

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**336th
PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 8 November 1951, at 3 p.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

C O N T E N T S

General debate (<i>continued</i>)	Page 19
Speech by Mr. Vyshinsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).	

President : Mr. Luis PADILLA NERVO (Mexico).

General debate (*continued*)

[Agenda item 8]

SPEECH BY MR. VYSHINSKY (UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS).

1. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*) : I shall take this opportunity to fulfil from this rostrum on behalf of the USSR delegation the pleasant task of greeting the freedom-loving people of France, who have for the second time so hospitably welcomed our General Assembly to their country.

2. The United Nations is faced at this moment with a number of important problems requiring the particular attention not only of the General Assembly but of all peace-loving nations. The USSR delegation is fully aware of this and is conscious of the responsibility which rests on the United Nations for the course which it will take in resolving these problems and fulfilling these tasks.

3. The USSR delegation now, as at previous sessions, realizes that it is its duty to direct the General Assembly's efforts to removing all obstacles that stand in the way of strengthening world peace and international co-operation in an attempt to remove the threat of a new world war.

4. This is at present the most important and urgent task and requires immediate action by the United Nations. We are convinced that there is no other problem the solution of which is awaited so eagerly by millions and millions of people, indeed by the entire peace-loving world.

5. This task is the more important because the international situation has further deteriorated, both economically and politically, since the General Assembly's sixth session.

6. The economic situation in the capitalist countries has further deteriorated during this time as a direct result of the aggressive policy of the Atlantic bloc, led by the United States of America, and of a number of other countries forced to follow this policy under constant pressure from the United States.

7. The economy of the United States itself has become unstable as a result of war inflation. It is marked by a steady increase in the production of armaments and simultaneous retrenchment in the civilian branches of industry. The armaments race has inevitably resulted in an increase in military budgets and direct and indirect taxation, which

has led to a further deterioration in the material situation of those countries. It must be pointed out that the policy of economic discrimination, primarily in trade relations, against the Soviet Union and the countries of the people's democracies plays no small part in worsening the international economic situation ; this policy has seriously harmed the economy of the world, the economy of the United States, and, to an even greater extent, that of the United Kingdom and France. Many of the prominent leaders of these countries have been forced to admit that the economic situation in the capitalist countries has seriously deteriorated.

8. As to the United States, such an admission was made recently by Mr. Truman in his economic report to Congress for the first half of 1951 in which he said that inflation in the United States of America has led during the past year to an increase in the price of essential consumer goods. I shall quote further from this report : " It has encouraged speculation and has made things more difficult for a large part of our people "—that is, the American people. Those, continued Mr. Truman, who have been fortunate enough to increase their incomes have been able to maintain their standard of living. But more than half the families in the country have been unable to increase their incomes between the beginning of 1950 and the beginning of 1951. Indeed the incomes of nearly a fifth of the aggregate number of families have actually decreased.

9. Mr. Truman in his broadcast address last night again had to concede—a point which Mr. Acheson today confirmed from this rostrum—that there is a close connexion between raising the standard of living of the population and decreasing the armaments burden. However, it is common knowledge that this realization does not prevent the Government of the United States of America from pursuing the mad arms race, thus bringing about a further deterioration in the material condition of its people.

10. The economic position of the countries of Western Europe, and in particular of England and France, may be judged from the conclusions contained in the report of a United Nations economic commission — not the statements of any mere propaganda paper but the conclusions set out in the report of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, and quoted in the 1 September number of the British periodical *New Statesman and Nation*, as follows :

" The economy of the United Kingdom is showing every sign of suffering from severe strain. Cost inflation

is rampant, and towards the end of the year may well be enhanced by demand inflation flowing from the heaviest rearmament programme in Europe."

11. Economically and in particular financially, both Great Britain and other Western European countries are now threatened, and will continue to be threatened by serious difficulties, especially in view of the new United States law, which the President signed only a few days ago, 26 October. According to this law I am trying to keep as closely as possible to the actual wording—it will be United States policy to impose an embargo on all goods exported to the Soviet Union and countries friendly to the Soviet Union and to discontinue economic and financial aid to all countries trading with those countries.

12. While on this subject I cannot refrain from mentioning an article which appeared in the April 1951 number of the American periodical *Foreign Affairs*, written by the present Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, Mr. Eden, who is now here as head of the United Kingdom delegation. That article contained the following passage, to which I think it is important to draw attention now. Mr. Eden was at that time, it is true, in the Opposition, but I do not imagine he has changed his views, at any rate on this point, as a result of becoming a member of the Government. Mr. Eden wrote, "it must be remembered that the British economy is already fully stretched, with a higher level of taxation than any other country in the world".

13. Nor can I deny myself the pleasure of referring to another even more explicit statement on the same subject, made by the new British Prime Minister in outlining his programme to the House of Commons. In his speech, as reported in the official Press, Mr. Churchill used the following words: "As regards the general balance of payments of foreign trade, we are in the midst of a crisis. For the deficit is larger than in 1949 and in many respects even worse than in 1947. In the present half-year", said Mr. Churchill, after the speech from the Throne, "we are running into an external deficit at the rate of £ 700 million sterling a year compared with an annual rate of surplus of about £ 350 million sterling in the same period a year ago".

14. "In 1952", said Mr. Churchill, "the latest estimates show that unless the situation deteriorates, the United Kingdom will have a deficit on its general balance of payments of between £ 500 million sterling and £ 600 million sterling". Unless, Mr. Churchill said, the situation deteriorates. But what guarantee is there that it will not in fact deteriorate?

15. The exhaustion of the central gold and dollar reserves in the transactions of the sterling area as a whole would increase this deficit considerably. The conclusion? Mr. Churchill has drawn this conclusion: "These figures mean", he said "that we are buying much more than we can afford from current earnings". The new law, signed by the President of the United States of America on 26 October will of course make the situation even worse.

16. "That", concluded Mr. Churchill, "may lead in time to national bankruptcy". Such is the present economic situation of Great Britain, one of the leading members of the Atlantic bloc, a country which is also engaged in a mad arms race.

17. Even more serious is the economic plight of the under-developed countries, most of them Asian countries, which, as a result of the militarization of the United States of America, the United Kingdom and a number of other States, are unable to obtain the equipment they require

for developing their own industries. The proceeds from the sale of their raw materials are frozen in American and British banks, and they cannot dispose of them freely. Agriculture in these countries is on the decline, and holds out no promise of progress in the future. The production of foodstuffs is falling, and the populations of a number of areas are doomed to famine, disease and extinction.

18. The political situation too has deteriorated during the past year. The aggressive Anglo-American Atlantic bloc has led to a further worsening of international relations, already sorely strained by the atmosphere of unbridled war hysteria, the armaments race, and the constant attempts to frighten other nations by the threat of atomic and hydrogen bombs, for which the American reactionary leaders are responsible.

19. For almost a year and a half the United States of America and Great Britain, the leaders of the Atlantic bloc, have been waging an aggressive war in Korea. Mr. Acheson today made an attempt to shift the responsibility for the war from the government of the United States to other countries, although, as was proved over and over again in the course of the fifth session, it was in fact the United States of America which really launched the aggressive, predatory war in Korea. If it proves necessary to do so, we shall be prepared to marshal all this evidence again at the sixth session. There is, I think, no need to dwell at length on that point at the moment.

20. As regards the Kaesong negotiations, to which Mr. Acheson also referred today, there can surely be no doubt about the fact that it is the American generals—the MacArthurs and the Ridgways and their protectors—who have persistently sabotaged all attempts from the other side to achieve success in these talks. Is it not, after all, the American command which has been undermining the success of these negotiations by using various delaying tactics, bombing neutral zones, and adopting other similar typically American methods of negotiation? Can there be any doubt that the truce talks in Korea could be brought to a successful conclusion by a very simple process? The American Government need merely instruct General Ridgway not to complicate the situation by all kinds of incidents; not to set up artificial obstacles designed to prejudice the success of the Kaesong talks; not, for instance, to put forward proposals such as the one reported over the radio today, an utterly ridiculous demand to the effect that the Kaesong area should be taken over by the American command, quite regardless of the fact that the area is at present in the hands of the North Korean forces. With an approach such as this, can there be any hope of successful talks? And who, in these circumstances, must be held responsible for their breakdown? Really honest people can obviously give only one answer: those who invaded Korea, who spilled the blood of the Korean people, who subjected the Korean people to untold misery and suffering, who are breaking all the laws and regulations of international law by bombing civilian centres, including even neutral zones. That is where the responsibility for the Korean war lies.

21. The United States has seized the Chinese island of Taiwan, and is threatening the borders of China. Now it is trying to strengthen the North Atlantic bloc by the inclusion of Greece, Turkey and Western Germany, which have been assigned a special role in its aggressive plans against the Soviet Union. The members of the Atlantic bloc are thus openly flaunting international agreements which were signed during the war against Hitlerite Germany and militarist Japan with the object of preventing a repe-

tition of fascist aggression and strengthening the bonds of friendship with the Soviet Union. In this way, the bosses of the North Atlantic bloc are rushing to pave the way for carrying out the aggressive plans worked out in the offices of the general staffs at the order of reactionaries in the United States of America who are thirsting for another world war. And, in order to deceive the public, in order to mask their true aggressive aims, the President, members of the Cabinet, Senators and other political and social leaders in the United States are raising a hue and cry about the security of the United States being threatened by the Soviet Union.

22. They are trying to twist the recent atom bomb tests in the Soviet Union to serve this purpose; tests of different sizes of such bombs, according to a reply made by Generalissimo Stalin, President of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, to a *Pravda* correspondent in connexion with the atomic weapon, are to be carried out as part of the plan for the defence of our country against attack by the aggressive Anglo-American bloc.

23. In his reply to the *Pravda* correspondent Generalissimo Stalin exposed the complete groundlessness of such apprehensions and showed them to be without foundation.

24. "The rulers of the United States", said Generalissimo Stalin, "must be aware that the Soviet Union is not only opposed to any use of the atomic weapon, but recommends its prohibition and the discontinuance of its production. If the United States does not intend to attack the Soviet Union the fears of its rulers are spurious and unfounded, since the Soviet Union has no intention of attacking the United States of America or any other country at any time".

25. The Atlantic bloc has based its hostile policy towards the Soviet Union and the people's democracies, under pressure in these cases chiefly from the United States of America, in an endeavour to make a tool of the United Nations and to push through the General Assembly and other United Nations organs resolutions invalidating decisions, designed to remove the threat of a new war and to maintain international peace and security, which had been adopted at previous sessions of the Assembly. Such resolutions were in fact taken at earlier sessions of the Assembly. But they have not been acted on. At the fifth session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union delegation declared that the Assembly was thereby violating the fundamental principles of the United Nations. Our delegation called for the adoption of proposals submitted by the Soviet Union and the people's democracies to strengthen peace and to prohibit—not reduce, as Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson would have it—I repeat, completely and unconditionally to prohibit the atomic weapon, proposals for the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only, and for the prohibition of war propaganda. At the same time we called upon the Assembly to adopt resolutions for the immediate cessation of the war in Korea, which had been forced upon the Korean people by the Anglo-American interventionists, for the cessation of aggressive action against the People's Republic of China and on a number of other important subjects.

26. Unfortunately, the General Assembly did not adopt that course. On the contrary, it embarked on further departures from and violations of the purposes and principles of the United Nations. At the last session a number of resolutions were adopted, the aggressive character of which are beyond dispute, notwithstanding all the attempts of their authors and instigators to disguise their real object beneath fine phrases such as "uniting for peace", and

"peace through deeds", to quote two of the bloc's resolutions. The Assembly resolutions on the so-called collective measures, those establishing a blockade and putting an embargo on goods exported to China, the iniquitous resolution declaring the People's Republic of China an aggressor, and the equally iniquitous resolution charging the American Command in Korea to ensure "conditions of stability", in the words of the resolution, throughout the whole of Korea, or in other words to continue the aggressive war until the whole of Korea had been conquered, speak for themselves and show the aggressive character of the policy pursued by the General Assembly at its last session under United States pressure. The Assembly openly embarked on a policy of supporting and intensifying aggression against the peace-loving peoples of Korea and China.

27. Shortly before this sixth session the majority in the Security Council, at the instigation of the United States and England, committed a new violation of the most important principles of the United Nations Charter by accepting for consideration the British complaint against Iran, in clear violation of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter which, as you are aware, forbids intervention in the domestic affairs of States. Thus once again the Anglo-American group in the United Nations demonstrated its complete contempt for the most important principles of the Charter, which require respect for the independence and sovereign rights of States.

28. It is only necessary for me to mention these facts to remove any doubt that the elementary principles and standards of international law are being trampled under foot in the United Nations, and that American policy is doing immeasurable damage to the moral authority of our Organization.

29. Instead of performing the important tasks of helping to establish the requisite conditions for peaceful and friendly relations between nations, of promoting a better standard of life, of securing full employment, the Economic and Social Council, at its last session, devoted itself entirely to the preparation of measures supporting the Anglo-American aggression in Korea. During its eleventh session the majority in the Council adopted¹ at the instigation of the United States, a resolution for the so-called "relief and rehabilitation" of Korea. It should be quite clear to all and sundry that the purpose of this resolution was to provide a hypocritical and lying cloak for the barbaric destruction of Korean towns and villages and the slaughter of the peaceful Korean people by American aircraft.

30. The Economic and Social Council took the same line at its twelfth session and did everything it could to support American aggressive policy also in the economic sphere. The majority in the Council at the same time systematically rejected any proposals for the development of a peaceful economy and the satisfaction of civilian needs. The Council rejected a proposal recommending steps to decrease war industry, to reduce prices of articles of mass consumption, to decrease the people's burden of taxation, to increase expenditure on housing, health, education and the like. In a word, it rejected any proposal submitted by those who were really attempting to improve the physical, economic and social condition of the people in many countries. All such proposals were rejected root and branch.

31. In the regional economic commissions, which dealt with matters chiefly affecting Asian countries, the Anglo-American bloc rejected a number of important constructive proposals by the USSR delegation and the delegations of

¹ Economic and Social Council resolution 338 (XI).

the people's democracies for promoting the development of economic relations in the countries and territories of Asia and the Far East and for promoting the development of national industry in those countries and territories, together with a number of other important proposals.

32. These facts are well known to you all. It was before your very eyes and unhappily, I must point out, it was with the support of many of you that all these decisions were taken, decisions designed to defeat the attempt to strengthen universal peace and prosperity, and to create a war psychosis which would facilitate the preparations for a new war that are being secretly made by the American military staff.

33. In this way, year by year, step by step, the United Nations has been departing more and more from the purposes and principles of the Charter, from the tasks set before the United Nations by its Charter and its founders. The United Nations has strayed far from the path of strengthening peace and promoting the development of friendly relations between countries and peoples. To-day, it is being guided by different interests; it is being pushed towards different goals by aggressive forces in the United States, England, France and the Latin-American countries, which now manage the questions of war and peace in the United Nations. And it is these goals and interests, this craving for a new war, for riches from war, for gigantic profits from war, which is the source of encouragement of the master monopolists who, as generalissimo Stalin, the head of the Soviet Government, remarked, "consider war a money-making proposition providing colossal profits". Nor can this be concealed by deceitful and hypocritical phrases about peace, about "peace through deeds", and "uniting for peace"—phrases, the spurious character of which is being demonstrated every day, every hour, every minute, by numerous facts.

34. The aggressive tendencies and plans of the American monopolists are fully supported by a number of States, members of the North Atlantic bloc, which hold a commanding position in the United Nations, and are converting it from an instrument of peace into a tool of war.

35. "By becoming an instrument of aggressive war", said Generalissimo Stalin, "the United Nations is ceasing to be an international organization of nations with equal rights. The United Nations is now substantially not so much an international organization as an organization for Americans, acting to satisfy the requirements of the American aggressors".

36. Such are the facts and facts, as we know, are stubborn things. But we must not go further along this path.

37. It is time to remind the United Nations of its duties, which are: to support not the aggressors who attack other countries, but those who are subjected to attacks by aggressors; to support international peace and security; and to develop friendly relations between nations. It is time to rebuff the aggressive forces which are pushing the world toward a new world war.

38. What is happening in the United Nations is a direct result of the foreign policy of the Anglo-American bloc, which constitutes the aggressive core within the United Nations.

39. Influential government leaders in the United States—the President, members of the Cabinet, Senators—day after day instigate hostility towards the Soviet Union and the countries of the people's democracies. The United States Congress piles act upon act aimed at destroying the

peaceful co-operation between our peoples, at kindling a new world war.

40. Only this year the United States Government, proceeding along the path of further worsening relations with the Soviet Union, adopted an act to embargo trade with the Soviet Union and the countries of the people's democracies and broke the USSR-United States trade agreement of 4 August 1937, which had hitherto operated quite soundly.

41. We cannot fail to note that this decision to break the United States-USSR trade agreement was adopted in the United States almost simultaneously with the appeal of the United States President, Mr. Truman, and the United States Congress to the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Mr. Schvernik, and to the Supreme Soviet of our country, an appeal which contained assurances of the desire to improve relations with the Soviet Union. It must be frankly said that such declarations are not in harmony with the actions of the United States Government and in particular with the breaking of the aforementioned trade agreement with the USSR, which can only be evaluated as an act designed to bring about a further deterioration of relations between the USSR and the United States.

42. The aggressive character of the foreign policy of the United States is obvious to the whole world, in spite of the efforts of the United States Government to conceal it from world public opinion by representing the new war which it is preparing as a defensive war and representing the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries as an aggressive policy, although everyone knows that the Soviet Union, as I already said in quoting the authoritative statements of Generalissimo Stalin, has no intention of ever attacking the United States or any other country.

43. Meanwhile, year after year, the United States has been increasing its army, navy and air force, has been building hundreds of new naval and air bases on foreign territory, has been creating a whole system of military alliances, involving in those alliances even the former "axis" countries—so well experienced in such matters—Japan and Italy, and also Western Germany.

44. The whole economy of the United States of America, as well as of England, France and a number of other countries, has been geared to war production. The lion's share of expenditures in their State budgets goes for war preparations. Military expenditures in the United States budget for 1951-52 amount by official American figures to £ 81,800 million, a sum which is seventy-six times greater than what was appropriated in 1939.

45. As Mr Truman admitted in his message to Congress in April of this year, the United States had over the preceding ten months more than doubled the number of its armed forces and is planning in the course of the next fiscal year to increase them further to 3,500,000 men, not including 2 million men in other military units and in the National Guard. The number of the armed forces of the United States, England and France is thus already several times greater than in 1939, in the period before the Second World War, and is more than double the number of the armed forces and armaments of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, the armed forces of these countries and their expenditures are being increased more and more.

46. The United States is continuing to expand its military industry, which is swallowing up more and more thousands of millions of dollars, under the pretext of the "defence" and "national security" of the United States.

47. American ruling circles are trying to picture the armaments race, the forming of a large number of armies, the production of atomic bombs, the creation of military bases on foreign soil, as a necessity resulting from an alleged danger from the Soviet Union threatening England, the United States and France.

48. Aiming at a similar deception of the peoples in regard to the real character of the policy of the Atlantic bloc is also the declaration—I learned about it last evening—of France, England and the United States presented yesterday to the General Assembly. From this declaration, in spite of the words it contains about peace, the conclusion may clearly be drawn that these States will continue the armaments race, the production of atomic bombs, the barbarous aggressive war in Korea, once again on the pretext of defence interests and the alleged desire to protect the security of their countries. They thereby seek to prove that peace can be preserved only on the basis of a powerful war-machine, by force, and that only under such conditions can the well-known existing political disagreements between various countries be settled.

49. Here, I would recall, is a basic thesis of American total diplomacy, exhibited once again today by Mr. Acheson, repeating yesterday's radio speech by Mr. Truman. Once again they boast of successes in the armaments race, in the expansion of the so-called combined defence forces in Europe under the command of General Eisenhower, and promise future expansion and increase of those armed forces and armaments, as Mr. Truman declared, in Europe and in other parts of the world just as long as that is necessary. It is obvious that all these measures are planned on a long-term basis. At the same time they are all screened with spurious phrases about an alleged threat from the Soviet Union; but this is a repetition of the slander against the policy of the Soviet Union in order to deceive their own peoples, in order to drag them into a new world war organized by the ruling circles of the United States of America. How many times have they tried to resort to the same deception in order to strengthen their own position in the eyes of public opinion and to continue the line of their aggressive policy.

50. All that we heard today from Mr. Acheson is an expression of that same policy of situations of strength, the utter recklessness of which is now evident to every clear-thinking person, in spite of all the artifices employed by the instigators of the plan for another world war to deceive unsophisticated people. But this total diplomacy has already proved its complete bankruptcy. And if now a proposal on peace is introduced and words about peace are jumbled together, this has only been done under the pressure of a powerful movement of the popular masses, who are demanding peace and who have put more than 500 million signatures to a new appeal on the necessity of concluding a pact of peace.

51. Is this the source of your love of peace, organizers and inspirers of the Atlantic bloc warmongers? Now your only course is to try to conceal even more effectively your aggressive plans by false phrases of peace; you need to reconquer the trust of the peoples in order to hoodwink them. That, however, cannot always be carried off successfully. Even in the United States this theory of "strength" no longer carries its former weight. Among large numbers of people in the United States dissatisfaction with the policy of "situations of strength" is expressed with increasing frequency and insistence. In all probability these voices reach even the State Department, although the ears of the responsible persons there are tightly stuffed with cotton-wool. For example, the view is expressed that

if the United States stubbornly refuses to conduct negotiations, and insists on rearmament at an increasingly furious rate, the consequences will be disastrous not only for the United States, but for its allies too.

52. The basis of the entire United States foreign policy is in fact the preparation of a new world war, with the object of winning world hegemony for the American monopolies and extracting gigantic war profits. In recent times the United States, the United Kingdom and France have been exerting fresh efforts to extend the conspiracy against peace, and to draw Western Germany, Italy, Turkey and Greece into the preparation of the new war.

53. It is no secret that the United States is the chief organiser and inspirer of measures such as the "Pleven Plan" and the "Schumann Plan", the general objective of which is to restore German militarism and the military-industrial power of Western Germany, and to use the German regular army and the German economy for aggressive ends.

54. That is why the United States and the United Kingdom and France, which indisputably follow in the wake of the United States, broke off the Paris meeting of the Deputy Foreign Ministers on the German question. Mr. Acheson's attempts to whitewash the boycott policy of the United States and its allies during the three months marking-time at the Paris meeting of Deputy Foreign Ministers on the German question are no avail.

55. The facts speak against Mr. Acheson. The facts speak against such attempts. The facts show that in this instance once again it was the Anglo-American bloc which did everything in its power to break off the meeting of Deputy Foreign Ministers on the German question, and in fact succeeded in doing so.

56. Last September, having wrecked the Paris meeting of Deputy Foreign Ministers, Mr. Acheson and his adherents organized their own meeting in Washington and then held a meeting of the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Ottawa, endeavouring to intensify and extend the remilitarization of West Germany, to go still further in transforming Western Germany into a base for aggression against its neighbours.

57. For some years since the end of the Second World War—as also before it—rivers of American gold have been flowing into German war industry, with the object of forcing that industry into the service of the American monopolists, who thirst for ever greater profits even at a cost of disastrous calamities and sacrifices to all humanity.

58. The objectives of United States policy towards Japan were demonstrated beyond need of words in the farce staged at San Francisco by the United States for the signing of the so-called Peace Treaty with Japan. That Treaty is quite incompatible with the principles on which a genuine peace treaty might be constructed, a treaty calculated to ensure peace in the Far East and provide guarantees against any recurrence of Japanese aggression. Not only the United States Government, but the Governments of the United Kingdom, France, Canada, Australia and a number of other States which signed the San Francisco Treaty, violated the obligations which they assumed in 1947 as members of the Far Eastern Commission. With their participation, the Commission adopted resolutions stating that the above-mentioned Powers undertook to carry out reforms in Japan with the object of destroying the influence of militarism and ensuring the complete disarmament of Japan, thereby rendering it impossible for that country to wage aggressive war in the future.

59. Instead of fulfilling these obligations, the initiators and inspirers of the "peace treaty" with Japan resorted to a policy of reviving Japanese military organizations of all kinds and establishing and expanding military, air and naval bases in Japan; of restoring the Japanese army, fleet and air force; of strengthening Japan as an American military arsenal and war base in the Far East.
60. Such a "peace treaty" with Japan is incompatible with the interests of the peace-loving peoples and with those of the Japanese people themselves. By compelling Japan to enter a war bloc directed against the USSR and the People's Republic of China, it condemns the Japanese people to the bitter fate of serving as cannon-fodder in the new war under preparation by the aggressive Atlantic bloc. This is a dangerous development in international relations; a step which undermines the peace and security of the peoples of the Far East. It is dangerous, moreover, because the San Francisco Treaty provides for the continuance of the occupation of Japan by United States forces even after the signing of the Treaty, and lays upon Japan the obligation of offering its territory for American war bases. It is obvious that the San Francisco Treaty is not a peace treaty, but a treaty for the preparation of a new war in the Far East.
61. The San Francisco Treaty makes it more difficult for the Japanese people to secure the democratization of their country and develop the peace economy of Japan. It will lead to the transformation of Japan into a country dependent on foreign monopolies, will make it impossible for the Japanese people to develop their welfare and will impede the development of their material and spiritual forces.
62. This, however, was not the object of the inspirers of the treaty—the Anglo-American monopolists. They needed the treaty solely in order to legalize their way to a military alliance between the American monopolists and the Japanese militarists. Such a treaty cannot and will not serve the cause of peace. Rejected by the USSR and by the People's Republic of China, India and Burma—the countries most interested in a peaceful settlement with Japan—the peace treaty signed at San Francisco will remain a dead letter.
63. The basis of present United States policy is fear of any possibility of a peaceful development of international relations or the strengthening of international co-operation.
64. In American "business" circles it is openly admitted that fear of the "peace danger" reigns supreme; that share prices rise on the American stock exchange—as has been reported on many occasions in the American Press—when the continuance of the Korean war appears probable, and fall, on the contrary, whenever there appears any likelihood of the conclusion of peace in Korea.
65. Having started a war of aggression in Korea which is earning them huge profits, the American billionaires and millionaires are tenaciously clinging to this source of gain and are in no mood to let such a "golden opportunity" of multiplying their millions and billions slip out of their hands. They view with alarm every hint of the likelihood of an armistice in Korea, and are doing everything possible to thwart the conversations in Kaesong, despite the fact that the American people—in common, we are profoundly convinced, with all peace-loving peoples—are longing for and demanding the termination of the war and the establishment of peace in the Far East.
66. The July issue of the bulletin published by the American National City Bank of New York, which is well-known to be under the control of the influential Morgan group, frankly states that any reduction in expenditure on armaments will make the situation of the monopolists a difficult one.
67. The President of the United States, Mr. Truman, stated at one of his many Press conferences that an armistice in Korea may lead to delay in the fulfilment of the American armament programme, which, to quote his words as reported in the Press, "would be the most catastrophic thing that could possibly happen in the United States".
68. Another president, Mr. Rubin, who is the president of the powerful investment company Selected American Shares Incorporated, frankly asserted at a bankers' conference in Los Angeles that "if peace is achieved, it is difficult to imagine what will take the place of the defence programme as a support of our economy".
69. Thus, two presidents, equally authoritative, have stated their views in favour of war.
70. It is for this reason that the USSR proposal for a cease-fire in Korea created serious alarm in the governing circles of the United States. In order to exert appropriate pressure on American public opinion, Mr. Wilson, director of the United States office of so-called defense mobilization stated in a radio broadcast on 9 July 1951 that the Soviet proposal for cease-fire in Korea was a manoeuvre undertaken for the purpose of "weakening the vigilance of the United States and obstructing the fulfilment of the country's defence programme". That is his description of the military programmes for the implementation of American aggressive plans. Furthermore, Mr. Wilson expressed his conviction that the United States Congress would not embark on so dangerous a path. The path of peace, in Mr. Wilson's eyes, is a dangerous one.
71. Are not all these facts sufficient to confirm the fact that the trend of American foreign policy is aggressive, and that its purpose is not to support peace but to unleash a new world war, whatever the cost to mankind in new bloodshed and disaster?
72. The foreign policy of the USSR is a policy of peace. The Soviet Union is waging a ceaseless struggle against the menace of war, a struggle for peace, for the strengthening of friendly relations among the peoples, for close international co-operation based on mutual respect for the independence of nations and for the sovereign equality of States.
73. When, nearly twenty years ago, diplomatic relations were established between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, Generalissimo Stalin characterised that event as one of momentous importance. It was important politically, he said, because it improved the chances of preserving peace, and economically because it brushed aside secondary considerations and made it possible for the two countries to discuss questions of common interest on a business-like footing. Lastly, it paved the way towards mutual co-operation.
74. These words were uttered twenty years ago, when diplomatic relations were established between the Soviet Union and the United States for the first time. But these words are of the greatest importance, and do not apply alone to the United States.
75. These words of the leader of the Soviet people reflect the fundamental principles of Soviet foreign policy, the policy applied by the Soviet Government in its relations

with all other nations. The Soviet Union steadfastly adheres to these principles, which have determined every course and every step taken by the Soviet Government in international affairs.

76. In the pursuit of its peace policy, the Soviet Union is utilizing its entire resources, not in order to expand its armed forces or to conduct an armaments race, not to expand its war industry or to organize military bases on foreign territory, but in order to expand to the full its civilian industry and develop the national economy as a whole.

77. The successful reconstruction and development of the postwar economy have enabled the Soviet Union to tackle gigantic projects; projects, I maintain with full justification, such as have never before been undertaken by any other single country in the history of mankind. There is the project for the extensive multi-purpose exploitation of the Volga, Don, Dnieper and Amu-Darya rivers, designed to satisfy the requirement of the national economy in regard to power, agriculture, transport et cetera. The huge construction projects already undertaken by the Soviet Union, such as the hydro-electric plants at Kuibyshev, Stalingrad and elsewhere and the Grand Turkmen, Southern Ukrainian and other canals, are also well-known. The new electric power plants will yield a daily output of 22,000 million kilowatt hours of cheap electric power, which, as L. P. Berya, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers, has pointed out, is equal to the entire annual output of electric power in Italy. The new irrigation projects will permit the irrigation and reclamation of over 25 million hectares of land, an expanse equal to the entire area of several European States. The purpose of these huge projects, in the construction of which the Soviet Union is investing thousands of millions of roubles, is to promote the development of the peaceful economy of the country and to enhance the welfare of its people.

78. In the Soviet Union the entire population is engaged in creative work, is directing all its efforts towards the development of the national economy and is achieving success after success in the continued promotion of culture, technique, science and art. In its political relations with other countries, the Soviet Union has always stood and still stands for friendly co-operation and is opposed to any discrimination, and to all artificial barriers preventing the free inter-course of the Soviet people with others. The Soviet Union has always stood and still stands for friendship among the peoples.

79. Ever since the General Assembly began its activities, the Soviet Union has, year by year, advocated the adoption of measures to strengthen peace and international security. Sufficient it is in this connexion to recall that as early as 1946 the Soviet Union submitted a proposal for a general reduction of armaments and for the prohibition of the production and use of atomic energy for warlike purposes. Notwithstanding the resistance of the Anglo-American bloc to these proposals, the General Assembly, as you will remember, substantially accepted [63rd meeting] these Soviet Union proposals. Throughout the subsequent period, unfortunately, the Anglo-American bloc has hampered, in every way possible, their implementation.

80. At subsequent sessions, from 1947 to 1950, the Soviet Union has steadfastly demanded the prohibition of atomic weapons; not their reduction I would stress, as in the proposal just submitted by the United States of America, but their complete prohibition. However, the Soviet Union has

encountered constant resistance from the powers of the North Atlantic bloc.

81. The Soviet Union has also repeatedly advocated the establishment of strict international control, in order to ensure the meticulous and conscientious fulfilment of decisions on the prohibition of atomic weapons and the use of atomic energy exclusively for civilian requirements. But here also the aggressive North Atlantic bloc has constantly wrecked the Soviet Union's proposals for international control—as indeed occurred again today—and has put forward its own proposals, which have in fact nothing to do with genuine international control. I refer to the notorious Acheson-Baruch-Lilienthal plan, which is no more than a mockery of international control and which no self-respecting State, genuinely desirous of preventing the leakage of atomic energy for military purposes could ever accept. For what Messrs. Acheson, Baruch and Lilienthal propose is not an international but an American control organ, designed to legalize and sanction the production of atomic weapons, and not to supervise the implementation of decisions to prohibit the production of atomic weapons, as proposed by the Soviet Union and as demanded by millions and millions of people and by all the peace-loving nations of the world.

82. In the light of these facts the true worth of the outcry raised in the United States and certain other member countries of the North Atlantic bloc over the atom bomb tests in the Soviet Union will be clear to all. Particularly vociferous have been certain members of United States ruling circles who make no secret of their plans to use the atom bomb against the Soviet Union and who view with equanimity even so infamous and cynical an expression of their devotion to the atom bomb as the article which has just appeared in one of the latest numbers of *Collier's Magazine*, accompanied by disgusting illustrations. These gentlemen clamour at the fact that an atom bomb—and indeed more than one—has been manufactured in the Soviet Union. However, they are not willing to adopt our proposal, which is to prohibit the atom bomb, to destroy atom bombs or even to use those bombs already manufactured, as generalissimo Stalin has said, for civilian purposes—which is entirely feasible. Most noisily of all, these gentlemen sow slanderous rumours to the effect that the Soviet Union is against international control over the execution of the decision to prohibit atomic weapons, and that the United States on the other hand is in favour of such control. In reality, however, the reverse is the case: it is in fact the Soviet Union which has always striven and still strives for the establishment of effective international control over the observance by all States without exception of measures to prohibit atomic weapons; prohibition here meaning *unconditional* and *unqualified* prohibition. Let Mr. Acheson answer: is he in favour of the prohibition of atomic weapons with control, or of control without any prohibition of atomic weapons, as is stated in the documents which he has here read out? However, we shall have more to say about this in the First Committee and I shall reserve further comment for the future. I need hardly say that we welcome such further discussion.

83. Since they are in favour of atomic weapons the United States ruling classes desire neither the unconditional prohibition of the production of atomic weapons nor genuine international control. As J. V. Stalin stated in his reply to a *Pravda* correspondent on the subject of atomic weapons, what they really want is the legalization of the right of the warmongers to use atomic weapons for the destruction of tens and hundreds of thousands of peaceful human beings.

84. At the fourth and fifth sessions of the General Assembly the Soviet Union submitted a proposal for the conclusion by the United States, the United Kingdom, China, France and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of a pact for the strengthening of peace. More than 500 million people throughout the globe warmly supported this proposal. They still continue to support it steadfastly, since this proposal inspires great hopes for the removal of the threat of a new war and for the strengthening of peace.

85. At the present time particularly energetic efforts are required to achieve a solution of this problem and to lead the world out of the dangerous situation into which it is being drawn by the criminal machinations of the instigators of a new war.

86. In view of the situation which has arisen in international relations the leaders of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc have been obliged to come forward with their plan for reducing the danger of war, as they allege, and increasing the security of all nations. This plan was the subject of the so-called three-power declaration by the United States of America, France and the United Kingdom to which I have already referred, and also of yesterday's broadcast speech by President Truman and today's speech from this platform by Mr. Acheson. In spite of all the impressive publicity which preceded these three declarations it may be stated without fear of error, in the words of a Russian and, I believe, an English proverb, that "the mountain has brought forth a mouse". I will amend this only by saying that it has brought forth a still-born mouse; so frivolous and so manifestly specious are the peace proposals emanating from the North Atlantic camp.

87. What, in actual fact, do they propose as the most radical method, they claim, of removing the threat of a new war and strengthening peace? From a perusal of yesterday's speech by Mr. Truman and from today's statement by Mr. Acheson, it would appear that they propose the undertaking of a census or inventory of armed forces and armaments under the supervision of a new joint commission for atomic energy and conventional armaments. Is this not absurd? Of course, stock-taking is a useful procedure in every economy. Inventories must be made of boots, great-coats, bayonets, cartridges, rifles, machine guns, *et cetera*—all this needs to be checked over. But is this a task for the United Nations in the struggle for peace? For Mr. Acheson it is the main task, and yesterday Mr. Truman resoundingly proclaimed to the whole world that without the solution of this problem there can be no reduction of armaments and no peaceful settlement of outstanding questions.

88. After reading this speech I could not get to sleep all last night—because I was choking with laughter. I am not by nature given to laughter, but even on this platform—although, as the President will attest, I am refraining from laughter—I am unable to restrain my irony over this sensational peace offensive by which the United States delegation hoped to wrest the initiative from the Soviet Union. I trust they will accept our congratulations.

89. As long ago as 1948 we were asked to undertake the collection of information on armed forces and armaments. We are now being asked to undertake a census of all armed forces and armaments, and the supervision of this census. In accordance with its outcome, concrete measures for reducing armaments are to be elaborated. On the basis of this census it is suggested that we determine what weapons and armed forces each country shall have the right to

maintain now and in the future. With regard to so critical a weapon as the atom bomb, the sponsors of the proposals limit themselves to a publicity campaign in favour of the notorious Acheson-Baruch-Lilienthal plan, claiming that it is the most suitable. But the complete worthlessness of this plan was exposed by the United States representatives themselves; if necessary, I can quote documents stating that this control plan in actual fact controls nothing, that this guarantee plan guarantees nothing; that it is in short a plan which, in the words of a commission under the chairmanship of Mr. Acheson himself, in its report of its findings to the United States Government, entirely passes over the question of prohibiting the production of atomic bombs, since the whole matter is subject to the discretion of the Senate, which will act in accordance with its own prerogatives and the appropriate legislation. I quoted this report at the last session and I do not intend to abuse your patience by going further into the matter now. I will only say that it has been proved up to the hilt that the Acheson-Baruch-Lilienthal plan is utterly worthless: it provides no control whatever because, since there is no prohibition, there is nothing to control; it provides no guarantees because, since it is not an international plan, it is in no position to give them. Yet this plan is now officially presented to us as the very latest innovation in United States peace policy for 1951. But this same plan is modestly silent as to the necessity of prohibiting the atom bomb.

90. Neither Mr. Truman, nor Mr. Acheson, nor the three-power declaration, propose to lift a finger to prohibit the manufacture of atomic bombs. They cravenly shy away from the subject and pretend that a mere reference to last year's General Assembly resolution, which referred in passing to the prohibition of atom bombs but in no way indicated the necessity of prohibiting them, will settle the whole affair, and that all nations will continue to thrive, awaiting the moment when that very same bomb bursts over their heads.

91. Moreover, the President of the United States and his Secretary of State, as is clear from their respective speeches of yesterday and today, continue to insist that the most suitable plan for controlling the use of atomic energy is precisely the one which is clearly a mere mockery of all international control.

92. Is it necessary to state that all such plans, and all proposals of the kind contained in the three-power declaration and advocated here by the United States representative, though they may be submitted in the form of peace proposals and with the avowed objective of strengthening peace and removing the threat of a new war, are in actual fact nothing but sheer speculation on either the ignorance or the naïvety of people seized with fear for their own future and that of their children.

93. The sponsors of these proposals stated yesterday and today, with their customary lack of ceremony, that they insist—this phrase, please note, is used in speaking to the Soviet Union—that they "insist" that the Kremlin accept their proposals. Is this all you wish to insist on, gentlemen? They will insist on the Soviet Union's accepting these proposals, and at the same time they make slanderous allegations about the Iron Curtain and such nonsense which should have been dropped long ago and placed, where it belongs, in the archives of the State Department.

94. But what are these proposals worth? Instead of dealing with the vitally important and serious matter of

making a real effort to avert the threat of another world war and ensure the security of the peoples, they attempt to evade that issue by empty chatter purporting to deal with the reduction of armaments, the first stage in which process—and no one knows how many years that stage may last—being devoted to the rearmament of States.

95. It is difficult to see what value can be attached to this whole scheme, as outlined in the so-called tripartite declaration, because, in submitting their proposals for a so-called reduction of armaments, the authors of the proposals declare that as long as the Korean war continues, as we were told by the President of the United States of America yesterday and again by Mr. Acheson today, "and while the major political issues that divide the nations remain unsettled",—I am quoting from the relevant part of the speech made by the President of the United States yesterday—"real progress toward reducing armaments may not be possible".

96. This remark is characteristic. It clearly reveals the true meaning of the so-called three-power peace offensive led by the United States of America at the sixth session of the General Assembly in 1951. That offensive is supposed to open a new era in the fight for peace, but in fact it has nothing to do with peace or the strengthening of peace.

97. If the purpose really is to strengthen peace, any sincere plan for the reduction of armed forces and armaments must be based on an equally sincere attempt to put an immediate end to the war in Korea. The United States, however, is unwilling to take any steps to end the Korean war, as this would be against the wishes of the American multi-millionaires, who are growing rich on this war, on war hysteria and on the armaments race.

98. Mr. Acheson saw fit to repeat the slander—I will refrain from using a harsher word out of deference to this Assembly, but no doubt you will all be able to provide a suitable epithet—about the infringement of human rights in, he said, a "large" area of the world, referring in this connexion to Hungary and Czechoslovakia. I shall not dwell on this matter particularly since these slanderous inventions spread about in Mr. Acheson's camp have already been repeatedly and fully refuted.

99. But Mr. Acheson speaks of the infringement of human rights in other countries. I too would like to refer to what I read in a French evening paper about a revolting crime recently committed in Florida. Two negroes, Leon Shepherd and Walter Irving, had been convicted by an American Court of the traditional crime of raping a white woman. They were later acquitted and set free by the United States Supreme Court because of the many and varied irregularities which had occurred during their trial. After their acquittal by the United States Supreme Court these unfortunate negroes were openly shot by the sheriff of Eustace, Florida, and a third negro was shot in the sheriff's presence by a policeman.

100. This is apparently what human rights mean in America; this is apparently the meaning of the American way of life, which we so firmly reject and which we would advise you to look into more closely. We would counsel you to pay greater attention to these matters in your own country, in the vicinity of your own noses, so to speak, and to keep those noses out of other people's countries.

101. It is essential that the manufacture of atomic weapons should be prohibited without delay and that a strict international control should be set up to see that this prohibition is obeyed, so that atomic energy and the existing stocks

of atomic bombs could be used solely and exclusively for civilian purposes.

102. It is essential for nations to end the armaments race, stop the setting up of military bases in foreign territories, and finally, withdraw all their troops from foreign territories.

103. It is further essential that every State should take immediate steps to reduce its armed forces and armaments and to divert its funds from military budgets to satisfying the needs of the peoples, improving their material condition and safeguarding their welfare.

104. It is essential that the United States, the United Kingdom, France, China and the Soviet Union should at last make a concerted effort to conclude among themselves a peace pact, such as the one we have been striving for for years, a fact which all peace-loving peoples should be asked to join. Action along these lines would frustrate the aggressive plans of the ruling circles in the United States, the United Kingdom and certain other countries, and would remove the threat of another world war.

105. The delegation of the Soviet Union, acting on its Government's instructions, is submitting proposals which it firmly believes will be an important means of attaining the purpose which millions and millions of people throughout the world dream of and for which they live and toil.

106. The USSR delegation is convinced that the struggle for peace will end in a complete victory for peace. "Peace", as Generalissimo Stalin has said, "will be preserved and fortified if the peoples take the matter of preserving it into their own hands and if they defend its cause to the end". We believe that the General Assembly should listen to the voice of the peoples and fulfil its duty in this great and noble cause.

107. On its Government's instructions, and with a view to strengthening the peace and security of the peoples and averting the threat of another world war, the USSR delegation submits the following proposal for the consideration of the General Assembly [A/1944]:

"1. The General Assembly declares participation in the aggressive Atlantic bloc and the creation by certain States, and primarily by the United States of America, of military, naval and air bases in foreign territory incompatible with membership of the United Nations.

"2. The General Assembly recognizes it to be essential that:

"(a) The countries taking part in the Korean war should immediately end military operations, conclude a truce and withdraw their forces from the 38th Parallel within a period of ten days;

"(b) All foreign troops, and also foreign volunteer forces, should be withdrawn from Korea within a period of three months.

"3. The General Assembly calls upon the governments of all States, both those which are Members of the United Nations and those which are not at present in the United Nations, to consider at a World Conference the question of a substantial reduction of armed forces and armaments and also the question of practical measures for prohibiting the atomic weapon and establishing international control over the observance of such prohibition.

"The General Assembly recommends that the above-mentioned World Conference should be convened at the earliest possible date and in any case not later than 1 June 1952.

"4. The General Assembly calls upon the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, France, China and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to conclude a peace pact and to combine their efforts for achieving this high and noble aim.

"The General Assembly also calls upon all other peace-loving States to join in the Peace Pact."

108. The Soviet Union Government believes that the adoption of these proposals, some of which have been submitted previously by the USSR delegation for the General Assembly's consideration, would play an important part in maintaining peace throughout the world.

109. The USSR delegation calls on all the representatives present here to support these proposals, which it firmly

believes will be welcomed by all nations striving for peace and by all peace-loving peoples.

110. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I propose to adjourn the meeting now. We shall meet again tomorrow at 10.30 a.m.

111. The meeting is now adjourned so that the General Committee may consider the agenda of the current session. The General Committee will meet at 5.30 p.m. in Conference Room No. 4, the First Committee room.

112. I should also like to say that I have twelve speakers on my list and to ask any representatives who wish to speak in the general debate to let me know.

The meeting rose at 4.40 p.m.