secretary of Defense Johnson? But these are not insignificant people in the governmental system of the United States of America, these are the official representatives of the American Government!

One could expect that Austin would cite some kind of explanations for these maniacal speeches, that he would say: "You do not interpret properly what General Bradley said," or "He did not say this, he did not have this in mind, he said something else, you distorted, you misinterpreted, your proof therefore cannot be believed." Austin said nothing of the kind. He kept silent, posing as an Egyptian sphinx, whom incidentally I do not envy—not Mr. Austin, but the sphinx. And Austin simply let all these facts slip by. I pointed also to such facts as the organization in the military schools of the United States of a special course which is called "A Course of Special Strategy in the War against the Soviet Union." This course is being read not in some place, in some club of insane or semi-sane people, but in the military school at Maxwell Field. I now ask, perhaps this is untrue? No, it is true, and Austin could not deny it and did not deny it.

The entire reactionary American press screams and howls, clamoring for Soviet blood. Austin maintains an imperturbable calm as if nothing of the kind were taking place in reality, as if this press were singing love roudades dedicated to the USSR and not publishing despicable slander, outright calls for war on the USSR.

You demand facts. We have cited these facts. If this is insufficient for you we shall cite some more.

Austin expressed obvious displeasure with our proposals. He is dissatisfied in general that we speak the truth, that war preparation is called by us war preparation, that warmongers are called by us

warmongers. Austin is dissatisfied that we call things and people by their proper names. He said outright that abuse does not facilitate constructive co-operation, that provocation cannot serve as a contribution to friendly co-operation.

Of what friendly co-operation does Mr. Austin speak when the American militarists openly incite to war against the USSR? Of what provocation does Mr. Austin speak, unless this is to be applied to the behavior of Messrs. the American militarists? Austin says that the USSR proposal is directed at condemning the United States of America and Great Britain for preparing a new war. Yes, this is so. We have said it in the first sentence of our proposals. We said it at the plenary session on September 23. We repeated it here on November 14; I repeat it today.

We are told: This is a grave accusation. Yes, it is. But it is an accusation based on facts. You say: We must thus become a court and must therefore examine these facts. I welcome this but I cannot agree with speeches such, for example, as the speech of the Peruvian delegate who did not cite any facts whatever, who spoke more about his diplomatic practice, his splendid experience as a diplomat, who spoke about Bolivar and anything you please but said nothing concerning the substance of our proposals. This is not an examination of the matter, not a study of facts, and under such a situation you of course have no right to regard yourselves as the supreme court in matters of international import.

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

We promised to present additional facts, we shall do so, but we are entitled to present our demand which consists in that it is necessary to settle with the facts we have already cited. You ignore them, you say: Give us other facts. We shall give you other facts but you—I address my critics—bear in mind that we will remember that you have not settled with those facts, that you are indebted to us, that you prefer to keep silent about these facts. Thereby you have already said what these facts mean, what weight they carry.

Let us then turn to the facts. These facts show that the reactionary circles of the United States of America, Great Britain and certain other states—there is no need to enumerate them all—are preparing a new war. The leading role here belongs to the ruling circles of the United States of America which openly support the preparation of a new war which is manifested not only in propaganda but also in the precipitous growth of military budgets, in the armaments race, in the organization of bases which have the specific purpose of preparing the war; in organizing blocs which have the specific purpose of effecting the war.

What facts have we? Be so kind as to listen.

In September, 1945, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Hensel, outlining the view of his department at a public press conference, said that the United States must secure for itself a gigantic postwar ring of naval bases encompassing the Pacific Ocean, including the bases which formerly belonged to Britain. And indeed, according to authoritative data which no one has disputed as yet, throughout the war the United States of America built 256 bases of all dimensions and all types in the Pacific theater of war, and 228 military, naval, and air bases in the Atlantic theater of war, that is, altogether 484 bases. Since then the number of these bases has increased.

In October, 1948, a communiqué was published in London confirming that there are permanent bases for American superpowerful "flying fortresses" in Britain and that stationed on these bases were 90 American superpowerful B-29 "flying fortresses" subdivided into three groups of the strategic bomber air force. The former Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, General Spaatz, boasted then, counting on intimidating people with weak nerves, that these 90 American bombers translated into the language of atomic firepower would be equivalent to 19,800 superpowerful "flying fortresses."

Only recently, on November 4, 1949, *The New York Times* published a dispatch stating that after twenty-four hours of grave consideration the British Government finally agreed, on November 3, to accept the proposal of the United States to turn over to Britain 70 American B-29 bombers. These bombers would soon be sent to Britain as part of the military aid program in conformity with the terms of the North Atlantic Pact. The aforementioned

decision was taken by the British Government after a prolonged discussion, in the course of which high ranking officers of the Royal Air Force, officials of the Ministry of Aviation and the Defense Committee of the Cabinet of Ministers who took part in it disagreed on the expediency of accepting these American planes.

What do these indisputable facts show?

They show, first, that Britain has no faith in herself, that she recognizes her military weakness, that she turns over the destiny of the country into the hands of the American armed forces and consequently, into the hands of those who direct these armed forces.

Moreover, this is evidence that imposing air and military forces are being mustered precisely in Britain, that Britain has been turned into an American military base from which objects of attack could be easily reached. Which? Ponder this question. Well, who is to be attacked by these 19,800 bombers translated into the language of atomic firepower? Who? France? Belgium? Luxembourg? Western Germany? Sweden? Norway? Who?

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

The United States of America is building its bases on territories of other countries, including Great Britain, and at the same time accuses the Soviet Union of preparing an armed attack. It turns out that those who build bases are not preparing for an attack while those who do not build bases are preparing to attack! But after all one does not attack with bare hands! Those who are arming are peace-loving people, they are peacemakers; while those who demand disarmament, who demand signing of a treaty for the consolidation of peace—those are the real aggressors! But do you think that anyone will believe such logic? Do you think that such logic can convince anyone of anything?

Let us proceed. In 1948 *The New York Times* carried a dispatch from Nicosia (Cyprus) that Cyprus is being turned by the Americans and British into an important strategic base which must become, as the correspondent puts it, a point of support against

Soviet expansion. This means that Cyprus has been included in this system of attack on the Soviet Union.

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

In September, 1948—this is known to the entire world—Senator Gurney, Chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate, met Franco. The Madrid correspondent of the *Daily Mail* reported that in exchange for granting bases to the United States of America, Franco demanded the admission of Spain into the United Nations and the extension to her of all the benefits given to the Marshallized countries.

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

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

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

In July, 1949, the Associated Press published a report that the

United States is drawing up a plan for setting up advance air bases deep in the heart of the Arctic, and explained why this was necessary for the United States. It turns out that this was necessary because planes could refuel there during operations across the North Pole.

Will you be so kind as to tell us against whom these operations across the North Pole will be directed?

Perhaps against Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Iceland?

Across the North Pole—against whom could these operations be effected? Operations for which such tremendous preparation is necessary: bases, hundreds of planes, and the atom bomb which, as is known, is the last hope of the American militarists.

Was there a denial of the report of the same Associated Press, a report which said that they, the editors, happened to get hold of a report of the Department of the Air Force, the American Department of the Air Force, about the plans and estimates connected with setting up of bases for heavy bombers in Limestone, Maine, which said: "A typical Arctic operation may require that planes taking off from air bases in the United States of America should refuel at advanced bases in Northern Canada, Greenland or even on the Arctic ice . . ."

One could cite a host of other facts which prove the full justification for anxiety, the full justification for the assertions about the preparation of a new war being conducted under cover of all kinds of peaceful or peaceloving phraseology.

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

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

One cannot regard as an answer to these questions the speeches which we hear from time to time from American representatives—military and civilian—former and present senators—speeches about

a military vacuum which, don't you see, must be filled because the law of physics says that nature abhors a vacuum . . . or speeches about the need of mutual assistance, defense, when it is known that no one intends to attack the United States or the other participants in the North Atlantic Pact and consequently there is no one to defend against.

### III

#### The North Atlantic Union—An Instrument of Aggression and Not An Instrument of Peace

AUSTIN tried here to convince us of the peace-loving policy of the United States.

He quoted in his speech a statement of the Foreign Relations Committee of the American Senate as proof, as he said, that the main aim of the North Atlantic Pact is to assist in attaining the prime object of the United Nations, namely maintenance of peace and security. Austin quoted also that section of this statement which says that the North Atlantic union is a union only against war itself. In doing so he said also—I am quoting him—that “the policy of the United States of America is directed exclusively at ensuring international peace and security through the medium of the United Nations so that the armed forces should not be used otherwise than in the common interest.” Austin asserted further that “the United States seeks to secure armed forces to the United Nations, as envisaged in the Charter.”

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

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

If with the United Nations in existence it is possible to have a



North Atlantic Pact, even with the most peace-loving aims, a pact of twelve states, while the United Nations organization consists of 59 states, why is it impossible to have a pact of five states? Why is this regarded as contrary to the principles of the United Nations?

I must state that everything that is being said about the peaceful aims of the North Atlantic Pact does not withstand any criticism, nor does the reference to the alleged acting of the North Atlantic pact through the United Nations in the common interest withstand criticism. This does not correspond to reality because the United Nations gave no consent to the establishment of the North Atlantic union. You organized this union without us and without many other states and for a perfectly natural reason. Because this union is directed against us.

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

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

If the North Atlantic Pact deals with peace, why, in such a case, does the United States thwart the elaboration of measures for setting up armed forces of the United Nations? Why have we been unable for four years to reach an understanding about the contingents of armed forces of the United Nations, to reach an understanding on the qualitative and quantitative principle of the organization of armed forces? If the policy of the United States is really directed at ensuring peace and security through the United Nations, as you assert, how in such a case is it possible to set up such an organization as the North Atlantic union outside of the United Nations, even in an atmosphere of competition with the

United Nations? What relation does the United Nations bear to the North Atlantic union outside of the fact that 12 of the 59 states present here are participants in this union?

What right have you, Mr. Austin, to say that the North Atlantic union is a union set up through the medium of the United Nations and in such a way that the armed forces of the United Nations should not be used otherwise than in common interests? In whose common interests will the armed forces of this North Atlantic union be used if they are to be used? Whose "common interests" will these be? Twelve states participate in this union, 59 states participate in the United Nations, and outside of the organization remain a goodly 10 other possible participants in this organization. In whose "common interests" will the armed forces be used at the command of these 12 states, or, more exactly, the one state which runs all these affairs—the United States of America?

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

#### IV

#### Instead of International Control—An American Supertrust

AUSTIN is displeased with paragraph 2 of the Soviet Union's proposals, which speaks of practical measures for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and international control over the implementation of this prohibition. What has Mr. Austin expounded on this score, becoming for a time a real poet? This, it turns out, is "a sweet-sounding paragraph." This, it turns out, is "an artificial branch surrounded by thorns," this lastly is "lofty talk of peace which sounds like war." Not a senator, though a former one, but a veritable poet! But what did he say besides this on the substance of paragraph 2? I can assert that if one is to cast aside all these verbal trappings, all these belabored attempts at poetic imagery, what remains is only Mr. Austin's irritation. It is precisely only a state of irritation and loss of self-control which can explain this entire part of Austin's speech in which he said that

we allegedly ignore the conclusion of the General Assembly that effective prohibition of the atomic weapon can be attained only by turning over all dangerous atomic materials and all means for manufacture and utilization into the hands of an international agency which the American delegates call an international co-operative.

But this, too, does not correspond to reality. Indeed, do we ignore the General Assembly's decision? On the contrary, we have thoroughly analyzed it and proved that this demand for placing all atomic raw materials and all enterprises processing these raw materials at the disposal of the so-called international agency, whether on the basis of property rights or ownership rights, is unacceptable. And we have shown why. All our opponents were irritated by the fact that we defend state sovereignty, that we oppose the conversion of the international control agency into an American super-trust. They attempted to reduce this entire matter to some theoretical talks about a juridical concept. But the point at issue is quite different indeed. I have quoted here the 1946 memorandum of the commission headed by Mr. Acheson, I have quoted a number of other documents and specifically the statement made by Mr. Barnard, whom Mr. Austin undoubtedly knows, a statement which reveals the ins and outs of this proposal on transferral of atomic resources to the ownership of the international control agency and of the opposition to our proposals. These questions remained unexplained although an elucidation of these questions would have eliminated many grounds for all sorts of differences of opinion which are tearing us asunder here.

But this has not been done either. We say that transferring to the ownership of this international control agency all the atomic resources of every country, all enterprises processing atomic materials, all enterprises of so-called related industries—metallurgical, chemical, etc., as well as all scientific research—to transfer all this to the ownership of this agency is impossible because it would mean paralyzing the entire economic system, particularly in those countries where energetics play the decisive role while atomic energy plays a particular role in the development of the national economy. Let us leave the question of sovereignty alone. Let it be a threadbare, old, some sort of feudal, medieval theory as asserted here. All this is certainly wrong. But let us leave it at that. Let us

break away from the captivity of legalistic scholastics and let us approach it from the viewpoint of life of states and nations. From this position too it is necessary to reject the American proposal to turn over the atomic resources and enterprises to the ownership of the control agency, because we cannot allow the entire economy to be subjected to the control of this agency by means of the American plan, which incidentally is deficient, as admitted by its authors themselves.

Besides, it can be regarded as established that the turning over of the atomic energy resources to the ownership of the control agency is not called forth by any necessity. This is said by persons of authority, by the Americans themselves. There are no grounds whatever for such a plan and such proposals except the striving to lay hands on the entire setup of atomic energy, to concentrate it all in one's fist and become the monopolist who would dictate to any country the lines of development of its economy, the lines of development of this country. The matter at issue is not theories of state sovereignty, although this to a great extent concerns state sovereignty too. In no way can we agree to a denial of sovereignty, of which we have heard here and not for the first year. The matters at issue are the vital interests of a country, and only those who have nothing to lose in this respect or those who by the course of historical developments have been placed in such a position that they are incapable of offering opposition, that they are compelled to drink this cup of bitterness to the last drop, only those have no choice.

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

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

But is it possible to find such a way? It is possible. And I shall particularly prove this later in connection with a very important question which was raised here about war and about the existence

of two systems, about the possibility of co-operation, about the statements of our great teachers, Lenin and Stalin, our teachers Marx and Engels. Yes, gentlemen, we are guided and inspired by Marxism and Leninism. We stand on these grounds, since they constitute the greatest achievement of science in the realms of sociology, economy, and the study of the paths of the social development of humanity, and our activity is built on the basis of science and not utopia. But now I want to speak about the Soviet proposals and about the extent of the honesty of the criticism of our critics.

The Soviet proposals are very modest. Our proposals on atomic energy are reflected in paragraph 2.

The Soviet proposals boil down to the proposal that the General Assembly instruct, direct, recommend to the Atomic Energy Commission that it not delay any further but get on with the practical measures for the prohibition of the atomic weapon, for the establishment of strict international control. Can such a proposal hinder or harm the matter in the eyes of those who are genuinely interested in it? Does the adoption of such a proposal exclude the duty of the Atomic Energy Commission or any other appropriately authorized body to begin drawing up practical measures for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and for control? But I shall not err if I say that the decision on atomic energy adopted yesterday in the Special Political Committee, and which will of course be approved by the General Assembly, will have the same practical importance as had all the previous decisions of the General Assembly on this issue, that is, no importance whatever.

Here we do not need words but we do need practical deeds and we have only one request to the Political Committee No. 1 and through it to the General Assembly—to adopt such a decision as would make it obligatory to tackle the practical task. If you want to prohibit the atomic weapon, then order that practical measures be drawn up. But you do not want to do it by way of instructing that practical measures be drawn up. This gives us the right to assert for the whole world to hear that you do not want the prohibition of the atomic weapon. This is attested to by the already quoted report of Mr. Acheson's commission, the report which you, the defenders of this plan, are attempting to gloss over. But you will not succeed in glossing it over since Mr. Acheson's letter states

in essence: "Here you have the control plan which we have worked out. But do not think, Messrs. Senators, that by adopting this plan the United States will be obliged to discontinue the production of atomic bombs. No, the United States will not at all be obliged to do so. This will still be decided by Congress in the light of higher politics; we shall settle this by our constitutional procedure irrespective of the plan for international control. In other words we shall vote in the Senate as we like if we desire to preserve these bombs and to increase their stocks." More than that, from the aforementioned report it is clear, as said by Lilienthal, chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, that the main attention of this commission is not directed toward inventing methods for suspending production of the atomic weapon, but toward accumulating as many atom bombs as possible. As far back as 1946 Lilienthal's commission realized that the hour would come, and that it would be struck by the clock of history, when other states also would be in a position to compete with the United States as regards the production of atom bombs! And this hour has struck, and struck several years earlier than estimated by the American star-gazers.

Now we are striving for the prohibition of the atomic weapon and establishment of strict international control over the implementation of this prohibition. We are offered such a plan as cannot satisfy anyone but those who want neither prohibition nor control. But we are being assured of the contrary by assertions that they—our critics—are also for prohibition and control. We say: Good, but let us begin to work together on the practical measures. But to this we get the reply: "This is useless! Accept our plan." We however say: "Your plan is no good." And this is said not only by us but it is also said by your own representatives as, for instance, Mr. Osborn. Your refusal to accept our proposals exposes you completely.

Mr. Austin suggested that the Political Committee No. 1 reject paragraph 2 of our proposals. In doing so he referred to the fact that the ad hoc committee had already examined the question of atomic energy. But this need not prevent the Political Committee from accepting our proposals on drawing up practical proposals on prohibition and control, the more so as the ad hoc committee had not considered or adopted such a proposal. The rejection of a

proposal such as is laid down in paragraph 2 of our draft resolution can be demanded only by those who are not interested in speeding this work, not interested in the prohibition of the atomic weapon.

## V

### Anglo-American Critics Try to Deceive Public Opinion

**N**OW a few words about other questions touched upon by Mr. Austin—about the elections in Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Poland. All these questions were dragged in here by the hair in order to divert public attention from the Soviet Government's proposals on strengthening peace, in order to deceive public opinion. My Polish colleague has replied to the questions regarding Poland. I shall say a few words in connection with what was said here by Austin about the other countries. First of all I shall recall what we said on this subject while discussing the question of the alleged violation by the Governments of Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania of so-called human rights and basic liberties; we spoke about all this rather in detail. We cited facts and you voted. We cited facts and you were silent. But the head of the Polish delegation, Wierblowski, opportunely recalled the Greek elections which had been accompanied by swindles and falsifications. Indeed it is a fact that a member of the International Control Commission, a professor of a California university who exposed these falsifications, was driven out of this commission. All this Austin and McNeil passed in silence, preferring to indulge in insinuations with regard to the elections in the People's Democracies. Austin thought it somehow appropriate to repeat the gossip to the effect that in 1945 I allegedly had presented the Romanian king an ultimatum demanding a reply within two hours and five seconds. Where did Austin get such accurate information? Is it from the ex-king himself? Maybe we ought to invite the ex-king to come here and question him?

Actually of course there was no ultimatum of any kind. There was General Radescu's conspiracy, the treason of a handful of generals—Hitler's agents. It was in February, 1945. It was the time when the Red Army was fiercely fighting its way toward Berlin and when Radescu and other traitors planned to undermine the Red Army's rear. In those conditions it was necessary to draw the

ex-king's attention to the situation that had arisen and to propose that the General Radescu government be replaced by a government enjoying the confidence of the Romanian people. And this was done. General Radescu resigned, and the resignation was accepted. General Radescu immediately took refuge in the British Embassy in Bucharest and subsequently, as is known, went to the United States where he is now in the company of other traitors and adventurers who are conspiring against the Romanian People's Democratic Republic.

If this question is to be referred to, then it should be recalled that in the same year of 1945, on the strength of a decision taken at the conference of three ministers of the United States, Great Britain and the USSR, a commission composed of your humble servant, the British Ambassador in Moscow, Kerr, and the American Ambassador in Moscow, Harriman, visited Bucharest and conducted negotiations with the same ex-king Michael and the Romanian Government on adding to Dr. P. Groza's government two members of the Tsaranist and Liberal Parties, which was also done.

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

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

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

## VI

### The Provocative Raving of the Tito Clique

**F**OLLOWING Austin, the floor was taken by the representative of the Tito clique who protested that I call him so, but I have no intention of changing my formulation. He tried to make insinua-



tions against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies.

Of course the Soviet proposals to strengthen peace and security of nations evoked the unconcealed irritation of this gentleman. He joined his voice to the chorus of slander against and enmity for the land of socialism. Mr. Djilas, who spoke on behalf of this group, was displeased by the fact that the Soviet proposals give, as he said, an incomplete and one-sided definition of war propaganda. He would like this definition to be extended in a direction for which there is no need whatever, because there are no grounds at all for those dark suspicions about which this speaker babbled here, having evidently lost all vestiges of shame. He tried to accuse us of exerting pressure on Yugoslavia, of even breaking the treaty of friendship. But did not Tito break the agreement on the Joint Stock Yugoslav-Soviet Danube Shipping Company? Did not Tito break the agreement on the Joint Stock Soviet-Yugoslav Transport Aviation Company? At whose initiative were these agreements on mixed companies broken? And did not the Tito Government permit itself to arrest Soviet people en masse, people whom it did not accuse, as is shown in its notes, of espionage, as Djilas falsely asserted here yesterday, but arrested them allegedly because they had been White Guards in the past, but in reality because they favored friendly relations with the Soviet Union?

Criticizing the Soviet proposals, Djilas almost word for word repeated what Bevin said on September 26 at the plenary meeting of the General Assembly. Bevin stated then that our proposals were a serious blow at co-operation, at the hopes for the strengthening of peace. Djilas repeats Bevin. "This," he said, "is a serious blow at the strengthening of peace." One cannot say that the gentlemen representatives of the Tito clique are poor students. They perfect themselves from month to month, increasingly grow into the camp of imperialists to which they deserted. It is no surprise to hear such slander and insinuations from these gentlemen!

Djilas devoted no little time to Rajk's trial seeking to prove that this trial allegedly was poorly put together. This is not new.

It is known that the Tito-ites have specialized in spreading all sorts of vile gossip. They have for this purpose such an expert as Mosa Pijado who in his exercises in slander does not disdain any abomination on any question pertaining to the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. He excels also in slander regarding Rajk's trial. Djilas

wants to outdo Pijado in inventing all sorts of fables. Djilas spared no words in the attempt to discredit Rajk's testimony and the trial as a whole. But it should be admitted that nothing came of it. He kept silent about a number of important facts disclosed at the trial of Rajk, facts fatal for the Tito clique. Djilas for example, kept silence about the testimony of Brankov. Yet Brankov was not the smallest pawn in the company of Tito-Djilas-Rankovic. Inveterate spy, chief secret agent of the Yugoslav intelligence service in Hungary—such was Laza Brankov. He was an agent directly subordinated to General Milic and the Yugoslav Minister of the Interior Rankovic. His testimony is widely known. Has Djilas forgotten about it? I can remind him of it.

Brankov testified in court specifically that during the war Misha Lompar was sent to Switzerland with the assignment of establishing contact with the leader of the American espionage organization in Europe, Allen Dulles.

This Misha Lompar contacted the chief of the American espionage organization in Europe, Allen Dulles. On arriving in Switzerland, Lompar also established contact with the Trotskyite groups which were there. Latinovic, who was in Marseilles, and Vasa Jovanovic, who was in Bari, established close relations with the Anglo-American intelligence service. General Velebit, a generally known old British spy, was in London. He turned over to the British intelligence service all the materials at his disposal, including information about the Soviet Army. According to Brankov's testimony, he learned about this from the secret archives of UDB (State Security Administration). This is what Brankov testified. But Djilas has "forgotten" to refute it. He did not deem it necessary to do so, he preferred to speak at length here about some sort of inaccuracies in Rajk's testimony!

Rajk's trial disclosed a great deal which had not been known before and covered with eternal shame the Tito clique which claims that it represents the Yugoslav people and that it also, don't you see, is a builder of socialism. It was precisely in this connection that the Soviet Government was confronted with the problem of the attitude to the treaty of friendship signed with Yugoslavia in 1945. Djilas of course knows that the note of the Soviet Government of September 28 pointed out that in the course of the trial of the state criminal and spy Rajk and his accomplices who at the

same time were agents of the Yugoslav Government, it was disclosed that the Yugoslav Government had been waging for a long time gravely inimical subversive activity against the Soviet Union, hypocritically taking cover behind the treaty of friendship, and that thus this treaty had already then been trampled under foot by the Yugoslav Government.

Such are the facts.

## VII

### Slanderers in the Role of "Theoreticians"

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

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

Cannot one advise Mr. Canadian Senator not to worry about these districts, let this be a matter for these districts themselves and that he rather be worried about the sordid fate of Canada. . . .

*(Mr. Martin interrupted the speech by the remark that he is not a senator.)*

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

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

Martin is also worried by the fact that according to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism war is inevitable in the history of mankind

while he, Martin, does not want, as he asserts, that there should be war. But why then does Mr. Martin not agree to record this in the international document, in an appropriate international treaty? Why does not he want to support our proposal that the five Powers conclude a pact for the strengthening of peace?

Why then does this supporter of peace run away from our proposals on peace like a devil from holy water?

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

What did our teacher V. I. Lenin really say in this cited section about the military organization of the proletarian state? When did he say it? Under what circumstances? What is the real meaning of V. I. Lenin's words?

I deem it necessary to reply to these questions because without replying to these questions one cannot claim to understand properly what was said by the great Lenin. This was in 1919. This was at the time when the young Soviet Republic was encompassed by a ring of enemy states. Already then the well-known defender of the capitalist classes, the former Marxist, Kautsky, (I hope this name is familiar to Mr. Martin, I am not certain of it but I hope) tried to accuse the Bolsheviks of having "not socialism but militarism." Thus Martin has not discovered any America but has merely repeated the elementary utterances of well-known slanderers against the Soviet Union.

On this score Vladimir Ilyich Lenin said at the Eighth Congress of the Party in 1919: "I smiled and shrugged my shoulders. As though indeed there has been a single big revolution in history which was not connected with war." This is a remarkable statement by V. I. Lenin. It was precisely the war which pressed from all sides on the young socialist republic and brought to the fore the question that the proletariat on becoming the dominating class build its own military organization capable of defending its frontiers—the frontiers of the young socialist state. Could one act otherwise under con-

ditions when the enemy attacked on all sides, when the fate of the young socialist state of workers and peasants literally hung in the balance? It is clear that under those circumstances one could not act otherwise, that it was necessary and imperative not only to speak of a military organization but also to build this military organization for repulsing the crusade of 14 states organized in 1918-1919 under the guidance of Winston Churchill.

One must say that in raising this question Martin is at least one year late, because at the third session of the General Assembly in Paris similar claims to interpret Marxism-Leninism were already made by no one else but—I was about to say senator—ex-senator Austin. He at that time cited the section from the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) Short Course*, which reads that war is an inevitable concomitant of capitalism and that there are just wars which are waged to liberate people from capitalist slavery, and that there are unjust wars. Mr. Austin wanted to prove that the Soviet Union seeks to destroy the capitalist states, considering war inevitable, and that the Soviet Union thus by no means strives for peaceful aims. From this Mr. Austin also drew the conclusion that consequently all the proposals of the Soviet Union directed at the strengthening of peace are hypocritical, insincere, because how can one propose to strengthen peace while advocating at the same time the inevitability of war?

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

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

These social phenomena are engendered by the very system of capitalist society and by no means by individual psychology or cer-

tain traits of people, violation of their rights and freedom, and so on and so forth. Violation of rights is itself a result of this system. The greatest service of Marxism-Leninism (I beg to be excused for having to speak about it here since perhaps it would be more suitable to speak about it at some university rostrum, but my opponents force me to delve into this field. I know whom I am addressing; for this reason I do not want to convince or "propagandize" anyone of anything. I am speaking about it to eliminate distortions in the interpretation of our great teachings). I repeat: the greatest service of Marxism-Leninism lies precisely in that it has found the key to a study of the laws of the development of human society and thereby to understanding of the laws of history of this society. It has found this key not in the minds of men, not in the views and ideas of society but in the means of production, in the organization of social relations and, first of all, of production relations in each historic period. But subordination of the development of human society to certain laws does not signify that man is reduced to the role of blind subjugation to the action of these laws. Man is man. The Canadian delegate said that man is the image of God.

Looking at my opponent I would not say that this maxim always holds good.

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

People, classes of society therefore play a tremendous role, and this means that the activity of people who are able to regulate social relations plays a tremendous role.

This task is effected by the internal and foreign policy of one or another state.

## VIII

### Soviet Foreign Policy—A Policy of Peace

**T**HE task of the foreign policy of the socialist state consists in restricting or completely eliminating such social vices as war, by undertaking measures capable of coping with this task. One of these

measures is organization of the peace-loving forces of society in all countries, establishment of mutual trust, elimination of everything that creates the possibility of conflicts which breed war.

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

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

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

Is it not remarkable that this was said in 1919 when our homeland was surrounded by states hostile to us, who plotted military intrigues against us?

And at that time, under those conditions, notwithstanding our victories over the enemies, V. I. Lenin proposed at the Seventh All-Russian Congress to adopt a resolution which read: "The Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic desires to live in peace with all nations and to devote all its energies to the work of internal construction in order to set going its production,

transport and public administration on the basis of the Soviet system, which hitherto has been prevented firstly by the oppression of German imperialism and then by the intervention of the Entente and by the hungry blockade."

You, Mr. Canadian, have not understood the elementary questions of Marxism-Leninism on the correlations between the laws determining the development of society and the measures which conscious society undertakes in order to lessen the pernicious effect of negative laws and in order to create conditions—notwithstanding these laws—favoring the utmost alleviation of the crisis which periodically leads to the catastrophies with which capitalist society is fraught.

That is why we state also now that there is no contradiction whatever between the precept that war is an inevitable phenomenon in capitalist, imperialist society, which is taught by our teachers, which is taught by the entire history of humanity, and the striving to restrict, to curb the operation of this law. On the contrary, notwithstanding the fact that wars are inherent in capitalism, the democratic forces are able to frustrate war, to prevent war by their solidarity, their strength and resolve to prevent war. The stronger is the unity of the masses in the struggle against war, the stronger resounds the voice of protest of nations against war, the sooner will the danger of war be reduced to naught. The might of the solidarity of the peace-loving nations can paralyze the activity of such phenomena as war preparation and save the world from this horrible calamity.

This is the reason, gentlemen, that when certain quotations from the works of our teachers, remarkable quotations scientifically substantiated with great profundity, are made here in the attempt to prove that if we recognize, for example, that crisis is inherent in capitalist society, this consequently means that we seek to foster the development of this crisis—we must say that this is absurd. If you consider that war is inherent in capitalist society then consequently you are for war, our opponents tell us. This is likewise absurd because the task consists in overcoming this feature, the law, if you wish, of capitalist society, in order by the conscious efforts of nations to paralyze the effect of such features, the laws of capitalist society.



So it was before the Second World War. Recall the history of the Second World War.

Was not the soil on which Hitlerite militarism flourished fertilized by the golden shower of American dollars in the twenties? Was not Hitlerite militarism nurtured by the shameful Munich policy of France and Britain, Daladier and Chamberlain, behind whose backs stood the United States—the great transoceanic Power?

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

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

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

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

We perfectly understand, and it is a pity that McNeil does not want to understand, that what is meant are not the nations, what is

meant are the reactionary circles of certain countries which really want war. First the "cold war" of which Professor Slichter of Harvard University spoke frankly, and then a real "hot" war of which the leading American personages who determine the policy of the United States scream almost to a man.

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

Why, in reality, did the Second World War become possible? This is known to all long ago. Naturally the fact that it became possible and that it occurred proves that there was also preparation for it. And we know this on the basis of historic data. But we also know that not a single move was made by the Governments of Great Britain and France, as well as of the United States, to prevent the organization of that war, that on the contrary they lulled public opinion into believing that there would be no war of any kind—that it was only necessary to appease Hitler, and they helped Hitler. They began to appease Hitler with loans and encouragement of his predatory policy.

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

Mr. McNeil tried to dispute, to shake the assertion about the 600,000,000 peace supporters: he even cited a number of countries where Communists received an insignificant number of votes to prove the weakness of Communist influence. But the point at issue is by no means the elections. And it is by no means typical for determining the attitude of the people toward peace to show what were the results of the election campaign in relation to one or another political party in one or another capitalist country.

It is known that a big role in this respect is played by the system of elections. It is known that the "Jules Moch" system in France was specially invented in order that those who poll the bigger vote should get the fewer seats. It is known that this

is a historic tradition of all such parliamentary systems; it is not fortuitous that the system known as the "system of rotten boroughs" flourished in Britain and makes itself felt even now. Therefore there is nothing to boast of in the fact that in some places the Communists received a small number of votes. Six hundred million fighters for peace are six hundred million!

We are told by Mr. McNeil: Look around, the number of your friends is becoming smaller and smaller!

This is a grave delusion; the number of our friends is becoming larger and larger. I would advise Mr. McNeil to remove the blinkers from his eyes, to open his eyes, look around himself and see what is happening. Does he not see how millions of people have gone into motion in all countries? These, Mr. McNeil, are not your friends, because you are not their friend. These are our friends, friends of peace, friends of democracy in the finest, in the lofty, sense of this word.

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

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

Mr. McNeil told us: "Show us your budgets." He wanted to prove that we are a militaristic power, that we do not want peace and that we are preparing for war and are setting up monstrous armies.

"Show your budgets"—please. I am ready to show our budgets. But McNeil ought to know this even without my help because on March 11, 1949 all the Moscow newspapers published our 1949 budget in full.

It says here—I beg your pardon Mr. Chairman, may I say this? (Chairman replies in the affirmative. General laughter.)

"The Soviet State, together with tremendous economic con-

struction effects a great plan of social and cultural measures which are important means for raising the cultural standard and material well-being of the people. For these measures the 1949 budget envisages 119,200,000,000 rubles, that is an increase of 13,600,000,000 rubles as compared with 1948."

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

"In 1949 it is intended to spend for the maintenance of our armed forces 79,100,000,000 rubles or 19 per cent of the budget expenditures. A certain increase in the military expenditures as compared with last year (when this sum comprised 17 per cent) is due to a rise in wholesale prices and railroad rates.

"Appropriations for the armed forces envisaged in the budget for 1949 ensure funds for all expenditures of the Soviet Army which reliably safeguards the freedom and independence of our homeland."

This is how matters stand with regard to our budget. Appropriations for military needs for 1949 planned in our budget amount to 19 per cent or 79,100,000,000 rubles.

And how do matters stand on this score, say, in other countries. What about Britain, for example?

The share of military expenditures in Britain's budget in the fiscal year 1949-50 is greater than before the war and comprises this year 30 per cent of all expenditures.

And what about the budget of the United States of America for the fiscal year of 1949-50? Of the total sum of 42,000,000,000 dollars direct expenditures for armaments and armed forces in the United States amount to 14,268,000,000 dollars, that is, 34 per cent of the entire budget.

According to calculations, about 30,000,000,000 dollars or 69 per cent of the entire budget of the United States in the fiscal year of 1949-50 go directly or indirectly for military purposes.

And in France? Twenty per cent of the state expenditures of France are rated for military needs. But after all it is known that the bulk of military measures is being effected in France for the French army not at the expense of the French budget but of the American budget. Incidentally this is not a bad illustration to the problem of state sovereignty!

It is not accidental therefore that the British, French and Ameri-

can press carried, on this score, views that this military budget exceeds all permissible budget standards which had been applied in normal conditions. Here, Mr. McNeil, is an answer to your question about our budget.

## IX

### Allied Duty and the USSR

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

He recalled one episode of tremendous historic importance. This is a highly significant episode. Perhaps, gentlemen, it will help some people in the future to regard with a greater sense of responsibility their words when it is a matter of the role of the USSR in the Second World War.

That was the time when the front in the West headed by Eisenhower, which included also the British air force subordinated to Air Marshal Tedder, was in an extremely difficult position. Here is the telegram which Churchill sent on January 6, 1945 to the head of the Soviet Government and Commander-in-Chief of our forces, Generalissimo Stalin:

"The fighting in the West is very heavy and at any time great decisions may be called for from the Supreme Command. You know yourself from your own experience how very anxious the position is when a very broad front has to be defended after temporary loss of initiative."

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

"It is General Eisenhower's great desire and need to know in outline what you plan to do, as this obviously affects all his and our major decisions. Our envoy, Air Chief Marshal Tedder, was last night reported weatherbound in Cairo. His journey has been much delayed through no fault of yours. In case he has not reached you yet, I shall be grateful if you can tell me whether we can count on a major Russian offensive on the Vistula front, or elsewhere, during January, with any other points you may care to mention. I shall not pass this most secret information to anyone except

Field Marshal Brooke and General Eisenhower, and only under conditions of the utmost secrecy. I regard the matter as urgent."

You must understand what the sending of such a telegram on January 6, 1945 by Winston Churchill to Generalissimo Stalin meant. It meant a call for heroic efforts to save the Western front. We forgot how the very same Messrs. Churchills and others treated us when they did not carry out their obligation on opening the second front. Our allies were in danger, and it was our obligation to discharge our allied duty. And Generalissimo Stalin the very next morning telegraphed:

"I received your message of January 6, 1945, on the evening of January 7.

"Unfortunately, Air Chief Marshal Tedder has not yet reached Moscow.

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

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

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

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

The Order of the Day issued by J. V. Stalin to the Soviet troops in February, 1945 said:

"In January of this year, the Red Army brought down upon the enemy a blow of unparalleled force along the entire front from the Baltic to the Carpathians. On a stretch of 1,200 kilometers it broke up the powerful defense of the Germans which they had been building for a number of years. In the course of the offensive, the Red Army by its swift and skillful actions has hurled the enemy far back to the West. . . .

"The first consequence of the successes of our winter offensive was that they thwarted the Germans' winter offensive in the West, which had as its aim the seizure of Belgium and Alsace, and enabled the armies of our Allies in their turn to launch an offensive against the Germans and thus link up their offensive operations in the West with offensive operations of the Red Army in the East."

And so when such facts are before us, fresh from the recent past, we hear speeches here by the Belgian representative, the New Zealand representative, to the effect that we repeat Goebbels and Hitler. Mr. McNeil today stooped to say that our policy is Goebbelsian policy. I cite this not in order to enlarge on this theme but only to remind the gentlemen critics that an elementary sense of gratitude should prompt them to be careful not only in using the words which they used but also in thinking the way they think with regard to the Soviet Union.

## X

### On So-Called "Cultural" Affairs of the United States and Britain

**M**R. MCNEIL, saying that we interfere with broadcasts of the BBC, simultaneously touched on the question of the "Voice of America" and said that we, so to say, do not permit them to penetrate this "iron curtain." All windows and doors, they say, have been shut!

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

I am deeply convinced that had we taken measures ensuring

the unhindered printing and unhindered radio broadcasting of all this collection of calumny, all these abominations against our country, this would have aroused such an outburst of general indignation and wrath among our people that this probably would not be very pleasant for Mr. McNeil and all those who seek that we should not hinder these broadcasts.

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

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

A booklet has now been published in Moscow which I would recommend to our critics. This book was penned by a well-known British journalist, Ralph Parker. You, gentlemen British representatives, probably know Ralph Parker, a British journalist who has lived in Moscow for eight years and now refuses to return to Britain because, as he said, he cannot return to a country which prepares war against the Soviet Union. In his book *Conspiracy Against the Peace* he relates with what aims gentlemen British "cultural" leaders come to our country through these "open doors." Allow me to quote several passages from Parker's book. Is this permissible, Mr. Chairman? (The Chairman replies: "Permissible." General laughter in the hall.) Thank you, I am quoting:

"Visiting London correspondents worked closely with responsible officials," Parker writes. "Every morning guidance talks were held for them at the British Embassy. The British correspondents resident in Moscow were pointedly excluded."

Mr. McNeil, open the doors to your own correspondents in your own Embassy!

Parker writes that presumably it was feared that their presence would disturb the harmonious relations between the Foreign Office and the diplomatic correspondents who came from London, the so-called "tame seals."

The latter reference hinted at the access they enjoyed to the head of the Foreign Office News Department, Ridsdale, who was always available day and night. And Parker further says that he



could not help admiring the skill with which the British Foreign Office spokesman handled his "tame seals" and that their accounts of the work of the conference were limited to an enumeration of facts which were fully copied from previously prepared accounts and reports of the Embassy sent to the Foreign Office.

Parker cites a host of facts showing how this very same BBC, as in general the Foreign Office, tried to send as many as possible of their secret agents to the USSR under the guise of journalists. And this incidentally reveals the secret of the special insistence which Mr. McNeil, the State Secretary of Great Britain and one of the leaders of the Foreign Office, displayed today in demanding that we, no matter what, "open the windows and doors" to these British spies camouflaged under different pseudonyms.

I must warn Mr. McNeil that for such people neither doors nor windows nor even the small window panes used for ventilation will be open in our country.

Mr. Austin also complained here that we are against cultural relations, that we break all these cultural ties, do not want any intercourse.

Mr. Austin, why do you ignore certain facts? Why, for example, do you not speak about the fact which occurred in 1946 when six delegates of the Soviet Union and five delegates of the Ukrainian Republic who arrived for the Third American Slav Congress in New York were ordered to register as agents of a foreign state or leave the United States at once? In these delegations were the writer Korneichuk, Professor Gorbunov, several generals, well-known Ukrainian artists, poets, journalists, a professor of the Lvov University and so on. And all of them, in view of the special hospitality of the State Department and Department of Justice of the United States, had to, as the saying goes, "pack in a hurry" and go home.

And did not, in March, 1949, a Soviet delegation consisting of the composer Shostakovich, the writers Fadeyev and Pavlenko, Academician Oparin, film producers Gerassimov and Chiaureli, and Professor Rozhansky arrive in New York for the Congress of Intellectuals for Peace? And were not these delegates prevented from making an artistic tour of the United States by the American authorities who let it be known that in view of the end of the

Congress there was no need for them to remain in the United States any longer?

You complain that we do not want cultural relations, but do you not maintain so-called cultural relations with all kinds of traitors and turncoats such as Kravchenko, Kassyenkina and so on and so forth, whom you boost notwithstanding the fact that they are traitors and turncoats, and do you not counterpoise these scoundrels in every way to the Soviet Union! And under these conditions you want us to maintain cultural relations with you? Mr. Austin, learn to maintain really cultural relations with the Soviet Union; then we shall reciprocate.

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

We maintain extensive cultural relations with all peoples, which fully refutes your lying talk about some sort of "iron curtain."

If you were really interested in this question you could learn that not a day passes without some delegation leaving the USSR for other countries or some delegation arriving in the USSR.

These rather lively relations are conducted in science and art, including all forms—from music and dances to football and other sport events. The Soviet Union maintains such relations with a whole number of countries. I will name them. These are Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Albania, Bulgaria, Finland, the People's Republic of China, Italy, Sweden, Eastern Germany, Belgium, the Korean People's Republic, Pakistan, where a delegation of Soviet writers is now taking part in the work of the Congress of the Association of Progressive Writers of Pakistan. This is a fact! If we send our delegations, our lawyers, our scientists, our writers, our musicians, to Belgium, to Italy, notwithstanding the resistance which the governments of these countries offer to these measures of ours, what right have you to speak of some kind of "iron curtain," repeating foul Goebbelsian calumny?

But we send delegations to countries where we are met as friends, where we are not counterpoised by Messrs. Kravchenko and others of your friends, where no attempts are made to vilify

us by all kinds of fables and slanderous inventions drawn from unclean sources.

Mr. Austin, think about it, before hurling such accusations!

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

I, Mr. Chairman, am finishing.

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

I must say that I consider it beneath my dignity to react to such an insolent statement.

I do not want to say any more harsh words.

Mr. McNeil amazed us today by his remarkable knowledge of Krylov's fables. He told me in private conversation a long time ago: "I am seriously studying your fables of Krylov. I shall reply to you."

I impatiently awaited the time when at last he would reply. And so today he replied to me. He cited Krylov's fable, available in English translation. The translation seems to be decent. It is entitled *The Serpent*, which not Krylov but McNeil dedicated to yours truly.

It turns out, according to McNeil, that I resemble a serpent. I have a similar poisonous sting, and moreover I resemble a nightingale because I have a very melodious voice. It is good to be if only for a minute in the position of a nightingale even as presented by McNeil. So before you is a serpent. A fable is a fable, but I would like to advise Mr. McNeil—it would be better perhaps if he turned to British fables, then he might be on more familiar ground. He made a mistake by turning to Krylov's fables without studying these fables. For if Mr. McNeil thought it necessary to look for an analogy, for the sake of objectivity he ought to have recollected or read some more fables. In your collection, Mr. McNeil—I perused it today—there are some other fables also about a serpent.

I in turn want to cite one fable in order not to be in debt to Mr. McNeil.

This fable is called *The Calumniator and the Serpent*.

I will not permit myself to make any comparisons. Mr. McNeil spoke here about me as a serpent with trills of a nightingale. But I will not say whom I have in mind when I outline this fable to you. You yourselves of course will easily see it.

Permit me to recall this fable. So we have Krylov's fable *The Calumniator and The Serpent*.

He who claims, this fable says, that devils have no sense of justice is grievously mistaken. It happened once that a calumniator and a serpent came to a quarrel, "both wished to take the lead in hell's parade, they argued sore and neither one would yield. At length to Beelzebub they went to settle their dispute. And to the serpent Beelzebub these words addressed:

"Though none admires thy virtues more than I, my decision needs must favor the calumniator.

"Thy sting I know is deadly but canst thou spurt venom from afar as his tongue does so skillfully that mountains high and seas no shelter give?

"Thus he is more malevolent than thyself. Crawl then behind him and henceforth more humble be.

"Since then in hell the serpent yields its place to the calumniator."

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

I have finished.

# Speech of November 29, 1949 before the General Assembly

OUR session is drawing to an end," A. Y. Vyshinsky said. "Its proceedings are concluded with consideration of the most important question raised on behalf of the Soviet Government by the delegation of the Soviet Union, the question of condemnation of the preparation of a new war and the conclusion of a Five-Power Pact for Strengthening Peace. The proposals submitted by the Soviet delegation to this session of the General Assembly are a continuation and development of the peaceful proposals repeatedly submitted by the USSR delegation to the UN. They express the general principled line of Soviet foreign policy, a line of unswerving and consistent struggle for peace, for security and friendship of nations.

"The policy of our Government, the foreign policy is based on the idea of peace. Struggle for peace, struggle against new wars, exposure of all steps taken with a view to preparing a new war, exposure of the steps which camouflage with the banner of pacifism the actual preparation for war—such is our task."

"Our tasks were thus defined long ago in 1925, by the leader of the Soviet people, J. V. Stalin.

"We stand for peace,' Stalin continued, 'we stand for the exposure of all those steps which lead to war no matter with which pacifist flags they may be covered up. Be it the League of Nations or Locarno—it makes no difference, no flag shall deceive us, no clamor will frighten us.'" (Stalin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 296).

"The Soviet Union has invariably followed these instructions of its leader, consistently and resolutely pursuing this noble line in the interests of its people, its State and also in the interests of all nations, of all peace-loving states."

A. Y. Vyshinsky further dwelt in detail on the history of the question and substance of the Soviet peace proposals submitted to the UN.

"In the course of four years—UN has existed for almost four years—the delegation of the USSR on behalf of its Government has already submitted its peace proposals four times. In 1946 the delegation of the USSR submitted its proposals on the general reduction of armaments and prohibition of the production and utilization of atomic energy for war purposes. Those proposals

formed the basis of the General Assembly's historical resolution of December 14, 1946. In 1947 the USSR proposed that a decision be adopted on the condemnation of propaganda of a new war in any form. After a protracted struggle, the General Assembly unanimously adopted a decision based on the Soviet Union's proposal. In 1948, the USSR suggested that a decision be adopted on the reduction of the armaments of the five Powers by one-third and once again on the prohibition of the atomic weapon. This proposal met with fierce opposition and was turned down. But the majority of the General Assembly which rejected this proposal could not simply relegate it to the archives. This majority passed a colorless and futile resolution, the task of which was somehow to camouflage the refusal to accept the Soviet draft aimed at the actual prohibition of the atomic weapon and reduction by one-third of the armaments and armed forces of the permanent member-states of the Security Council. Having retained the title of the Soviet draft, the majority of the General Assembly unintentionally stressed the striking contrast between the demand for real measures to prohibit the atomic bomb and reduce armaments by one-third, on the one hand, and the shallow, poor contents of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly's majority on November 19, 1948, in no way helping the solution of this noble task.

"It would be superfluous to emphasize of what tremendous importance is the successful solution of the tasks connected with each of the aforementioned proposals submitted and defended to the very end by the Soviet delegations and the delegations of the People's Democracies.

"The proposals of the Soviet Union on the condemnation of the preparation of a new war and the conclusion of a five-Power peace pact advanced at this session are logically connected with the peace-loving proposals of the Soviet Union made in 1946, 1947 and 1948. When presenting its proposals to the current session of the General Assembly on September 23, the Soviet Government was fully conscious of the great responsibility resting with it as well as with the other permanent members of the Security Council and the UN as a whole for the cause of peace, for the elimination of the danger of a new war, for the security of nations.

"Despite the important decisions adopted at the previous sessions of the General Assembly condemning all and every propaganda of a new war, such propaganda has not stopped. Preparations for a

new war are being openly conducted as expressed not only in this propaganda but also in the armaments race, in the inflation of military budgets, in setting up numerous military bases and in the organization of military blocs pursuing aggressive aims. Thus the decisions of the General Assembly are not fulfilled by certain members of UN and, first and foremost, by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain, engaged in preparing a new war against the USSR and the People's Democracies.

"The Anglo-American bloc bossing the United Nations, by its systematical violations of the United Nations Charter and by its policy in the United Nations, has contributed and is contributing now to undermining the prestige of UN, to weakening this organization, and is bringing to naught its importance in international affairs. This was to a great extent due to the rude violations of the United Nations Charter connected with the conclusion of aggressive pacts and the formation of military aggressive blocs, such as the North Atlantic or Brussels blocs and also due to such measures as the 'Marshall Plan.'

"The establishment of the North Atlantic alliance of 12 states pursuing aggressive aims, or the alliance of 16 states on the basis of the 'Marshall Plan,' have not only undermined the prestige and importance of UN but have also created the danger that the United Nations will be converted into a branch of the State Department, whose orders the majority of the United Nations, headed by the American and British delegations, obediently fulfill no matter what.

"There is a peculiar division of functions: the North Atlantic alliance is engaged in preparation for a new war while UN, through its Anglo-American majority, covers up this black work with false declarations about peace.

"In the UN, its commissions, committees and at the plenary sessions of the General Assembly, the representatives of the Anglo-American bloc pour forth unctuous speeches about peace and the welfare of nations, whereas outside the United Nations—in their military headquarters and offices of the North Atlantic, Brussels and other alliances—they prepare a new war, forge fetters for the peace-loving nations, dooming them to cruel sufferings and destruction.

"The peaceful proposals of the Soviet Union are called upon to expose this monstrous conspiracy of the reactionary forces against peace and the welfare of million upon millions of people so as

to stay the criminal hand of the warmongers raised to strike entire humanity, all the nations longing for peace and condemning war.

"In summing up the results of the discussion of the Soviet Union's proposals," A. Y. Vyshinsky continued, "two characteristic circumstances must be noted. First, that the opponents of the Soviet proposals did not refute one single concrete fact cited by the Soviet delegation or the delegations of the People's Democracies to substantiate their statements on the preparations of a new war conducted by some countries and first and foremost by the United States and Britain."

The Soviet representative recalled in this connection a number of undeniable facts confirming the participation of the United States and British Governments in the preparations for a new war.

It is important to note, A. Y. Vyshinsky said, that the preparations for a new war are borne out not only by such facts as the frank statements of United States Secretary of Defense Johnson, the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Bradley, Field Marshall Montgomery, General Spatz and a number of other high officials in the United States and Britain, but also by those material and organizational military measures which are effected before everybody's eyes and which in general cannot be concealed from the public! Such facts naturally cannot be refuted and even the most artful experts in this line from among the American and British diplomats do not venture to attempt this task, doomed in advance to failure.

"Indeed, with what did, for instance, the representative of Britain, Minister of State McNeil, counter our proofs besides questions asked with obviously false amazement: 'Does the Soviet delegation really believe that we are preparing for an aggressive war? How can it believe that we are preparing for an aggressive war?' But why could not McNeil or his friends point out at least one fact proving that the British Government does not participate in the preparations for a new war!

"Do not those approximately 500 military bases with which the United States has engirdled the world include bases located on British territory? Is it not a fact that 90 American superpowerful B-29 flying fortresses divided into several forces of the strategic air command are concentrated in Great Britain? Has the British Government or at least British Minister of State McNeil denied



*The New York Times* report about the discontent expressed in British military circles over the fact that the British Government had 'agreed' to receive on its territory 70 American B-29 bombers as 'aid' which Britain receives from the United States under the 'Marshall Plan' and as a member of the North Atlantic alliance? Has an explanation been given here as to the purposes and tasks of this bombing aviation, has it been honestly, to use a favorite expression of the British delegates, explained against whom, after all, against what country these bases were built and squadrons of American bombers prepared? No. The British Government and its Minister of State, usually so talkative and never letting anything that can refer to the actions of his Government pass without remarks or denials, they are silent on this score as if they had swallowed their tongues!

"And Greece? And Cyprus, converted into an Anglo-American strategic base and precisely into a base for attacking the Soviet Union? It is not accidental, indeed, that the Anglo-American press declared Cyprus to be converted into a 'stronghold against Soviet expansion!'

"McNeil declared in the Committee that Britain must have 'strong points from which we can defend our extended outer communications in case of war.' What war? Against whom? When? He asserted that Britain had by now withdrawn her troops from her bases in other countries. But he passed in silence the fact that the British bases had gone over to the United States and that the United States sets up its own bases on British territory.

"Has not the United States received from Great Britain bases on Newfoundland, on Bermuda, on the Islands of Ascension, Trinidad, and the Bahamas? Was it not the United States that built 18 new bases in Canada? Has McNeil forgotten the case with the American military air base in Mellah which is under British administration?

"In view of such facts McNeil's subterfuges concerning bases mislead no one however hard McNeil might try!

"The United States representative, Mr. Austin, adhered to the same tactics: he did not say anything about the facts cited by us to substantiate our statements to the effect that the United States plays a leading role in the preparations for a new war. He by-passed the remarks about General Bradley, United States Secretary of Defense Johnson, General Vandenberg, and so on and so forth. In an effort

to divert attention, the usual tactics of American diplomacy, Austin merely referred to the American act on mutual assistance designed to support the aims of the North Atlantic Pact—an act which states that 'the United States follows such a policy for the achievement of international peace and security through the United Nations in such a way that the armed forces be not utilized otherwise than in common interests.'

"But with such general phrases one cannot get away from the stubborn and convincing facts refuting these phrases! He declared that United States policy was to co-operate with all states in setting up a universal system of collective security, and he stressed these words '*with all states.*'

"But is this not refuted by such a fact as the organization of the North Atlantic Pact? Austin and his friends keep on asserting that the North Atlantic Pact is not an aggressive but a defensive one. But whom does it defend its signatories from? But why are Iran and Turkey, countries bordering on the Soviet Union, being dragged into this pact although it is common knowledge that they are not North Atlantic countries? Why, at last, does Iran need military aid as, according to the report published in the *New York Herald Tribune* on November 18 of the current year, stated by the Shah of Iran who is now visiting in the United States and who said that he would beg the United States for even larger deliveries of armaments?

"The American delegation," the Soviet representative said, "launched a counterattack at the Political Committee, having set itself the task of proving that the USSR rejected the United States proposals on co-operation and that it had, for instance, rejected such proposals with regard to Germany. But does not Austin remember the story connected with the statement of the former United States Ambassador in Moscow Smith made during his talk with V. M. Molotov on May 4, 1948, when he said that 'as regards the United States, the door would always remain open for exhaustive discussion and the settlement of our differences,' a statement which the United States Government made haste to disavow as soon as the Soviet Government had declared that it could only welcome the United States Government's statement expressing the hope that it would be possible to find means for eliminating the existing differences and for establishing between our countries such good relations as would conform both to the interests of our peoples

and the cause of strengthening peace? So who was it that refused to co-operate? It should be incidentally recalled that in order to lend additional significance to such a refusal on the part of the United States, Mr. Bevin also hastened to declare that he had no inclination to take part in a new conference 'until the ground is cleared.' How Mr. Bevin and his assistant Mr. McNeil 'clear the ground' for co-operation with the USSR has been seen from their speeches at this session, for instance, and not at this session only . . .

"In the same distorted way Mr. Austin, while addressing the Political Committee presented the matter of 'co-operation' on the German issue. He misrepresented the circumstances connected with the notorious proposals of Byrnes and Marshall on the so-called guarantees against German aggression for 25 and even for 40 years! But what kind of 'guarantees' were they! The proposals of Byrnes and Marshall did not contain one single word about such important questions as the denazification and democratization of Germany, as the establishment of international control over the Ruhr with the participation of the USSR, as the liquidation of German concerns, cartels, syndicates, trusts and banking monopolies controlling them which had been the inspirers and organizers of German aggression, as the demilitarization of Germany, as the eradication of the remnants of fascism, as the establishment of a democratic way of things, as the implementation of the land reform so that the land belonging to the big landowners—the Junkers—be handed over to the peasants, and so on and so forth. All this Mr. Austin preferred to pass in silence since this would fully refute his allegation that the USSR did not want to co-operate with the United States, Great Britain and France in the settlement of the German issue. Austin naturally likewise glossed over the fact that although it was agreed in Paris in June, 1949, to carry on the efforts toward the restoration of the economic and political unity of Germany, the United States, Britain and France completed the split of Germany by setting up the puppet anti-popular Bonn Government which, true enough, is already falling to pieces.

"No, it is the leading circles of the United States that are frustrating international co-operation, using for this purpose every possibility, every pretext. Co-operation among nations hampers these circles in realizing the American plan for world domination. The policy of peaceful co-operation with other countries does not suit the bidders

for world supremacy who dream of converting other states into American colonies, of reducing sovereign nations to the position of slaves.

"But the implementation of such plans meets with an unsurmountable obstacle—the powerful movement of peoples for peace, the movement headed by the Soviet Union—the loyal sentinel over the security of nations, consistent and determined enemy of war, the friend and defender of peace!"

Having pointed out further that an attempt had been made in the Political Committee to distort the principles, specific characteristics and substance of the Soviet foreign policy, A. Y. Vyshinsky declared that this mendacious and slanderous presentation of the Soviet foreign policy had completely failed. The Soviet representative briefly reviewed once again the principles, nature and characteristic features of Soviet foreign policy, how it had formed and been in operation since the very inception of the Soviet Socialist State and up to our days.

He particularly dwelt on the Soviet peace policy in the years preceding the Second World War.

"In 1936-1938," A. Y. Vyshinsky said, "it was quite clear that Europe was on the brink of war, that Hitler was planning a great war with the direct connivance of Great Britain and France.

"The position of the Soviet Union remained the same even at that time. True to its policy of peace and struggle against the war menace, the Soviet Government energetically opposed the treacherous Munich policy which opened the gates for Hitler's aggression. The Soviet Union was the sole state which preserved loyalty to its international obligations with regard to Czechoslovakia. In face of the impending Hitlerite aggression, the Soviet Union repeatedly suggested to the British and French Governments that an agreement be concluded for the purpose of repulsing the fascist attack then being planned.

"The developments that ensued fully justified the alarm sounded by the Soviet Union before the Second World War.

"Even on the eve of the Second World War the Soviet policy remained the same policy of peace. This is attested by all subsequent events, specifically by the position of the Soviet Union in the negotiations held in Moscow in March—May 1939, on an Anglo-French-Soviet agreement for repulsing Hitlerite aggression. As is known,

despite all efforts of the Soviet Government to reach an agreement, the negotiations failed because, as openly admitted by Lloyd George, 'Neville Chamberlain, Halifax and John Simon did not want any agreement with Russia.'

"To have a correct understanding as to the course of developments, it is necessary to recall that Poland, ruled by Beck and having Britain and France as allies, concluded in 1934 a non-aggression pact with the Germans, and that Britain and France themselves in 1938 agreed to a joint declaration with Germany about non-aggression; that is, for all practical purposes, signed a non-aggression pact though it was called a declaration.

"It should be also borne in mind that in 1938 trade negotiations were conducted with Germany without, however, yielding any favorable results at that time. In July, 1939, these negotiations were resumed and ended on August 19, 1939, with the signing of a trade-credit agreement. In the summer of the same year, 1939, the Germans proposed to the Soviet Government the conclusion of a non-aggression treaty. By that time, it had already been clear that neither Britain nor France intended to conclude an agreement with the USSR and that, on the contrary, the policy of Chamberlain and Daladier sought to direct the Hitlerite aggression toward the East against the recently 'guaranteed' Poland and against the Soviet Union.

"In this situation, the Soviet Government decided to conclude a non-aggression pact with Germany. It was a wise and far-sighted step since it predetermined the outcome of the Second World War favorably for the USSR and all freedom-loving peoples. It was a step prompted by the certainty that the Hitlerites were preparing an attack against the USSR and that it was necessary to gain time for preparing resistance to the insolent aggressor. This forecast was subsequently fully justified. One cannot but point out that while preparing an attack against the USSR the Hitler Government tried to cover up those aggressive intentions with an insolent campaign, a veritable crusade against Communism.

"On April 13, 1941, as a result of the negotiations held during the sojourn in Moscow of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan, Matsuoka, a pact on neutrality was signed between the Soviet Union and Japan as well as a declaration on mutual respect, territorial

integrity and inviolability of frontiers of the Mongolian People's Republic and Manchukuo.

"The campaign against the peace-loving proposals of the Soviet Union is being conducted behind a barrage from essentially the same positions as in the period prior to the Second World War, in the period of the Pact of the Four, the Kellogg Pact and the Munich agreements. An unprecedented baiting of Communism and 'Communists' is rampant, and every progressively-minded person, every one who supports progressive democratic opinions is classed as a Communist. It is an open secret already that the 'anti-Communist' crusade is designed, as was done by the Hitlerites at that time, to camouflage the crusade against the Soviet Union and People's Democracies, that this crusade is an ideological preparation for a new war.

"Such is the situation in which we began and are now concluding our session, a situation which urgently demanded and demands now that the United Nations summon enough strength to put an end to such a situation. The mobilization of aggressive forces acting both against peace and against our organization called upon to serve the cause of strengthening peace still continues.

"Such are the causes which made the Soviet Government submit and defend its proposals now before the General Assembly.

"We are against the Anglo-American draft supported by the majority of the Political Committee," A. Y. Vyshinsky said, "inasmuch as this draft is absolutely inadequate. This draft resolution is entitled 'The Necessary Conditions of Peace' but it does not contain any conditions such as would actually contribute to the consolidation of peace. Besides, this draft contains a number of incorrect provisions contradicting the decisions of the General Assembly and the United Nations Charter. Thus, for instance, the draft resolution by-passes the question of reduction of armaments and leaves entirely out of sight the question of prohibition of the atomic weapon. It incites to weakening state sovereignty, proceeding from the false, dangerous and harmful concept denying the importance and significance of the consolidation of national sovereignty. This resolution contains a number of points which repeat some provisions of the Charter without adding anything to them, with the sole object of camouflaging the other points of the same resolution in order to

legalize the systematic violation of the Charter by the Anglo-American bloc. The draft resolution submitted by the USSR delegation follows a different path.

"The Soviet Union proposes the condemnation of war preparations expressed in war propaganda encouraged by the governments of a number of countries and particularly of the United States and Britain, in the armaments race, in the inflation of military budgets which constitute a heavy burden for the population, in the establishment of numerous military, naval and air bases on territories of other countries, in the organization of military blocs of states pursuing aggressive purposes with regard to peace-loving democratic countries, and in taking other measures for aggressive ends. We have cited numerous facts that have fully proved the correctness of our assertions. These facts prove that in a number of countries, and primarily in the United States and Britain, preparation of a new war is really in progress.

"During these days," the chief of the Soviet delegation said, "at a meeting of delegates of the Land Grant Colleges and Universities Association which was holding its 63rd annual congress, one of the speakers, a general, sought to prove 'that to neutralize an enemy country by air force is the greatest weapon of a democracy concerned with the maintenance of peace.' He also sought to prove that the task of the navy was to 'blockade and to subject to starvation' and that against a 'sole possible' adversary in war having at his disposal a powerful land army, 'the only effective means' is 'strategic bombing!'

"What is important is not that there appeared one more insane warmonger. What is important is that he was heard by a whole association of colleges and universities! What is happening before our eyes? It turns out that leaders of the United States Air Force and Navy have quarreled, arguing as to what is the best method of annihilating the greatest possible number of Soviet people and Soviet towns. Economists are calculating the profits which a war has to bring to the 'business' circles of the United States and openly declare that precisely a war could relieve the difficult situation in American economy which increasingly suffers from the blows of the approaching crisis!"

A. Y. Vyshinsky cited a number of new facts attesting to the war preparations in the United States and then said:

"This is why the Soviet Union submits its resolution on the condemnation of such a policy, the policy of preparing a new war; that is why the Soviet Union proposes that in the same way as the civilized nations have long since condemned the use of poison gases and bacteriological means for war purposes as the gravest crime against humanity, to recognize the use of the atomic weapon and other means of mass annihilation of people as contradicting the conscience and honor of peoples and incompatible with membership in the United Nations, considering impermissible further delay in the adoption by the United Nations of practical measures for the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and establishment of appropriate strict international control.

"In the opinion of the Soviet delegation the resolution on the atomic question adopted by the General Assembly on November 23, this year, on the insistence of the United States, Britain, France and Canada, as well as the resolution of November 4, 1948, in no way contribute to a solution of the problem of the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of control in order to prevent the utilization of atomic energy for war purposes. The Soviet delegation believes that only the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of strict international control over the fulfillment of the decision on prohibition of the production of the atomic weapon and use of atomic energy for war purposes would speed the development and utilization of atomic energy exclusively for peaceful purposes.

"I must say that the Soviet delegation has attentively studied the appeal to the six permanent members of the Atomic Energy Commission sent by the Chairman of the General Assembly, Mr. Romulo. The Soviet delegation highly appreciates Mr. Romulo's desire to draw the attention of the General Assembly and all states to the need for settling the question of the prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of strict control over atomic energy, and deems it necessary to declare that it shares the opinion that it is necessary to continue striving for an agreement on this issue which is of such great importance for humanity. Further delays on the part of the United Nations in taking practical measures—I stress: *practical measures*—for the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon and the establishment of appropriate strict control are impermissible. No delays! An end must be put to all delays in



this highly important matter. And this is precisely what the Soviet draft resolution proposes. This draft proposes that you, the General Assembly—this international forum of peace—pronounce your authoritative word and recommend to the Atomic Energy Commission that it work out practical measures in order to realize the unconditional prohibition of the atomic weapon, to establish strict effective control over the fulfillment of this prohibition.

"The Soviet delegation insists on this now and will continue to insist on this in the future.

"The draft resolution of the Soviet Union contains a paragraph proposing that the General Assembly appeal to all the states to settle their disputes and differences by peaceful means without resorting to the employment of force or threat of force. This proposal was rejected by the Anglo-American majority.

"The Soviet Union proposes to express the wish that the United States of America, Great Britain, China, France and the Soviet Union conclude among themselves a Pact for the Strengthening of Peace, joining their efforts for the purpose of the maintenance of international peace and security of nations, the responsibility for which is borne by these five Powers—permanent members of the Security Council.

"This proposal met in the Political Committee—apparently the same will be repeated here—the opposition of a number of delegations and was also turned down as if the point at issue was not a Pact for the Strengthening of Peace, but a proclamation of war!

"But the arguments advanced against this proposal are strikingly stilted and weak.

"We are told that there is no necessity for this pact because there is a Charter—'a most solemn pact of peace.' But the Charter did not prevent five states—United Nations members—from concluding the Brussels pact!

"But the Charter did not prevent a group of states—United Nations members—from concluding the North Atlantic Pact! Why does the Charter now prevent the conclusion of a pact by five Powers—the permanent members of the Security Council? It is clear that this is mere subterfuge.

"We are told that the maintenance of peace and security of nations is a matter of concern of all the United Nations members and not only of the Security Council permanent members!

"But the role and importance of these five permanent members of the Security Council in the settlement of all international affairs is known, known also is their weight, authority and influence. Is it not clear that a pact among these five Powers such as would eliminate the threat of war, rid the world of the burden of inflated military budgets, the armaments race with all the attendant negative phenomena in the political and economic relations among states, that such a pact would constitute a mighty foundation for universal confidence, a foundation of peace and security of nations!

"It is clear that the aforesaid consideration advanced against the proposal for a Five-Power Pact is insolvent, is mere subterfuge.

"We are told that such a pact would not eliminate all the differences and consequently it is superfluous.

"But no pact in itself can guarantee the immediate elimination of all or even some important differences. Such a pact can assure the elimination of differences provided, of course, there is the appropriate attitude toward the obligations which must be assumed by the contracting parties on the strength of such a pact. It is clear that such a pact can play a most positive part in the stabilization of friendly relations among states.

"It is clear that this objection too does not stand criticism. This is also mere subterfuge.

"Many subterfuges of this kind could be invented. This is done and will be done by all enemies of peace, all instigators, inspirers and organizers of new wars.

"This, however, cannot and must not stop the fighters for peace in their noble struggle. They are supported by millions upon millions of honest and unselfish people. Tomorrow their number will be greater than it is today. The struggle for peace against the instigators of a new war shall continue and victory in this struggle will go to those who hate war, who demand peace.

"The powerful movement for peace of hundreds of millions of people, the movement of nations will overcome all the obstacles on its way. It is an invincible force which will be victorious, which will bring humanity salvation from wars and will assure peace throughout the world."



SUPPLEMENT TO:  
USSR  
INFORMATION BULLETIN  
WASHINGTON, D. C.