

YUGOSLAVIA

THE U.N.—COOPERATION MUST BE DESIRED

Address by

MR. EDVARD KARDELJ

Chairman of the Yugoslav Delegation,
Vice Premier and Minister of Foreign Affairs

at the

General Assembly of the United Nations, Paris,

September 29, 1948

Published by

Information Officer, Yugoslav Embassy, Washington

Mr. President,
Fellow Delegates,

In the course of the general debate some speakers—I might say, in a panicky manner—expressed their fears with regard to the fate of peace. Such an exaggerated anxiety is obviously a reflection of the war-inciting atmosphere which is being created today by a large section of the international reactionary propaganda, harassing the wide masses of the people, who still suffer from the horrors and devastations of World War II, with various “forecasts” that the third world war is, so to say, on the doorstep. The political “lesson” to be drawn from such forecasts and similar hair-raising philosophies, injected into international life by various war-inciting centers, lies in the fact that it is necessary to accept, as soon as possible, and support with every force the so-called “get-tough” policy against the Soviet Union, against the peoples’ democracies and against democratic movements in general; otherwise—says this propaganda—the third world war is bound to break out at any moment.

The Yugoslav Delegation considers these very tendencies among the major causes of the rather poor results of the work of the United Nations. We should resort here to the use of such instruments which facilitate agreement on questions under dispute, especially among the great powers, because without harmony among the great powers international cooperation is but an empty fiction. Nevertheless, the leading group of states of the majority embarked upon a different course, viz. the unilateral realization of its aims and imposition of its will, relying on the formal, arithmetical majority in this Organization. Under such conditions, naturally, we are not going towards agreement but towards the transformation of the United Nations into an instrument of the policy of a certain group of states or even of one single state. It goes without saying that such a course of action—in so far as it continues—will be the source of even greater difficulties and will bring the United Nations themselves to an impasse.

This danger is today evident to nearly everyone and many representatives have referred to it in the course of the general debate. However, the majority of the representatives are trying to find a solution which would actually lead to the collapse of the United Nations as an organization for international cooperation. They are trying to find a solution

in the revision of the Charter of the United Nations, especially in the liquidation or essential limitation of the principle of unanimity of the great powers.

It is difficult to suppose that the authors of these proposals do not realize this. They know it well, of course. Therefore, we cannot characterize these attempts other than as tendencies to abandon the policy of international cooperation and collective security and move gradually to a policy of blocs—as tendencies to relinquish the system of the United Nations.

Real Cause of Difficulties

It is, of course, absurd and insincere to seek the cause of the present unfortunate conditions in the United Nations, or of the international situation in general, in so-called “mistakes” or “shortcomings” of the organizational mechanism of the United Nations. The real purpose of this is to conceal the actual cause of the many difficulties which appear in the work of the United Nations and which generally amount to the fact that the leading group of states of the majority in the Organization does not wish to cooperate and to come to agreements with other countries, especially with the Soviet Union. To abolish the principle of unanimity of the great powers or to weaken other instruments of agreement, foreseen by the Charter of the United Nations, would be tantamount to weakening the United Nations, to transforming them from an organ of international collaboration into an organ of intimidation in the hands of one state or a group of states, and finally to the collapse of the whole post-war system of international cooperation, for it must be perfectly clear to us that the United Nations shall either be an organ of mutual agreement and cooperation of sovereign states with regard to the most important international questions, or that they shall not exist. Therefore, we must remind those who today persistently strive to liquidate the principle of unanimity of the great powers that by doing so they are actually endeavoring to abolish the fundamental reason for the existence of the United Nations, in other words, that they are on the way to liquidating the Organization itself as an efficient instrument of international cooperation.

For all these reasons the Yugoslav Delegation deems it necessary to liquidate the Interim Committee and to uphold the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. This is

necessary owing to the fact that those who invented this Committee, which was formed in contradiction to the Charter of the United Nations, did so for the purpose of still further weakening the United Nations, completely disarming them as an instrument of international cooperation and subordinating them to the interests of a group of states or even one single state.

What the work of the United Nations would look like if this Organization abandoned the very instrument which gives it the right to exist, is shown by the experience of the work of the Organization so far.

The Greek Problem

I shall merely draw your attention to the fate which has befallen some of the most important decisions of the United Nations in the period between the two sessions.

Let us turn to the Greek problem, which throws an especially clear light on the actual essence of the tendency to use the United Nations and its organs for the specific aims of certain states forming the majority. The representatives of Yugoslavia—together with representatives of the USSR and the other peoples' democracies—have constantly pointed out that the real causes of the national uprising in Greece are not to be found in the alleged intervention or instigation on the part of the northern neighbors of Greece, but, on the one hand, in the fact that a government which does not represent the majority of the people had been established in Greece in an undemocratic manner and, on the other hand, in the brutal interference of the United States and Great Britain in the internal affairs of Greece, which prevents the expression of the will of the large majority of the Greek people. Consequently, the recall of foreign troops, missions and various "experts" from Greece would be the first step towards the only proper solution of the "Greek problem" in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, which condemns interference in the internal affairs of other states.

Another road has been taken, however, the road of strengthening foreign intervention in Greece and throwing responsibility for the conditions in that country on Greece's northern neighbors. It is really strange. The war in Greece has been going on for several years and the accusations that Yugoslavia and the other northern neighbors of Greece are

responsible for this war have been made during the same period of time. Nevertheless, all the evidence in support of these accusations the various "Special Commissions" were able to gather in Greece, with the help of all sorts of machinations, amounts to such insignificant things that, even if they were true, they would be a drop in the sea in comparison with the means that the United States and British interventionists are pouring into Greece. Besides, it is evident that this so-called "evidence" against the northern neighbors carries the trademark: "Made in Athens." Nevertheless, the Greek people are fighting. I believe that one has to disregard truth to a large degree, in order to assert, after all this, that only a small minority, encouraged by the northern countries, is in revolt in Greece. However, if truth were not to be disregarded, it would be easy to understand that increased foreign intervention brings about an increased resistance on the part of the people, for it is a well known fact that nations do not approve of armed foreign missionaries in their country. The present conflagration in Greece is the consequence of, and the answer to, foreign intervention, which had already been started by Mr. Churchill. This intervention failed once, but was later continued by the United States of America. A nation is defending itself against foreign expansion. This is the core of the Greek problem and it is here that its solution is to be sought.

The so-called United Nations Special Commission on the Balkans was created at last year's session of the General Assembly. The representatives of the democratic countries of Eastern Europe have refused, in the name of their governments, to collaborate with this Commission, stressing that the competence, powers and functions of the said Commission were in contradiction to the principles of the United Nations, represented a violation of the sovereignty of Yugoslavia, Albania and Bulgaria, and that, therefore, the Commission was illegal and non-existent as far as their countries were concerned.

We have been reproached here for having taken such a stand. However, allow us the right to defend ourselves against attempts to burden us with the faults of others.

We are able to establish today on the basis of concrete facts that the said Commission has not only failed to contribute to the solution of the so-called Greek question in a democratic sense and in the interest of peace, but has aggra-

vated the situation in Greece by giving unbounded support to monarcho-fascist elements and to the intervention of the United States and Great Britain.

It is known that the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece has repeatedly declared that the liberation movement is ready to accept a peaceful solution of the conflict in Greece. Here is what is said in a statement of the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece issued in May, 1948:

“With the aim of easing the tension prevailing in world public opinion, which has recently been showing an intensive interest in Greece and the Greek people who are fighting, and desirous of contributing to the efforts made by the democratic forces throughout the world for the attainment of peace and democratic agreement in the world, the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece declares that it is always ready to accept and support any initiative, from whatever side it comes, which would be aimed at helping Greece find herself and achieve tranquility in the country, on condition that the democratic life of the people be assured without any limitations whatsoever, that national sovereignty and independence be secured without any foreign interference, and that the Greek people be free to decide their own fate.”

U. S. The Master of Greece

One would have expected that the so-called United Nations Special Commission on the Balkans would accept such a peaceful initiative and undertake some measures in this respect. However, the contrary was the case. The United Nations Special Commission on the Balkans has disregarded all such initiatives and has blindly clutched at every provocation organized against Yugoslavia and the other northern neighbors of Greece. Nevertheless, while this Commission was engaged in the collection of false accusations against the northern neighbors of Greece, Greece was becoming more and more the domain of American expansion. Numerous American officers have completely taken over the Army of the Athens Government. United States representatives have become the actual masters of Greece. This goes so far that even rightist newspapers in Athens protest against this state

of affairs. Thus, for instance, the newspaper "Eleftheria" of September 2, 1948, wrote:

"By poking his nose everywhere, clamoring, moving around more than is necessary and speaking about himself, writing and always pushing himself to the fore, it seems that General Van Fleet is laboring today under the impression that the position of the Chief of the General Staff of the Greek Army is, in relation to himself, that of an orderly."

In the same way the key positions in Greek economy are now in American hands. The United States representatives in Greece have seized prerogatives which in an independent country belong to the government. They are preparing draft bills, regulations, rules, receiving for consultation representatives of political parties, ministers, members of parliament, various delegations, etc.

All this is accompanied by a rising wave of mass terror which was stimulated by the statement of the American General Van Fleet, made on February 27, 1948, in which he put forward the slogan: "Capture and kill." The mass crimes perpetrated in Greece have provoked indignation and protests in the whole world, but they have, apparently, not influenced the United Nations Special Commission on the Balkans.

It is perfectly evident that the so-called Greek question is in line with the expansionistic policy of the most influential American circles, which is manifesting itself in the creation and development of Western Germany as a military and economic base of the United States of America in Western Europe, in the keeping of armies on the territories of Allied and other countries, in the machinations in the Near East, in the re-establishment of Japan as an anti-Soviet base, in the non-fulfillment of peace treaties, in the organization of a vast system of military bases, in the refusal to consider disarmament and the prohibition of atomic energy as a means of waging war etc. This is the reason why the Greek people have to fight today for their liberty and independence, this is the reason why the Greek people are victims of the tragedy of war. No Special Commissions will be able to deny these facts.

An Overt Provocation

The extent to which the United Nations Special Commission on the Balkans has lost the sense of differentiating provocations from facts is best exemplified by a short phrase in the supplementary report of this Commission in which it is said that in recent months there has been less evidence of receipt of supplies from Yugoslavia by the guerillas. Yugoslavia has never interfered in the internal affairs of Greece, and, therefore, it is obvious that this assertion in the report of the Balkans Commission is nothing but an overt and very cheap provocation, adapted to present-day conditions, the background and aims of which are clear to everyone. It is also characteristic that numerous frontier incidents and other provocations, directed against Yugoslavia, and organized, apparently, for the purpose of supplying the Commission with the necessary evidence, are connected with the work of the said Commission in Greece. But we shall refer to this in the course of the debate on the Greek question. If all these facts are taken into account it is understandable when the following is stated in the memorandum of the Provisional Democratic Greek Government of August, 1948:

“Whoever is possessed of a minimum of good faith will be unable to understand why a plan for a democratic solution is not established, a plan which would exclude the possibility of any machination, of any fraud by one side or the other. And the task of the United Nations should rightly consist in the elaboration of such a plan, instead of nominating commissions, which have proved to be the servants of those who organized and who are responsible for the civil war.” (“Blue Book” of the Provisional Democratic Government of Greece, pp. 196-197).

The remark of Mr. Bevin that the Greek people have never had a chance since the war closed is in any case true, but to blame this on the northern neighbors of Greece or the Soviet Union can be done only with utter disregard for truth and reality. Everyone knows that the northern neighbors of Greece and the Soviet Union participated neither in the persecution of Greek anti-fascist fighters, nor in the imposing of anti-democratic regimes upon the Greek people, nor in the imposing of electoral comedies, nor in the rehabilitation of fascists and quislings, but that all this has been done under

British and American patronage. However, these are the very reasons why the Greek people could never express their will in a genuinely democratic manner. In such a case, is it not clear that the responsibility for the conditions in Greece rests upon the Athens regimes and upon those foreign powers which support them?

The Korean Commission

I have dwelt on the work of the so-called United Nations Special Commission on the Balkans somewhat longer because direct accusations have been made through it against the Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia. However, the same holds true of similar bodies of the United Nations. Let us take, for instance, the Korean Commission. Instead of accepting the Soviet proposal tending to withdraw all occupation forces from Korea and to enable the Korean people to decide their own fate, a Commission was formed with the actual aim of covering and justifying an electoral comedy in Southern Korea and the creation of a puppet government dependent upon foreign support and charity and, consequently, an obedient tool of its masters. This Commission has succeeded only in compromising, in the eyes of the Korean people and world public opinion, the United Nations, as an organization which, through its Special Commission, gives assistance to those who are suppressing the independence of the Korean people.

The Soviet Government has recently taken a practical step towards solution of the Korean question by deciding to withdraw Soviet troops from Korea. It would serve a useful purpose if this Assembly recommended to the United States Government to do likewise. Such a recommendation would do more for the cause of peace than the above-mentioned special commissions of the United Nations, which have to a large degree compromised themselves to such an extent that the peoples everywhere are receiving them with suspicion and even hostility.

The same holds true with regard to the fulfillment of international treaties and obligations. I shall take as an example the Free Territory of Trieste.

Maneuvers on Trieste

The Italian Peace Treaty came into force on September 15, 1947, i.e. more than a year ago. The Security Council by

its resolution of January 10, 1947, assumed the obligation to protect the independence and integrity of the Free Territory of Trieste and to appoint a governor as soon as possible. We know that the Free Territory of Trieste is still under a provisional regime of military occupation and that the governor has not yet been appointed, owing to the attitude of those great powers. All sorts of maneuvers have been resorted to in order to prevent implementation of the clauses of the Peace Treaty of Italy concerning the Free Territory of Trieste, while the resolution of the SSR of Ukraine, which drew the attention of the Security Council to the necessity and obligation to appoint as soon as possible the governor of Trieste, was rejected.

The majority of the Security Council fully supports not only the above mentioned violation of the clauses of the Peace Treaty with Italy, but also the policy of the United States of America and Great Britain aimed at a de facto revision of the Peace Treaty. The Yugoslav Government submitted a complaint to the Security Council, pointing out that organs of the United States of America and Great Britain in Trieste are carrying out a policy which is virtually incorporating the Free Territory of Trieste within Italy. Nevertheless, the majority of the Security Council undertook nothing to assure the implementation of the Peace Treaty, thus breaking its solemn obligation of guaranteeing the independence and integrity of the Free Territory of Trieste. Is it not clear that such moves are bound to be reflected in an aggravation of international relations?

Human Rights

Certain representatives have spoken a great deal here on the question of human rights as one of the main questions of our times. It is undoubtedly a fact that this is a momentous and important question. But when we consider the practical aim of the declarations concerning human rights which have been made here, we have to conclude that these declarations are serving entirely different aims, which have nothing to do with strengthening these rights in the world. On the other hand they cause much harm to the cause of international cooperation. This question is presented in such a tendentious manner as to be directed against the USSR and the peoples' democracies. The purpose of the erroneous and false

portrayal of internal conditions in these countries is obviously to divert the attention of world public opinion from the main questions concerning international relations today to secondary ones, to represent the causes of the existing contradictions in international relations erroneously, and to contribute to the ideological mobilization of the masses for a policy directed against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies.

If the substance of the question of human rights is to be considered, then socialist countries have a definite advantage over other countries. But we shall probably speak about this matter later. I should like only to stress here the discrepancy between the words and deeds of the leading states of the majority in general, and specially in the actual work of the United Nations, a discrepancy so manifest that no solemn declarations concerning human rights, made in this house, can conceal it. I shall merely mention a few facts with regard to the national and colonial question.

Let us turn to the question of trusteeship. The majority in this Organization has approved treaties according to which the trustee countries will administer territories, which they had received in trust, as integral parts of their own territories, and have even been accorded the possibility of using these territories for the creation of military bases. In other words, instead of systems which would enable the territories under trust to develop more quickly and become independent states—as laid down by the Charter—ordinary colonial regimes have been set up on these territories. When such conditions prevail in the territories under trust, it is evident that the conditions in other colonial, so-called non-autonomous, territories cannot be different. It is no wonder, therefore, that uprisings are spreading over the colonial world. These peoples have been brought to a condition where they have to pay in blood for every step on their way to freedom. Nevertheless, the colonial system is portrayed here almost as a sort of charitable institution.

Palestine

In this connection mention must be made of the Palestine question. The implementation of the resolution of the United Nations of November 29, 1947, with regard to the partition of Palestine, could save many human lives in that country.

However, it very soon became obvious that the United States of America and the majority in the Security Council had no serious intention of implementing this resolution and watched passively the carrying out of a policy aimed at creating chaos in Palestine and provoking aggression against the State of Israel. At the second extraordinary session of the General Assembly the majority rallied to open revision of the former decisions concerning Palestine. Now they are presenting us with a "new" plan, which is nothing but a continuation of this political line. And thus the bringing of a decision is put off, while in Palestine hatred is spread among the people and blood spilt.

In the same respect one could enumerate many questions which have experienced a more or less similar fate. One could not say that these questions had been solved in harmony with the spirit of the democratic principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

The policy of the majority with regard to international economic cooperation is also in contradiction to the principles of the United Nations.

The peoples of the countries devastated by the war rightly expected that the activity of the United Nations as a whole, as well as the activity of their particular organs, headed by the Economic and Social Council, would develop more and more toward ending discrimination in granting economic assistance for reconstruction of their countries and, in general, discrimination in economic relations. They could rightly expect that these relations would move toward development of the productive forces of the respective countries, and especially of their industrialization, without which there is today no independence nor equality of nations, and toward strengthening trade and other economic relations among the states on the basis of equal rights—in other words, in the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. Finally, they were right to expect that the assistance granted for their reconstruction would not be linked to conditions curtailing their independence.

American Aid Contradicts U. N. Principles

It is well known to everyone, however, that the majority in the General Assembly and other organs of the United Nations have, under the influence of the radically different

attitude of the United States Government, taken an entirely different road. The economic organs of the United Nations are practically paralyzed, and the so-called American European "Recovery" Program, i.e., the "Marshall Plan," has gone into effect outside the framework of the United Nations. The essence of this matter is that this American "assistance" to Europe is linked to conditions which are in direct contradiction to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and altogether inconsistent with the independence of peoples. The Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia was one of the countries which did not wish to accept such conditions, knowing they would impede her economic development, endanger the plan of her socialist reconstruction and her very independence.

Mr. Bevin mentioned in his speech that Eastern European countries had been "forbidden" to join the Marshall Plan. As far as the Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia is concerned I am compelled to state that its Government had not been "ordered" by anyone how to act, but had made its decision itself, as it was convinced, and is still deeply convinced, that the conditions laid down by the so-called Marshall Plan are unacceptable for an independent country, which has taken the course towards an all-round development of its productive potentialities. It is evident that such conditions have been laid down on purpose, in order to make them unacceptable to the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies. Finally, if it were not so, it would be incomprehensible why the initiators of this plan have not raised the question within the United Nations.

We are able today to talk about the results of this plan. These results confirm that our opinion regarding the economic role of the Marshall Plan was correct. Nevertheless, this plan has simultaneously brought about very serious international political consequences, both in Europe and in the world in general. Western Germany has begun to transform herself into an industrial and military base of the United States of America. German revisionist and imperialistic tendencies are reviving. The Marshall Plan countries are compelled to accept conditions tantamount to the direct inclusion of their countries into American military strategic plans. American control over the so-called "strategic raw-materials" is being established. Military alliances are being hastily set up and a net of military bases organized, etc.

It is perfectly clear that such action was bound to worsen relations among nations. Simultaneously, a heavy blow has been dealt in this way to the role and authority of the United Nations.

Displaced Persons

Let us consider the question of displaced persons from Eastern Europe. Reactionary propaganda strives to represent these people as victims of an "unbearable" regime behind the "Iron Curtain." This propaganda obviously relies on the fact that the wide masses in the world have already forgotten that these people had, in the great majority, fled from their countries together with the Nazi army, precisely because of their collaboration with it, or had been deceived by their quisling chiefs. However, it is not necessary to dwell on this further. It is essential that these displaced persons, who are, naturally, ready to sell themselves for a piece of bread to anyone who wishes to buy them, are being partly employed as the cheapest labor and in hostile acts of diversion against the states of Eastern Europe.

It is rather difficult to understand how it is possible to speak simultaneously of peace and peaceful cooperation among nations and, at the same time, send fascist hirelings to countries, members of the United Nations, for the purpose of committing acts of diversion in the said countries.

The views of the Yugoslav Government regarding the Yugoslav displaced persons are well known. Yugoslavia demands that the resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations be carried out, i.e., that all criminals who participated in the assassination of peaceful inhabitants and of anti-fascists be handed over to Yugoslav tribunals. As for the mass of displaced persons, an amnesty, granted a long time ago by our highest authorities, is in force. It is inhuman and against the interests of cooperation among nations to deceive and retain helpless masses of people who are grasping at every opportunity to keep themselves alive. The Yugoslav Government demands that the United Nations help these people return to their country to assume peaceful work.

Fellow Delegates,

I have enumerated a few of the most important questions facing the United Nations not for the purpose of examining

their substance, but to point out the fundamental sources of difficulties which we encounter in the field of international cooperation and in the work of the United Nations. All this, as well as many other facts, shows that the major illness of our organization lies in the fact that the leading group of states of the majority is trying to transform the Organization into their own instrument.

American Atomic Plan

It is necessary to state that the stand taken by the United States of America on atomic energy is also in full agreement with this goal. Detailed criticisms of the substance of the American Plan for the "control of atomic energy" have been made more than once in this Assembly and I shall not repeat them. I should like only to emphasize that this plan is at the same time aimed at fundamentally changing the principles upon which the United Nations are based. It is well known, for instance, that the United States plan abolishes, among others, the principle of unanimity of the great powers in connection with the question of the control of atomic energy. It is obvious that the aim pursued here is to clear all obstacles which could hamper the policy of the United States of America. It is not a mere chance that many influential Americans and others openly state that the United Nations should be transformed from a community of equally sovereign states into a "world state," which would be governed by a "World Government," which would rule on the basis of a certain "international legislature," and in which the full hegemony of the United States of America would of course be assured. There are also influential circles in America who openly say to peoples: Abandon your sovereignty, accept our hegemony and all that is connected with it and you will be saved from war and the atomic bomb. In other words: Decide yourselves whether you will willingly submit to American world domination, or whether you prefer to be subdued by force. It goes without saying that no nation which wishes to develop freely on the basis of its own conceptions and progressive social achievements can accept such alternatives.

In justifying his stand regarding the Soviet proposal concerning the reduction of the armed forces and the prohibition of atomic weapons, Mr. Bevin referred to a quotation of Lenin as proof of the dangers menacing the capitalist coun-

tries from the Soviet Union. However, if this quotation is closely examined, it can be seen that all Lenin said was that the socialist countries should be vigilant, because the capitalist world will not tolerate that a new, more progressive, socialist system should exist alongside it and that, therefore, it will try to crush it with all means at its disposal.

The prolonged foreign intervention—referred to yesterday by the delegate of Byelorussia—was at that time tangible confirmation of the accuracy of Lenin's viewpoint. However, it is necessary to point out that the war-inciting propaganda of today and the so-called "get-tough" policy against the Soviet Union and the peoples' democracies proves without a doubt that marxism-leninism has not become obsolete—in spite of Mr. Bevin's assertions—and that Lenin's warning has not to this day lost its validity. But it does not mean that the "program" of the socialist countries makes it obligatory for them to wage war against the capitalist countries, or that no cooperation in the sphere of international relations is possible between the countries of capitalism and socialism. The question is not one of the possibility or impossibility of cooperating but lies in the fact—as Soviet Prime Minister Stalin said on one occasion—of whether there is or is not a wish to cooperate. The Soviet Union and the people's democracies have proved, and are proving every day, their readiness for such cooperation and their conviction that such cooperation is possible and indispensable.

However, the same cannot be said of the leading states of the majority in our Organization.

Yesterday we heard Mr. Spaak and his argumentation—if I understood it correctly—followed the line that cooperation with the Soviet Union is impossible because the latter is a communist country. It is well known, however, that the Soviet Union had the same form of government both before and after the war, as well as at the time of the United Nations Assembly in San Francisco, and that no one considered the social system of the Soviet Union then as an obstacle standing in the way of cooperation, although the quotation from Lenin, cited by Mr. Bevin, was a familiar one. If the representatives of the majority approach this issue in a different manner today it means that their standpoint, and not that of the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, has changed. It means that they take the view that the system of interna-

tional cooperation, created in the midst of war and immediately after it, and which has found its expression in the United Nations, is in their way.

However, it is this very system of international cooperation which ought to be strengthened, if the people are to devote themselves to peaceful construction with all their strength. In order to attain this, we have to do much more than was proposed here yesterday by Mr. Spaak. It is necessary to give tangible proof to millions of working men, who day after day are intimidated by the clamor of the warmongers, that they need have no fears regarding the future.

The only genuine way to this goal in present world conditions is the way leading to the prohibition of atomic weapons, the destruction of atomic bombs, the control of atomic energy and an all-round reduction of armaments. For this reason the proposal, put forward by Mr. Vyshinsky in the name of the Soviet Government with regard to the reduction of the armed forces to one third, represents a serious and important contribution in the struggle for the strengthening of peace and peaceful international cooperation and thereby for the strengthening of the United Nations themselves. To accept this proposal would be an important contribution towards liberating the masses of the people from the fear of war, eliminating use of the threat of war as a method of international policy, and creating an atmosphere in which all outstanding international questions could be solved more successfully.

The Yugoslav Delegation, expressing the wishes of the peoples of Yugoslavia, who have not forgotten the sufferings and horrors of World War II, will support with all determination this proposal, and any other proposal which will strengthen the cause of peace and peaceful cooperation among nations.

